

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 1 May 2024

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 14:16 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 (14:17): I bring up the 44th report of the committee, 2022-24.

Report received.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN: I bring up the report of the committee on House of Assembly petition No. 50 of 55/1, entitled 'Western Hospital at Henley Beach'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Report by the Minister on the schedule of approval to remove track infrastructure

Ministerial Statement

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE, NATIONAL CABINET

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:19): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Premier in another place, entitled 'Meeting of national cabinet on gender-based violence'.

Question Time

THRIVING REGIONS FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding PIRSA funding and the Thriving Regions Fund:

1. Can the minister please name all of the streams associated with the Thriving Regions Fund?
2. Can the minister please state how much funding is allocated to each of the streams?
3. Can the minister please state the dates of opening and closing for each round of those streams?
4. Can the minister explain how and where people in the regions can find this information?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for her questions. The Thriving Regions Fund is a total of \$15 million per year. There are three streams: the Strengthening Industry stream, the Thriving Communities stream, and the Enabling Infrastructure stream. The

Enabling Infrastructure program is \$5 million. They are being assessed in a two-stage process. The first process was an expression of interest.

It is important, in my view, that, where possible, people don't expend large amounts of time and resources into applications if they are not going to be competitive in the final assessment and, therefore, that program has a two-stage process. The first is the expression of interest and then, depending on the recommendations from that, a number of applicants were invited to stage 2, which of course involves a lot more detail in terms of the projects and the funding that is being applied for. I am advised that there should be recommendations coming to me about that stream in the very near future.

Yesterday, I outlined the latest round of the Thriving Communities Fund, which is about \$800,000 to 21 different projects, if I recall correctly. That is something that has been very well received. The third is the Strengthening Industries program, which is open year round. If people go to the PIRSA website and put in 'Thriving Regions' or 'Thriving Regions Fund' it will come up with that. I think the current line in that document in regard to the first two of those streams says that the opening and closing dates and recipients are announced throughout the year—or words to that effect—I obviously don't have it right in front of me. That is the situation in regard to our very successful Thriving Regions Fund.

THRIVING REGIONS FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: how can members of the public apply for the Strengthening Industries program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:22): In the first instance they are encouraged to speak to their regional coordinators in whichever region they have their business.

THRIVING REGIONS FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Further supplementary: in regard to the Enabling Infrastructure stream, who makes the decision on whether the applicant for the expression of interest is granted approval to go to the round 2 stage?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): Ultimately, as minister, the final decision is mine, but that is based on all the information available to me, which includes feedback from the eight Regional Development Australia associations. Obviously, I highly value the advice that they provide.

I thought it was particularly important that—given we want to make sure we are getting the best bang for our buck in terms of the regional development fund or the Thriving Regions Fund—we do engage with people on the ground. I think the regional development associations on the whole have a strong brand, a strong recognition as being in good contact with their local communities and, importantly, are able to look at the priorities for the whole region rather than necessarily looking at projects in isolation.

I think it's the first time that this fund or its equivalent predecessors have used this type of two-stage process with the RDAs having such an important input into it, and I look forward to evaluating in the future how this new process has gone.

THRIVING REGIONS FUND

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Final supplementary: will the successful grant recipients from both the Enabling Infrastructure stream and the Strengthening Industry program stream be made public?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:24): It will have the normal announcements about successful applicants, as we have done in the past.

WINE GRAPEGROWERS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question on wine grapegrower land diversification.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The oversupply in commercial wine is a global phenomenon, and it seems inevitable that there will need to be vineyard removals here in South Australia, as is now happening in wine producing regions internationally. A national wine sector organisation, Australian Grape and Wine, asserts:

If we don't make a relatively modest investment now we could face bigger problems down the track, with a mass exodus from these towns, high rates of unemployment and pressure on schools.

We have asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development numerous questions to find out the measures the government is taking to provide assistance to wine grapegrowers, particularly to the Riverland region. The minister has listed some of those short-term assistance measures in relation to support and some assistance to boosting markets for South Australian wine, measures which are of course welcomed.

However, reinvigorating the much-reduced China wine market is unlikely on its own to correct the oversupply problem and provide an answer to the challenges faced by the state's grapegrowers and winemakers. It is of paramount importance that, as vineyards are removed, productive agricultural land is not left bare and that these growers left with few options, other than pulling out vines, are provided with options and, where appropriate, assistance to convert their businesses to a sustainable footing.

This is essential to preserve the socio-economic wellbeing of regional communities and represents an investment into the future of the state. My questions to the minister are:

1. What modelling has her government done in anticipation of the potential impacts of the likely transition on the state's regional areas?
2. What measures is the government planning to ensure that productivity of agricultural land is preserved as growers around the state decide to remove areas of vineyards?

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. It is interesting that she says that wine pulls are inevitable: I think there is certainly some active and live debate around that. One of the reasons for that live debate is the lack of data, particularly in other states, around demand and supply. Members will recall that on my initiation there is now a federal working group looking at the national viticulture and wine sector, and that involves all the other states and territories that have an interest, as well as the commonwealth government.

One of the things they have done is met and had meetings within each of the inland wine regions of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, as well as having multiple meetings with various stakeholders. One thing that is clear is that we have excellent data here in South Australia and that is through the vine health register. There is not the same level of data available in other states. That means there is a lot of debate around the supply.

We have perhaps a better understanding of demand, because that is a reasonably transparent market measure, but in terms of supply we do not have nationally the data we need. That is one piece of information that will be coming back, I would imagine, through the working group, because it is something that has been raised on a number of occasions.

It is really important that we do have that information because, as again I think I have mentioned here before, there are state implications for any kind of measure. If there was a vine pull, for example, in the Riverland, but not an equivalent reduction in supply just over the border, the positive benefits in terms of addressing the imbalance are likely to be continuous, if not non-existent. That is why there needs to be the holistic approach, the national approach that I advocated for, and I look forward to hearing more about what the working group has been able to ascertain as we go forward.

WINE GRAPEGROWERS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: given that the working group was supposed to report back to agricultural ministers by the end of April, has the minister had any dialogue or correspondence in recent days from the working group?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:29): I haven't had any files come through to me at this stage. My understanding is that the work that will be provided to agricultural ministers, which is out of session from our national agriculture ministers' meeting, will include essentially a summary of what has been heard, what the working group heard so far, and then potentially information about measures that will need most likely to have more investigation. The paper is due to come back to the meeting of agricultural ministers, if I remember correctly, in July, and so there is obviously quite a lot of work that needs to be done before that date.

FISHERIES SECTOR

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on fisheries and cost recovery. Has the minister and her department begun the implementation of the revised and reset policy? If not, when will this begin, and when can the industry expect it to be completed?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to hear the answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:31): I would have hoped the opposition leader would have wanted to hear it as well. In terms of the cost-recovery report, for those who have read it they would recall that a lot of the actions involved working with industry on a number of different initiatives. So that is an ongoing process and therefore is something that we are continuing to work on both within the department and with stakeholders.

FISHERIES SECTOR

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary: what consultation has the minister and her department had with industry specifically in regard to the revised and reset policy to date?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:32): We have had ongoing discussions and, I understand, some correspondence.

WINE INDUSTRY

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about how our world-class South Australian shiraz is currently being showcased on the global stage?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am pleased to inform the chamber that part of the Via Sensoria exhibition at the La Cite du Vin wine museum in Bordeaux is the featuring of our very own South Australian world-class shiraz.

I have previously spoken about the three-year memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the South Australian government and La Cite du Vin signed in August last year, when I had the enormous privilege of being able to visit the iconic wine museum and be a signatory to the MOU. This partnership has ensured that South Australian wines can be showcased to thousands of visitors each year, as well as other benefits, such as the platform for producers to hold wine tastings, run showcase events and contribute to the archive of wine literature held at the world-famous museum.

Initiatives such as the La Cite du Vin partnership are important opportunities to engage South Australia's new and existing markets around the world and are another way of promoting South

Australia on the world stage so that we continue to attract visitors and larger export numbers to grow our economy.

South Australian wineries Kalleske, Ochota Barrels and Pattriti currently have their shiraz varieties available for Via Sensoria visitors, with wines from other South Australian producers en route to the museum. Other wineries set to be showcased in coming weeks include Anderson Hill Wines, Brash Higgins, Dandelion Vineyards, Heirloom Vineyards, Mitolo Wines and Penfolds.

I understand the exhibition features four pavilions, each representing one season, with South Australia's Autumn Pavilion offering visitors the opportunity to experience sommelier-guided shiraz tastings. The Via Sensoria exhibition runs until November this year, and I am sure members will join with me in wishing South Australian producers and wineries who are exhibiting all the best over the coming months.

WHYALLA STEELWORKS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, representing the Minister for Infrastructure in the other place and the Premier, a question about the Whyalla Steelworks.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: On 9 April, I asked the minister a question about the steelworks amid growing concerns in Whyalla about its future. While I await a formal response from the minister, further doubts are being raised about the steelworks, which is the lifeline of the Iron Triangle town, employing about 1,000 workers.

Much of this uncertainty centres around the financial stability of the steelworks' owner, Sanjeev Gupta's company GFG Alliance, which has been forced to refinance \$5 billion in funds previously extended by its former chief financier Greensill Capital, following that company's spectacular collapse. Administrators for Greensill Capital have warned they could attempt to seize assets from Mr Gupta to recover nearly \$900 million in unpaid funds.

I am reliably informed the arc furnace, the current blast furnace, has been out of action for almost a month and might be turned back on sometime this month, which is more than eight weeks after breaking down. I am also reliably informed there are growing concerns within the government about the impact that Mr Gupta's global financial woes is having on the steelworks, but they have graver concerns about its future and that of Whyalla should Mr Gupta be forced to walk away from business, with another buyer highly unlikely to be found in the short term.

It is my understanding that no steel has gone into the rolling mill for more than a month. My questions to the minister are:

1. What reassurances can the minister give to South Australians that the steelworks' short-term future is secure?
2. Can he confirm that government executives are demanding briefings with company management twice a week to be kept updated on the steelworks' operational and financial issues?
3. Has the government given Mr Gupta the \$50 million he has been asking for for several years to help him with his financial problems?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have been provided with some information by the Minister for Infrastructure in the other place that addresses some of the points that have been raised.

I am advised that the blast furnace remains operational, albeit at a reduced capacity. I am advised that nine tuyeres—which are nozzles around the tap hole used to force natural gas and air into the furnace to facilitate a slow return to production temperature—are now online. I am advised that once 12 are online the blast furnace will be able to return to normal operations, which is expected in early May.

Once that occurs, the temporary roster changes that have been in effect since 22 April can revert back to normal. In the meantime, GFG are managing impact on staff through leave arrangements, training attendance and reassignment to other parts of the steelworks, which I understand has been accepted by the Australian Workers' Union.

The government is continuing to monitor the situation closely. It is critical that the blast furnace returns to normal production as soon as possible and the ageing plant is maintained until the new electric arc furnace (EAF) is commissioned.

WHYALLA STEELWORKS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:39): Supplementary: can the minister also indicate when the electric arc furnace that Mr Gupta promised to install by 2025 is expected to be installed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:39): The only information I have is that the project completion is targeted for 2025-26.

POLITICAL DONATIONS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General about political donations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: InDaily reported on 20 April that the member for Kavel now has oversight of the Electoral Commission instead of Attorney-General Kyam Maher, as well as carriage of Labor's pledge from opposition to ban political donations. The article went on to posit that:

An argument could be made that by handing over responsibility for working on a donation ban to Mr Cregan, it may give Labor an out if it does prove too hard to develop legislation robust enough to face legal challenge.

My question to the Attorney-General is: did the Attorney-General intentionally handball responsibility for the ban of political donations to the member for Kavel because he knew it would be too hard to achieve the government's election promise?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): No.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will listen to your supplementary, the honourable deputy leader.

POLITICAL DONATIONS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Can the Attorney-General elaborate on the 'no'?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

WE'RE EQUAL CAMPAIGN

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:41): My question is to the Attorney-General regarding a We're Equal update. Will the minister inform the council about the progress of Equal Opportunity SA's We're Equal campaign?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. I am very pleased to be able to update the council on the current status of the We're Equal campaign run by Equal Opportunity SA, which has continued in its growth and success since I last informed the chamber about the program.

Encouragingly, there are now 169 We're Equal members listed on Equal Opportunity SA's website pledging to be employers who treat everyone equally regardless of their age, ability, gender diversity, sexuality, relationship and reproductive status, race, religion or culture. As acknowledged

on Equal Opportunity SA's website, We're Equal members are actively committed to a vision of South Australia as an open and inclusive society that embraces and supports difference and diversity. This means they will make sure that their premises are safe places for all people. These employers have a zero tolerance for discrimination or disrespectful behaviours, whether to or by their customers, staff, suppliers or contractors.

A significant update to the campaign is that We're Equal now underpins a range of areas in public sector diversity, including the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Strategy 2023-26, which was launched in December of last year and as a result membership of We're Equal was made a deliverable for all public sector agencies under the strategy.

The sector's senior leadership council collectively signed the We're Equal statement of commitment, with agencies subsequently registering for membership. This brought all public sector agencies and over 130,000 South Australian public sector employees under the We're Equal values commitment to actively support the diversity of their customers and consumers, their workers, their contractors and their suppliers through the zero tolerance for discrimination, bullying and harassment.

For example, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport has endorsed the We're Equal message through Adelaide Metro services and Service SA customer centres, and the Department for Education is planning to roll out We're Equal across 945 schools and preschools in the state. The Department of Human Services will also be promulgating We're Equal through its youth justice, disability and women's information services.

When I last updated the council about the We're Equal campaign, the project was still in its infancy. I am very pleased to report that as I said there is now a membership network of over 169 locations across South Australia in seven sectors, including government, health and wellbeing, professional services, retail, sport and unions.

Large agencies, such as the Adelaide Fringe, the Legal Services Commission and the Adelaide Central Market, are working to roll out the We're Equal message across metropolitan and regional South Australia. They join peak sporting bodies, such as the SANFL, Netball SA, Adelaide United, the Adelaide Football Club and Tennis SA, along with numerous arts organisations, hospitality and other services providers that are leading the way to ensure South Australian businesses are safe and respectful workplaces.

The project is one for all of us to be especially proud of as it is unique to South Australia. I understand there is no equivalent within Australia and in a search overseas. Importantly, we know that businesses with diverse workforces who respond to the needs of diverse consumers attract loyal customers and have better retention and productivity outcomes, which is why the We're Equal campaign is important on so many levels, including economically.

I want to thank the Equal Opportunity SA office staff, in particular the commissioner and assistant commissioner, for their efforts in getting the campaign to this stage, and I look forward to seeing the continued growth of this campaign and the positive impacts it has on South Australian businesses and our broader community.

WE'RE EQUAL CAMPAIGN

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:46): Supplementary: are any religious-based schools participating in the We're Equal campaign, and does the We're Equal campaign have a view on provisions within the Equal Opportunity Act that allow religious-based schools and institutions to turn away gay teachers and staff?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:46): I would be very happy to take that on notice and bring back a reply to the member about whether any of the 169 fall into that category.

HARASSMENT IN THE PARLIAMENTARY WORKPLACE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Special Minister of State, on the topic of

implementation of the equal opportunity commissioner's recommendations on sexual harassment in the parliamentary workplace.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: A review of harassment in the South Australian parliament workplace by the then equal opportunity commissioner was requested by both houses of parliament on 12 November 2020. A report was laid before each house of parliament on 26 February 2021—over three years ago. That review yielded several recommendations aimed at the prevention and appropriate handling of sexual and discriminatory harassment in the parliamentary workplace, noting, and I quote the then acting commissioner:

There are some fundamental gaps in policy, training and complaints practices that, if addressed, will make a significant difference in preventing and responding to harassment. However, sexual and discriminatory harassment will only be eliminated through concerted efforts to create cultural change. In that regard, strong leadership in driving workplace standards and an emphasis on systems that shift responsibility away from victims and place the onus on leaders to respond effectively is crucial.

She went on to say in her report:

Imperative to achieving cultural change is effective and consistent leadership on sexual and discriminatory harassment. The Commission accordingly calls on the Houses to implement a number of recommendations including reviewing standing orders to allow breast and bottling feeding in the Chamber, adopting a motion declaring that sexual and discriminatory harassment is not tolerated in the parliamentary workplace—

both of which I am pleased have been actioned—

and implementing a formal cultural change framework for gender equality, such as Our Watch's Workplace Equality and Respect Standards or seeking White Ribbon Australia Workplace Accreditation.

Which, of course, has not yet been implemented, despite acting equal opportunity commissioner Strickland noting:

Prompt and comprehensive implementation of all of the recommendations in this Report will demonstrate that leadership across the parliamentary workplace is committed to a safe, respectful and inclusive environment for all.

I draw the minister's attention to the correspondence received by the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, which has been received and published by that committee, dated 27 March. In response to a question from the committee as to when recommendation No. 6(c) of the EO commissioner's report would be implemented—specifically, the Our Watch Workplace Equality and Respect Standards program—the Clerk has written:

I can advise you that a comprehensive program of works is currently underway to give full effect to the recommendations of the EOC report, which includes a suite of HR policies and procedures. It is anticipated that the development and dissemination of the policies and procedures referred to will be completed by June 2024. Upon completion of the policies and procedures which have been identified as a top priority, work will then commence on implementing the Our Watch's Workplace Equality and Respect Standards program.

It takes a simple email to Our Watch to start the process. Their resources are available free to any workplace or local government or government or parliament which seeks them. They would have been able to roll out this program within months, but here we are three years on without this program even being contemplated by the so-called leadership of this parliament. So my question to the new Special Minister of State is: will he take responsibility for ensuring that all of the recommendations of the equal opportunity commissioner's report are implemented with appropriate haste?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for her question. The new Special Minister of State, as we talked about yesterday in this chamber, has responsibility for the Electoral Act being committed to him and electoral reform, and also particular responsibility for the operations of parliament.

The particular report, the EO review of harassment in the parliamentary workplace, spans both the operations of parliament and the general legal framework in which society, including parliament, operates. There were a number of recommendations that, to their credit, the former government had initiated. There are other recommendations that are within the purview of parliament, and the honourable member has talked about recommendation 6(c) that seeks for the

parliamentary workplace to be accredited as a White Ribbon workplace or implementing Our Watch's Workplace Equality and Respect Standards.

I am happy to go away and talk to my new colleague, the Special Minister of State, and between the two of us liaise with officers of parliament and bring back to the honourable member a reply.

CLOSING THE GAP

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Priority reform 4 under the national agreement under Closing the Gap, which was part of the reforms I think signed in 2021 given that Closing the Gap targets were not being met fast enough, relates specifically to data and sharing with Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations.

On the SAACCON website, it particularly refers to governments providing access and sharing data for decision-making—I am paraphrasing here—and it has a dot point that refers to up to six community data project locations being established by 2023. Can the minister advise whether the latter has been achieved and provide details about which projects those are, and what progress is being made on sharing data for the capacity of Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for her question and I do acknowledge that the honourable member is quite familiar with the Closing the Gap reform process. I know that the current overarching not just priority reforms but 17 socio-economic targets were signed off and agreed on in the term of the last government, and I think the honourable member was a minister who actually personally attended joint council meetings on behalf of the South Australian government in the initial stages of progressing the new Closing the Gap reform process.

In relation to the shared access to data and information, I don't have information in front of me as to where we are in terms of our partnership agreement but certainly we have signed as a government a partnership agreement between the South Australian government and SAACCON, the South Australian Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisation Network, to jointly work on those priority reforms.

I am happy to go away and find out, in relation to the data sharing area, exactly where that is. I know there has been a massive body of work undertaken in terms of the financial data and the government spending on programs specifically for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and spending generally that includes Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people that is helping us inform where we can spend, involving Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations more in delivering programs. But in terms of data sharing, I am happy to go away and bring back a response in relation to the particular—that priority reform, its targets and where they sit.

CLOSING THE GAP

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:55): Supplementary question: can the minister advise which is the lead agency for that work that he referred to?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for her question. In terms of the Closing the Gap reforms, the lead agency within government is the Attorney-General's Department, within which the department for Aboriginal affairs sits.

FARM BUSINESS RESILIENCE PROGRAM

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister tell the chamber about the state government's delivery of the Farm Business Resilience Program and how it is being rolled out across farming and growing sectors, in particular the GrowStrong program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his question. Over many years and across many colours and levels of government there have been numerous initiatives and programs to assist farmers to get through periods of drought, in many cases prolonged periods of drought. The state government is currently delivering two Future Drought Fund programs: the Farm Business Resilience Program and the Regional Drought Resilience Planning Program. It is also a major partner in the South Australian Drought Resilience Adoption and Innovation Hub, known as the SA Drought Hub.

Now in its second year, the Farm Business Resilience Program in South Australia is helping farmers in the wine grape, broadacre, vegetable and dairy sectors to build resilience to the impacts of drought and climate change. The program does this through training projects that cover strategic farm business management and planning, farm risk management and decision-making, natural resource management and personal and social resilience.

Of course, development of knowledge in these key areas is critical to being able to navigate difficult periods for farmers and producers in both a personal and a business sense. Our state's sector-led farm business resilience delivery model means that training is tailored to specific needs of industries, further enhancing the value that this program provides in meeting the needs of farmers and producers across sectors, where, of course, operations can differ quite vastly.

One of the industry-led initiatives is the Wine Grape Council of South Australia's GrowStrong program, currently being delivered as a pilot project for South Australian wine grapegrowers in the Riverland and Limestone Coast, and it has already been completed in Langhorne Creek. The program provides practical help to wine grapegrowers, with training components delivered in the region consisting of the following training: firstly, Viti Fundamentals, which offers wine grapegrowers training in intensive vineyard resilience practices to build capacity, reduce vulnerabilities and promote financially and environmentally sustainable practices in their businesses.

Secondly, Business Fundamentals, comprising a masterclass series by the University of Adelaide business school and one-on-one business planning sessions run by Rural Business Support, covers topics including risk mapping, scenario planning, financial management and budgeting, industry law, technology adoption and customer engagement. Thirdly, and finally, Sustainable Winegrowing Australia training, which supports participants to gain nationally accredited sustainability certification.

GrowStrong is now in full swing and will run through May and June. In the Riverland Viti Fundamentals is being run today and tomorrow (1 and 2 May) and Business Fundamentals on 14, 21 and 28 May and 4 June. In the Limestone Coast Viti Fundamentals is being run on 18-19 June and Business Fundamentals on 21 and 28 May and 4 and 11 June.

The other sector-led projects delivered during the first two years of the Farm Business Resilience Program are AgRi-Silience, led by Livestock SA for the broadacre sector, Growing Profitability, led by AUSVEG SA for the vegetable sector, and Our Farm, Our Plan, led by the SA Dairyfarmers' Association for the dairy sector. The state government is pleased to partner with industry in ensuring that critical programs such as these are available as they really can make a difference in developing skills and knowledge that can see farmers and growers through difficult times such as drought and other natural disasters, many of which, of course, we know are inevitable.

CEDUNA

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding crime in Ceduna.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: According to the Red Suburbs—Crime Map of Australia, Ceduna, in the state's Far West, has a crime rank of 100 out of 100. It has been reported that the rise in antisocial behaviour contributing to this appalling ranking has been exacerbated by the very social services set up to assist drug and alcohol-dependent members of the community. Over the past 18 months these publicly-funded services have been misused, attracting people to drink and use the social services

for food, enabling them to continue antisocial behaviour but not providing rehabilitation. As a result, incidents of public intoxication and antisocial behaviour have soared.

Locals are concerned that these services are not assisting people to move from alcohol addiction to sobriety, and are not supporting the families caught up in the mess while people are entangled in addiction. It must be noted that former mayor, Allan Suter, worked tirelessly to have the cashless debit card implemented in Ceduna in 2016, and since it was scrapped in 2022, the Red Suburbs—Crime Map of Australia has shown a rapid rise in crime and violence in Ceduna. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the minister aware that local community leaders have raised concerns with SAPOL and the Ceduna district council that the prohibition of drinking in public by-laws is not being enforced?
2. Does the decision to end the cashless debit card program need to be reviewed?
2. What is the government doing in response to reports that Aboriginal people have died in the street from hypothermia, and that kids are stealing to feed themselves as intoxicated parents continue to neglect them?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is substantially similar to a question that the opposition asked me yesterday, so I will obviously provide a very similar response. I have had the opportunity in recent months to spend time in Ceduna with Aboriginal community leaders. There was concern about a range of things including housing and social behaviour but also the misrepresentation and unfair portrayal from earlier in the year about some issues in Ceduna that many leaders of the Aboriginal community were concerned about.

I think the honourable member is conflating correlation and causation in terms of an absolute link between the cashless debit card and any change in any behaviour or social issues in Ceduna. As I answered yesterday, the police decide on their operational matters and how they apply resources, and do a very good job right across South Australia, not just in Adelaide and the CBD but in regional areas. I note that in many regional areas the remoteness and isolation does provide challenges in many areas of service provision.

The other matter that I talked about briefly yesterday was the work that the Consumer and Business Services commissioner, who is responsible for alcohol regulation, does in remote areas, particularly in Ceduna. I have had a number of conversations with Aboriginal leaders in Ceduna as well as the commissioner about what I think has been a welcome responsiveness to imposing conditions on alcohol service that are bespoke and needed for particular situations in areas like Ceduna.

CEDUNA

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about Ceduna.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Yesterday, as a result of my question in regard to the rise of antisocial behaviour in Ceduna, the Attorney called those concerns 'a misrepresentation by local Liberals in that part of the world'. On the website of the office of Consumer and Business Services, under the headline 'Stronger liquor restrictions to be trialled in Ceduna', it says that an increase in antisocial behaviour and alcohol-related harm in Ceduna has prompted a three-month trial of stricter regulations on the sale of takeaway alcohol in Ceduna and surrounding areas. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Is he aware of the changes that occurred last month from the office of Consumer and Business Services that were put in place for the three-month trial, which started last week on 22 April, of restrictions that meant takeaway, cask wine, spirits and fortified wine cannot be purchased before midday?
2. What is he doing to use all his power at his disposal to arrest the rise of antisocial behaviour that has been highlighted by this department?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:05): I am happy to repeat myself, which is a repeat of myself from yesterday, in relation to the question that was just asked. As I answered, probably about three minutes ago, to the previous honourable member's question, yes, I am aware that bespoke responses are put in place from the office of Consumer and Business Services in relation to alcohol service in response to particular matters that come up in the area of Ceduna.

As I said not more than three minutes ago, I am pleased to have had communications regularly with Aboriginal leaders in Ceduna and also with the office of Consumer and Business Services about initiatives they are taking. They are often very sensible initiatives worked through, regularly at the request of communities, that provide a release valve in a lot of areas. Some of the measures the honourable member has outlined have the capacity to do that, as have other measures that have been implemented over months and years in remote areas like Ceduna.

CEDUNA

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:06): Supplementary: does the Attorney agree with the office of Consumer and Business Services that there has been an increase in antisocial behaviour and alcohol-related harm in Ceduna?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:06): I don't have figures in front of me, but as I said I have had regular discussions with and applaud the work of the office of Consumer and Business Services and the regulator on the alcohol provision and services, and where there is a need to make changes in response to the environments they find themselves in, to do that.

CEDUNA

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:06): Supplementary: will the Attorney-General do an Anthony Albanese and visit Ceduna in the near future and speak to concerned community leaders about what is happening there?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:07): I am happy to repeat myself, which is a repeat of repeating myself and the repeating of myself yesterday. I am very fortunate that in my role as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs I get to visit many communities right across South Australia. I suspect it was about a month ago that I last visited Ceduna, meeting with community leaders, particularly Aboriginal community leaders, not just in Ceduna but in the homelands around Ceduna. I have the opportunity to meet regularly with leaders from other communities such as Koonibba, Yalata and Scotdesco to the west of Ceduna as well, and I will continue to do so.

CEDUNA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:07): Supplementary arising from the first answer: in the minister's conversations with local communities, was the issue of the long-promised but never delivered rehabilitation centre raised?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): I know there are a number of centres and a number of areas that are used for the various needs of Ceduna. One area that certainly was spoken about at some length was the need for the Aboriginal Health Service, which has been in a shocking condition for many years.

On my last visit recently I spent time with the new CEO of Yadu Health and was able to look at the site where the old Yadu Health facility has now been demolished and a \$15.8 million new Aboriginal health centre, Yadu Health on the West Coast, is being built. There are constantly views put forward about how we can better and further improve services for not just Aboriginal but the whole community in terms of health and other services.

AFL MOB BREAKFAST

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:09): My question is also to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the chamber about the 2024 AFL Mob Breakfast, held during Gather Round?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. As many of us in this chamber will fondly remember, Gather Round was held in Adelaide in early April. I know that, as I look around, I saw many members of this chamber partaking in the many great events that Adelaide had during Gather Round. The city really came alive.

One of the new events at Gather Round that I very much hope is continued, which I had the pleasure of being invited to speak at, was on Saturday 6 April, the inaugural AFL Mob Breakfast, an event for all Aboriginal and multicultural AFL and AFLW players, staff and coaches. Hosted by the AFL's national Indigenous and multicultural engagement manager, Mr Pauly Vandenberg, the breakfast was a valuable opportunity to bring people together from different clubs and competitions in the same location to discuss and celebrate in particular the contribution of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians to our national game.

I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the important role that Pauly Vandenberg has played in our community through directing and managing educational sporting programs for Aboriginal children and young people. He has done this through his position as a founding and continuing board member for the Tjindu Foundation, as well as his previous roles as manager and director for Aboriginal programs at the Port Adelaide Football Club. Through these programs Pauly has helped create and manage, he has promoted the importance of leadership, health and wellbeing initiatives to ensure better education and employment prospects for some of our state's most vulnerable children, which is an incredible feat on its own.

The room at the Mob Breakfast during Gather Round was filled with many significant people who have been involved in the game and who continue to inspire up-and-coming generations, people like Michael Long, Eddie Betts, Shaun Burgoyne, Gavin Wanganeen, Shane Edwards, as well as many others, and current generations of players, including Shai Bolton, Bradley Hill, Chad Wingard, Jamarra Ugle-Hagan and many more.

The morning was started by Cliff Wilson welcoming people to his people's country in both English and the Kurna language. Cliff continued to highlight the strong connection Kurna people have with this land and pointed out it wasn't far from where the breakfast was being held that the Aboriginal flag was flown for the first time in 1971. It was a proud moment to be sitting there with not just incredible athletes but role models, who through football have made a significant contribution to changing our understanding of society and how Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people relate.

We heard from the executive manager for inclusion and social policy at the AFL, a former South Australian of the Year and Torres Strait Islander woman, Tanya Hosch, who continues to inspire not just me but I think all people in the room with her passion and drive for social justice. I had the privilege of saying a few words about the implementation of our state-based Voice to Parliament, as well as touching on the incredible work that past and current players have had in paving the way for young Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander boys and girls to take part in sports, which has a huge benefit to them, their health, their community and their education.

The Mob Breakfast presented the perfect occasion to announce the 2024 Sir Doug Nicholls Round honouree, proud Arrernte man Sonny Morey. Sonny Morey was born at Yambah Station in 1945. At around seven years of age, Sonny remembers being taken from his mother, who he never saw again. It was only decades later Sonny learned of his mother's lifelong efforts to find him.

Sonny started playing football competitively at the age of 15 and was part of the first Central Districts side when they were admitted to the SANFL league in 1964. Sonny played 213 games for Central Districts between 1964 and 1977, becoming the first player to reach 200 games for the club, receiving a best and fairest, a runner-up for the Magarey Medal, as well as being selected as part of the SANFL Indigenous Team of the Century. There are not many as deserving as Sonny Morey to be honoured during this year's AFL Sir Douglas Nicholls Round.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the organisers for an incredible morning, the AFL for their continued work in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, and those players who, no matter what adversity they face, continue to show up, entertain, inspire and change our nation.

HUTT ST CENTRE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the minister representing the Treasurer on the topic of the Hutt St Centre's Aspire Program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Data released by PropTrack today shows that Adelaide's house prices have increased more than any other capital city in Australia over the last year, at 13.99 per cent. In March, Domain's vacancy rate report showed that Adelaide has the lowest housing vacancy rate in the country, at 0.3 per cent, further pushing people into housing stress and, ultimately, homelessness. The Adelaide Zero Project's March 2024 figures show that 194 people are actively homeless in Adelaide, with 144 people sleeping rough.

This morning, on the steps of Parliament House, advocates were calling for an end to homelessness and better affordable housing options for our state. One homeless service, the Hutt St Centre's Aspire Program, helps people with medium and long-term case management to help get them out of homelessness. Since 2017, the program has seen 81 per cent of their 575 clients secure housing.

The Advertiser reported on 15 April that the Hutt St Centre chief executive officer, Chris Burns, is pleading with the state government to give assurances that it will keep funding the program. Last year, the government gave a 12-month extension in their budget; however, the future of this vital program is now unclear. *The Advertiser* reports that figures calculated show the program saved the government nearly \$33 million—\$33 million—in reduced hospital stays, criminal procedures and other services.

My question to the minister representing the Treasurer therefore is: will the government commit to funding the Aspire Program in this year's state budget, and what is the government doing to address the housing and homelessness crisis that is engulfing our state?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:16): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer that to the appropriate minister and bring back a reply for him.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE, TREATY, TRUTH

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:16): My question is for the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding election commitments. Does the minister anticipate that the government's election commitment of Voice, Treaty and Truth will be fulfilled by the next state election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:16): I have talked about this a number of times in this place. We had an election commitment—and I think it was our very first election commitment, way back in July 2019—to implement a state-based version in response to the Uluru Statement that includes the elements of Voice, Truth and Treaty.

As I have said before, many people have written about it and thought about it since the Uluru Statement was handed down in May 2017, but the logical first step in terms of sequencing in that process would be Voice. That is what we have done in this state. We now have the legislation, we have had those first elections and are in the process of the organisation of those first Local, and then State, Voices being set up.

As I have also said in this chamber before, we are keen to get some of the views of the newly formed Voice on the next stages of the three tenets of the Uluru Statement. We will certainly be making progress towards the other stages of Truth and Treaty during this term of parliament, but I don't think anyone thinks it will be completely over, done and dusted within the next year and a half.

Victoria is, I think, five or six years into a treaty process and is now at the stage of formal negotiations. Queensland is a couple of years into starting a treaty process. Other jurisdictions around the world, like North America for example—many of the provinces of Canada are treaty jurisdictions where treaties were signed in the mid to late 1800s, for instance the province of

Manitoba. Every part of that province is covered by, I think, five or six different treaties. In Canada, the province of British Columbia largely does not have treaties signed. They are, I think, into their second decade at least now in a number of areas of treaty negotiations and discussions.

We are under no illusion, and I don't think anybody who has worked in this policy area and thought about it thinks it will be a very quick process, but we are keen to get on with continuing with the other elements of the Uluru Statement once the Voice is set up.

ONEFORTYONE NURSERY

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Forest Industries. Will the minister please update the chamber about the recent opening of OneFortyOne's \$8 million upgraded nursery?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in the forest industry. It is an exciting time to be involved in the forest industry in South Australia. Not only is there significant investment in the forest industry by the Malinauskas Labor government but what we are seeing is continued investment by industry into this growing sector.

I am pleased to update this place that I had the opportunity recently to formally open the recently redeveloped \$8 million OneFortyOne Glencoe Nursery in Glencoe. I was joined at the opening by the Chief Executive of OneFortyOne, Ms Wendy Norris, the local and hardworking House of Assembly local representatives, the member for Mount Gambier, Troy Bell, and the member for MacKillop, Nick McBride, along with the Hon. Ben Hood MLC.

As we should all know, forestry is the ultimate renewable and the seedlings that are produced at Glencoe will contribute towards the 22 billion tonnes of carbon stored in plantation forests around Australia. An additional four million seedlings per season can now be grown, which is wonderful for the forestry industry and lays the groundwork for the industry to expand further.

These upgrades will deliver enhanced seedling growth, giving each tiny pine the best chance possible to survive being transplanted from the nursery and to continue to thrive out in sandy soils or dry conditions. The trees will then grow on for decades to contribute a quality of wood fibre that is highly prized both locally and internationally. The upgrade includes irrigation improvements and provides water-saving efficiencies and innovative mechanised processes which will sow millions of seedlings for our plantation forests across the region.

I congratulate everyone involved in bringing this project to its operational stages. This investment ensures Glencoe Nursery continues to build on its proud 40-year history. Investments such as this one make it clear that the forest industry has a great future in South Australia. It will enable the forestry sector to continue to thrive in South Australia, now employing 18,000 people, directly and indirectly.

We recognise the significant contribution this makes to our economy, our environment and the social fabric of our regions. Just as OneFortyOne is investing in our forest industry, the Malinauskas state government views this industry as critical, through both its economic and social returns and the significant decarbonising opportunities that it presents. That is why the government is investing \$19 million in growing the state's forest industry.

Matters of Interest

FALL OF SAIGON 49TH ANNIVERSARY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:21): I rise today to speak about the 49th anniversary commemoration of the fall of Saigon. The Vietnam War, from 1962 to 1975, was one of the longest conflicts in the 20th century. Some 60,000 Australian defence personnel served in Vietnam over 10 years of the war. Known as Black April, the fall of Saigon marks the capture of Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, by North Vietnamese forces on 30 April 1975. This dark moment in history signified the end of the Vietnam War and the collapse of the South Vietnamese state.

After the fall of Saigon in April 1975, the world saw one of the largest mass migrations of asylum seekers in modern history. It was reported by the National Bureau of Asian Research that almost two million Vietnamese fled the country by boat and risked their lives in order to seek freedom from the Vietnamese Communist regime. Sadly, more than 500,000 people died or disappeared during this tragic time. About 1.6 million boat people were resettled to third-party countries between 1975 and 1997.

The Vietnam War changed the world and changed Australia for ever. Since the fall of Saigon in 1975, Australia has been a proud home and safe heartland for many generations of the Vietnamese community. We are incredibly fortunate that the Vietnamese community of South Australia has continuously shown its gratitude towards Australia, and we are blessed to have such a hardworking and resilient Vietnamese community making incredible contributions to multicultural South Australia.

As the shadow minister for multicultural affairs, it was a great honour to attend the wreath-laying ceremony and the commemoration service marking the 49th anniversary of the fall of Saigon held on Saturday 27 April with the Hon. John Gardner. Special thanks to Dang-Thao Nguyen, President, and the committee/volunteers of the Vietnamese Veterans Association SA; and Quin Tran, President, and the committee of the Vietnamese Community in Australia South Australian chapter for their dedication and hard work to work with Australian and Vietnamese veterans in organising the meaningful event.

It was a solemn and moving commemoration, where we gathered to honour the brave Vietnamese and Australian soldiers, service men and women and civilians who made the ultimate sacrifice defending the freedom and democracy of the Republic of Vietnam. Every year, I am touched by the emotional speeches made by all speakers highlighting the trauma and pain still felt within the South Australian Vietnamese community. The brutality and injustice of the Vietnam War is still present for the community, who continue to grieve for loved ones lost in battle and lost at sea and for the loss of their beloved homeland they were forced to leave forever.

Both presidents of the Vietnamese community organisations reflected on the terrible sacrifice of the fallen soldiers and also expressed the community's gratitude towards Australia and the Australian people for supporting the South Vietnamese people in their greatest time of need. I would like to take a moment to share a beautiful and moving poem that President Quin Tran wrote to convey her refugee story and her deep thanks to Australia for welcoming her family. Inspired by Dorothea Mackellar's *My Country*, Quin wrote and spoke that day:

I love a sunburnt country,
A land of sweeping plains.
Of ragged mountain ranges,
Of drought and flooding rains.
I love her far horizons,
I love her jewel sea.
Her beauty and her terror,
The wide brown land for me.
My heritage is Vietnamese,
Our boat was 10 by 3m wide.
84 people crowded on board,
We prayed and cried, and cried.
I was one of ten toddlers,
My brother two weeks old.
Two days and three nights adrift,
In severe wind, wet and cold.
We refuged in Malay Bidong,

Until SA opened her doors.
Thank you to Australia,
For welcoming us, to your shores.
3,000 troops wounded,
Across our yellow land.
59 of them South Aussies,
Freedom forever stands.
I'm grateful to this sunburnt land,
Whose heroes fought for me.
Three red stripes in their honour,
Fallen soldiers—five hundred and twenty-three.

Lest we forget.

AUTISM

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:26): For those who do not know, we reached the end of World Autism Month as of today. Following on from World Autism Awareness Day on 2 April, the month of April is celebrated as a world autism awareness and acceptance month. However, while it is great to have a dedicated day and month to celebrate autism awareness, the Premier and this government have a policy agenda that extends beyond the month of April.

Eighteen months ago, this government became the first in the world to dedicate a policy portfolio to autism and to one member of government. Over this period of time, the autistic and autism communities have shared stories describing challenges, barriers, opportunity and success, but there is one word that pops up far too frequently, a word that frankly does not sit well with me, and that is 'luck'.

Luck is a word used flippantly, a word we all use to excuse misfortune or to celebrate success. But what if it was by luck that you were noticed, seen, heard and now feel that you belong? This is a story shared with me by many people in the autistic community, including Jack Herzich. Growing up, Jack always felt he had many differences to other children, and these differences became more apparent when he started kindergarten and school. His mum had many concerns but was unable to find the right support for Jack and someone to listen.

In 2013, Jack moved to a new public school in the northern suburbs. It was at this school that Jack found the teacher who would change his life: Mrs Parsons. It was Mrs Parsons who had the knowledge to see what so many had missed. She encouraged Jack's mum to seek an autism assessment for Jack, and by doing so, Jack discovered who he is: he is autistic. What followed was life-changing for Jack. The correct supports and therapies were put into place, and just last year, Jack graduated from school and is now in his first year of university. He is repaying Mrs Parsons's gift of knowledge in the greatest way possible: Jack is studying to be a teacher.

But when Jack shares his story, he credits his success to luck; luck that he found the right teacher who had knowledge and understanding, and luck that he was able to have access to an autism assessment while he was young. We cannot rely on luck to be the enabler of success. Success can come from policies that help replace chance, and with policies we can go to the core of the problem. We must start by replacing the word 'luck' with knowledge.

To Jack and the many who have shared their stories with me, this government sees you, we hear you and we are listening. We have launched the state's first Autism Inclusion Charter to build knowledge across government, to help change the narrative for the largest disability group in our community, the autistic community. I again congratulate and thank the crossbenchers for supporting the signing of that pledge and share my disappointment again with the opposition for not signing that pledge, a pledge that is not based on luck but a pledge developed through the knowledge of the autistic and autism communities.

It is the knowledge we are building that is changing the luck narrative. It is changing stories like Jack's. We are replacing luck with knowledge, and by doing so we are changing the stories and experiences of many in our community. We are doing this through the creation of the nation's largest autism inclusion network of teachers in our public primary schools, and we are doing this by changing university degrees so that our teachers come out of universities at the end of this year with knowledge, for the very first time, in disability, autism and inclusive studies.

This has not been done in any other state that I am aware of, where all four universities have come together and made an agreement to upgrade their university agendas. This can only be achieved when we have a government willing to bring people to the table and have this conversation, have a conversation about changing luck and building knowledge in our community.

RUSSO-ROSSI, MS M.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:31): This is a poignant Mother's Day story. It spans 60 years of a heartbroken mother's relentless search for the whereabouts of her baby son. What Maria Russo-Rossi uncovered is shocking: unlawful, unethical and disturbing practices which had occurred in the funeral industry. Hers is a story of bizarre and macabre twists and turns which began at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital on 5 May 1964 when newly arrived Italian migrant Maria and her now late husband, Rino, welcomed their first child, a boy. Sadly, he only lived eight hours.

Unable to speak a word of English in their adopted homeland, the grieving couple left it to the hospital to make the necessary arrangements. There was no funeral. Elliott funeral directors collected baby Rossi. A death certificate shows the unnamed baby was buried on 12 May 1964 at Hindmarsh Cemetery.

Here is where this tragic saga takes its first strange turn. In 1993, after 29 years of trying to forget the trauma of losing her firstborn, Maria went looking for his burial place at Hindmarsh Cemetery. Despite the official government document confirming the burial took place, there was no record of baby Rossi.

Believing neither she nor the baby's soul could ever find peace until his remains were found, Maria started her detective work. She began at The QEH, collecting the names of 35 babies who had died there between March and August 1964 and where they were supposedly buried in Adelaide's various cemeteries. To her horror, she found only one accurate record, so where were the others, including baby Rossi?

Hospital and cemetery workers told Maria it was a common yet illegal practice for stillborn and young children to be buried with adults in the same grave to slash costs. Unsure where her baby was, Maria and her husband erected a small monument at Hindmarsh. That was not the end of it. Maria was still desperate to find out where her infant son was buried.

Again, she scoured cemetery records to match burials of adults by Elliott funeral directors on 12 May 1964, and found one. So Maria wrote to the Attorney-General in March 2014 seeking an exhumation of that grave. It was only granted by the current Attorney-General in December last year. But there was to be more disappointment. No signs of a baby's remains in that grave were found. The wasted exercise cost Maria just over \$10,000.

Soon after, Maria's daughter, Anna Maria, scanned West Terrace Cemetery records and stumbled upon the name Rossi buried in a mass children's grave—not in May 1964 but three years later in 1967, that is if he is even there. Maria then learned that many other children who had died in different years, and from different areas, were also placed in the mass grave that year. So where was baby Rossi and those 34 other children she knew about for those missing years? Their fate still haunts Maria.

I recently quizzed a highly respected veteran funeral director who started working in the industry in the 1960s and asked if he could shed any light on the mystery. He revealed alarming and scandalous practices: babies and children whose families could not afford or did not have formal funerals for other reasons were kept for years in cold storage after disposal costs had already been paid to undertakers, or their bodies were used for medical research before being disposed in incinerators or landfill without family consent.

Who knows how many children were involved in this macabre practice? Hundreds, even thousands, without mothers, fathers and families ever knowing the truth to this very day. The funeral director also told me unscrupulous gravediggers, to save on grave places used for pauper burials, would place open caskets on top of three others buried in the same grave then cover the cadavers with lime so they could quickly break down. Apparently there is a whole line of these graves at Hindmarsh Cemetery and most likely elsewhere.

As for Maria Russo-Rossi, she and Rino led a productive life in Adelaide, going on to have eight children. Rino passed away in 2020 aged 83. Maria's emotional journey for closure does have a bittersweet ending. This Saturday, there will be a ceremony, with a priest in attendance, at West Terrace Cemetery's mass burial site for children to mark what would have been the 60th birthday of her unnamed newborn son. Considering all that has happened, I will be asking the government to reimburse Maria's costs for the exhumation.

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS' MEMORIAL DAY

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:36): On Monday, I had the honour of lighting a candle at the Pilgrim Uniting Church in Flinders Street as a mark of respect and remembrance for hundreds of Australians who lose their lives every year. With me was the Hon. Kyam Maher, the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Katrine Hildyard, the Hon. Andrea Michaels and the member for Colton, Matt Cowdrey. We came together that morning to commemorate Workers' Memorial Day, held on 28 April to coincide with World Day for Safety and Health at Work to mark the lives lost in the workplace.

The not-for-profit organisation Voice of Industrial Death (VOID) was present to remind us of the loss we endure every year. Rarely has there been a more appropriate acronym than VOID, which gives voice to the unnecessary and avoidable deaths and the unspeakable hole they create in our society. From families to friends and workmates, some of whom have had to live with witnessing the fatal injury, these deaths create a void in so many lives that cannot be filled.

As if around 200 Australians losing their lives every year at work was not horrifying enough, a further 2,000 people die from diseases contracted during their everyday work. Another 125,000 people are seriously injured every year at work, adding economic strain to the personal toll. I have said it here before and I will say it again: most employers do the right thing and provide a safe workplace. Unfortunately, the small percentage of those who cut corners in search of a financial edge often directly cause the death of their workers. Their greed, laziness, apathy and sometimes just ignorance kills the actual people they employ to drive their businesses.

Even changing weather patterns can create life-threatening work health and safety issues. Extreme weather events, UV radiation and increased air pollution are among the issues that need to be addressed more now than in previous decades. Employers have to consider the impact of a changing climate as well as the improved knowledge that we have of the elements when creating their workplace. Whereas a worker would have been unfairly expected to work all day in the blazing sun 50 or 60 years ago we now know better. Consequently, the employer has to do better.

In Australia we are in a better position for workplace safety than many other countries, but that is no comfort to the thousands of people who have been impacted, often shattered, by the direct and indirect workplace deaths. It means little to the widowed partner who has to deal with grief and then often endure ongoing financial hardship or to the children left without a mother or father who often cannot understand why they have been left with this hollowness in their once-normal, secure lives.

We cannot afford to look at the often terrible conditions workers are forced to deal with in other countries and be complacent. We need to keep improving so that not one person gets killed by simply doing their job in Australia. In South Australia this Labor government passed the industrial manslaughter bill, making it a potentially criminal act to provide an unsafe workplace.

The act contains penalties for employers who do not meet the required standards. These include a maximum of 20 years' imprisonment for individuals and an \$18 million fine for corporations if they engage in reckless or grossly negligent conduct. Like all laws, this is designed to be a deterrent from doing the wrong thing. We also need to change workplace culture where employers are

dedicated to safety and looking after their workers. Whether you go to work in a factory, on the road, a building site, an office, or any worksite, you should expect to come home safely.

Too often, though, in a country as advanced as Australia, we see workers being killed after being crushed under heavy machinery, struck by moving objects, having faulty supports collapse under them or being in poorly marked zones. This has to end now. We need to be vigilant, all of us but particularly employers who should be providing a safe and healthy workplace. We cannot afford the void left by workplace death.

GENDER-AFFIRMING CARE FOR MINORS

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:41): I rise to address a grave concern that challenges the very integrity of our healthcare system, and that is the aggressive promotion of gender-affirming care for minors. Damning findings from the Cass review necessitate a complete re-evaluation of these practices within our own country. After four years of investigation, including eight independent systemic reviews of global literature, the review found a lack of reliable evidence of key interventions, including social transitioning, puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones. It follows a trend in other countries like Finland and Sweden, which have now banned puberty blockers.

The review's main conclusion is as powerful as it is obvious: life-altering treatments should not be used on children without evidence of benefit. Dr Andrew Amos of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, shared his views on the Cass review in *The Australian* only yesterday. Dr Amos calls out the two big lies that gender-affirming care zealots are telling us; that is, that the services here are so different from England's that there is no lesson for us to learn from the Cass review, and, second, that a gender diverse identity does not involve mental illness.

Dr Amos ridicules these plainly absurd arguments. The Cass review, in fact, specifically evaluated the Australian endorsed guidelines and found them to be amongst the lowest quality of all international practices. They lack rigour and researchers warn that Australia's transgender guidelines are unacceptable as they did not follow rules that guard patient safety. This is a damning finding, as is the revelation, also from *The Australian* just this week, out of our country's most populous state.

FOI applications from New South Wales Labor MP Greg Donnelly revealed that Maple Leaf House, the largest provider of transgender health services in that state, has no data whatsoever on how many children they are treating with hormone therapies or even what their sexes are at birth. Mr Donnelly is quoted as saying, 'Maple Leaf House's operational procedures make the UK's failed Tavistock Gender Identity Clinic look good.'

Despite concerns being raised in 2006 about the Tavistock Centre, they treated thousands of gender-confused children and received referrals from kids as young as three years old. The Tavistock Centre is now being shut down and faces mass legal action from the families of children who claimed they were misdiagnosed and rushed down unquestioning gender-affirmation paths.

Dr Jillian Spencer, a senior psychologist at Queensland Children's Hospital, who was stood down for going against the trans lobby zeitgeist, had a 20-year unblemished record with Queensland Health, and she had this to say:

I am concerned Australian gender clinics are providing a standard of care significantly worse than the Tavistock Clinic on several measures.

Indeed, where Tavistock was criticised for rushing children onto hormonal interventions after just as few as four to six sessions, Australian clinics do so after merely three or four sessions. Cross-sex hormones are being prescribed from around a child's 16th birthday in the UK, but here routinely it occurs at just the age of 14. Where the UK does not allow gender surgery on minors, the Australian Family Court has greenlit adolescents who have decision-making capacity to go under the knife since 2018.

A senior lawyer in this state has expressed to me grave concerns about future damages claims which could result from our approach in this country. We are at a juncture where continuing down this path would not only be irresponsible but also unethical, where political activists rather than medical science has greater sway. It is a stark departure from the principle of 'first, do no harm'. That should guide all medical treatment.

A moratorium and inquiry is desperately needed. We must protect our youth from irreversible harm at a time they are most vulnerable. We must ensure that any intervention not only withstands the scrutiny of robust scientific inquiry but also aligns with the highest ethical standards of care. This is not about ideology, this is about safeguarding the health and future of our children. We cannot afford to be complicit in a practice that may very well be remembered as one of the most significant medical missteps of our time.

MAY DAY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:46): Today, 1 May, is May Day. It is an international celebration of organised labour, for those of you who do not know. The bonds of trade unionism that extend across cultures and nations bring us together to recognise the achievements of workers and their unions, and in particular the hard-won victory of the eight-hour day.

May Day may have its origins in history, but the truth is that it is a story that continues to be written. It is in fact still being written right now. Far from the fanciful Thatcher-esque notion that there is no such thing as society, our society has realised that Thatcher herself was just part of the story of our community. Labour exists, workers exist, within a landscape that is, by its very nature, ever changing. The economy is always changing, industrial landscapes are always changing, workers themselves are changing.

As we continue to progress toward a future economy, as we continue to write our story of next year's May Day, we must ensure that working South Australians do not get lost in the shuffle. We can do it; we have done it before. We were here, union members were right here where I stand right now, when the colony had yet to shift in true earnest from being an agrarian economy to an industrial economy.

Our movement has been here through so much industrial change. Across that span of time we have advanced industrial and democratic reforms that broadened economic opportunity and participation, and empowered workers to have a greater agency in their work and in their lives. Union members have been the driving force behind not only economic but social progress: the eight-hour workday, the five-day work week, overtime pay, our health system and superannuation. The labour movement is the reason we have ever been in a position to talk about the Australian dream.

At no point in our state's history were those at the top of the economic pyramid doing poorly. From the earliest days of South Australia there was a lot of wealth and a lot more was built during its early decades, but wealth inequality was rife and labour was feloniously easy to exploit.

Within an evolving and developing economy, and through reforms driven by workers and their unions, things started to change for those in our community who were not among the wealthy. Wages and incomes began rising, and along with them so did the standard of living for many South Australians. But now, as the economy continues to evolve, technology in particular has enabled industrial innovations that have made it easier for companies to do more with far less human effort. They can shift operations on global supply chains and replace human labour with automation.

Our industrial landscape is changing once again. As the change sets in, the same interests, from big business, from the conservative side of politics and from many corners of the media, make the same old arguments that worker protections and unions themselves are somehow to blame for the middle-class struggles. But as executive wages skyrocket, while the cost-of-living crisis rages on, it is an argument that rings, frankly, pretty hollow.

When union membership falls, inequality returns, and it has returned. The Australian Dream is, if not dying, at the very least a dream that seems perpetually deferred. Now more than ever it is clear that the anti-union rhetoric of attacking community and looking out for yourself ahead of anyone else just does not stack up. Those who prepare our food, who clean up after us, who heal our sickness, deliver our babies and look after our ageing parents cannot and will not house themselves in trickle-down promises.

The celebration that is this year's May Day should remind us all that the hard-fought victories for fairness in our past must inspire us to continue to fight against the change which brings inequality for workers right now. The first step we can all take is a simple one: celebrate the history of what we

all share today by being involved in your union. Be the change that you want to see in your workplace, in our society and in our community. Happy May Day, comrades.

GREEN BANS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:50): I rise to observe that today is May Day and pay tribute not just to May Day and the workers but to the green bans, as relevant as they ever were. The workers united will never be defeated. 'Intersectionality' might be a recent buzzword but it has existed for a very long time in the workers' movement and in the green bans movement. Touch one, touch all: you may find yourself standing shoulder to shoulder with members of the union movement and the so-called soccer mums or doctors' wives, should you find yourself up against a green ban.

It should come as no surprise that a Greens member of parliament would want to pay tribute to the green bans. In fact, it is partly where we took our party name from. In the early 1970s, green bans were instrumental in New South Wales in preserving buildings of great heritage and importance, including the historic buildings around Martin Place.

Somebody who came over to visit Australia to see what was an embryonic political movement at the time was Petra Kelly, who in the 1970s was a German political activist visiting Australia. She took the name 'Greens'—Grünen—and the philosophy home with her and used them in 1980 when she became one of the founders of the German Greens. In fact, they were based on what the global Greens are based on, which is the four principles, the pillars of ecological sustainability, grassroots democracy, social justice and peace and nonviolence.

A few years later, the name and the political concept came to Australia when the first Greens party in Australia was formed in Sydney in 1984 and registered in 1985. I am actually born in Dubbo, New South Wales, and grew up in Sydney in those years and so I am very familiar with the work of the green bans. In particular, I will jump ahead and thank the green bans movement for saving Centennial Park in 1972 from being overdeveloped. That was the park of my childhood, and I am pleased to say that it continues today.

So many parts of Sydney were preserved due to the green bans: Woolloomooloo in the sixties; Kelly's Bush in 1969; The Rocks, which we all know and love and is such a great tourist attraction now in Sydney, in 1971; Victoria Street in King's Cross, which is still a beautiful street but was saved by a conglomeration of squatters, unionists and ladies who lunch (and are activists) in the 1970s. More recently, in the 1990s we have seen, again in Woolloomooloo, Finger Wharf saved through green bans. In 2016, the Bondi Pavilion was saved through green bans.

How did these green bans come about? I want to pay tribute to a man called Jack Munday. Jack was born in 1929 in the Atherton Tablelands, the fourth of five children, in Queensland. He came down to Sydney to play rugby league, sadly for Parramatta, for three seasons, but then he seemed to move closer to the eastern suburbs, where I grew up in the shadow of those beautiful Moreton Bay figs in Centennial Park.

In 1969, he was elected secretary of the New South Wales BLF. Under his leadership, along with Bob Pringle and Joe Owens, the union won improved wages and conditions, but of course they also created the green bans; standing shoulder to shoulder, supporting Aboriginal land rights, gay rights, queer rights; standing shoulder to shoulder with student activists, ladies who lunch and environmentalists and bringing peace and nonviolence into their civil action.

The green bans today are as relevant as they ever were, and I am proud to be part of a party that saw that ethos put into a political practice, but right now in South Australia we need green bans if we are going to stand up and preserve our heritage. We only have those heritage protections, and some of those heritage pieces, because of that intersectional, worker-led work of the green bans.

Whether it is saving the Bondi Pavilion or saving the Palais down at Semaphore, I am proud that people like Jack Munday led the movement. He was a Greens member for the last two decades of his life until he passed. The spirit of Jack Munday will be upheld not only in this place by the Greens but, indeed, in the community, saving places like the Cranker.

*Motions***ST FLORIAN'S DAY**

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:55): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that 4 May 2024 marks St Florian's Day;
2. Acknowledges that St Florian is the patron saint of firefighters; and
3. Gives thanks to all past and present employees, members and volunteers of the MFS and CFS for their service.

Each year, 4 May marks the feast of St Florian. On the same day since 1999, we also celebrate International Firefighters' Day. International Firefighters' Day shares its date with St Florian's Day in recognition of the risks taken, the sacrifices made, and the exceptional bravery demonstrated by firefighting personnel around the world.

St Florian, who is recognised as the patron saint of firefighters, was born around 250 CE. A commander of the Imperial Army in the Roman province of Noricum, in modern-day Austria, he was responsible for organising and leading firefighting brigades. St Florian's cross is a recognisable motif incorporated into the insignia of many modern fire services.

South Australia's Metropolitan Fire Service, an institution that is universally highly regarded across our community and rated among the most trusted professions in the nation, is one of the oldest legislated government firefighting services in the world. Prior to its establishment, the responsibility for firefighting sat with the police and with the community. In the early 1840s the government purchased a vehicle to help with firefighting. This so-called fire engine was evidently nothing more than a cart with leather buckets and a few ladders on board.

Around 1855, a particular approach to firefighting arose. Building insurance in the colony was extremely expensive at the time and, in a bid to sell more of it, insurers lowered their premiums. To counter the risks they were taking on, they established their own firefighting service. We can imagine that the government of the day, then as now, recognised that crucial public services should not be subject to privatisation, because the Fire Brigade Act 1862 provided for the establishment of the South Australian Fire Brigade, now known as the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.

The job of the MFS today is, in their own words, 'to safeguard the irreplaceable'. Many South Australians have stories to share of moments when MFS personnel have stepped in and bravely saved the day. I have my own such story of a vivid memory from childhood that will stay with me forever and cemented early on my admiration and gratitude for the work of the MFS and its people, but I will not go into that today.

The MFS's role over more than 160 years of service has evolved far beyond their original remit of structural firefighting, in response to our community's needs in a complex, modern, multi-hazard environment. The courage and dedication of the MFS workers protecting our lives, our loved ones and our livelihoods is extraordinary. How fortunate we are that they are one of two firefighting forces that South Australians can count upon in our times of greatest need.

In 1976, the government passed the Country Fires Act, which set up the South Australian Country Fire Service. The CFS serves communities through dedicated volunteers delivering professional fire and rescue services to outer metropolitan, regional and rural South Australia. Throughout South Australia there are around thirteen and a half thousand CFS volunteers across 425 brigades, 33 hazmat brigades and 66 road crash rescue brigades, all supported by a fleet of over 800 fire trucks.

The CFS is also an all-hazards agency responding to bushfires, building fires, road crash rescues and hazardous material spills. The CFS works alongside the MFS and the SES and with local government to help with strategies for fuel reduction and to educate the community about bushfires and fire safety.

Particularly during a bushfire event, everything can change in an instant. The lives and the communities that have been saved by the quick action and the skill of our volunteer firefighters in the

CFS is almost beyond quantifying. To do this without remuneration, in sacrifice of personal time and often at very great risk is an extraordinary act of service. Both our MFS and our CFS are indispensable to our community, and without the dedicated service of the women and men in both services we would be lost.

Firefighters are on the frontlines of almost every kind of emergency we experience in South Australia. For both the MFS and CFS, the work is often dangerous. Firefighters are called upon to put their own safety on the line to protect people across our community, and they do exactly that whenever they must and there are many whose lives have been lost in doing so.

On St Florian's Day and International Firefighters' Day, we honour and remember those we have lost with utmost gratitude and respect. We acknowledge the profound enormity of their sacrifice, as well as the extraordinary personal losses endured by those who love them. To the union that represents our firefighting forces, the United Firefighters Union, I commend your steadfast advocacy on behalf of your members.

The Malinauskas Labor government is grateful, and I am personally grateful, to every firefighter in our state, whether they be paid or volunteer, full-time or part-time. The work that you do changes lives and saves lives, and you never let our community down. It really takes a special person to see a fire raging and run towards it, not just once but any time and every time it is necessary to do so. How very fortunate we are to have so many such people among us, each of whom is willing to suit up day after day and fight to keep us safe. In full confidence of the support of all members, I am proud to commend the motion to the chamber.

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

CHILD SAFETY (PROHIBITED PERSONS) ACT REGULATIONS

Private Members Business, Orders of the Day, No. 4: Hon. C. Bonaros to move:

That the regulations under the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016 concerning exemptions, made on 4 December 2023 and laid on the table of this council on 6 February 2024, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:03): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ANZAC DAY

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (16:03): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that ANZAC Day was commemorated on Thursday 25 April 2024;
2. Pays its respects to the families of those ANZACs who tragically lost their lives during the capture of the Gallipoli Peninsula;
3. Shows its gratitude to all Australian personnel who have served in defence of their country; and
4. Remembers all Australians who have been injured or killed while serving.

ANZAC Day marks the anniversary of the first major military action fought by the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps during the First World War. Last Thursday 25 April was the 109th anniversary of the landing of the Australian and New Zealand forces at Gallipoli.

On this day in 1915, before dawn, battleships, destroyers and troopships with Australian and New Zealand troops on board approached the Turkish coast. Leaving the ships, they rowed the final distance to shore in the dark, landing in the wrong position. They found themselves at a 600 metre long cove, in steep and difficult terrain, surrounded by headlands, where they were met with fierce resistance from the Ottoman Turkish defenders.

The purpose of the Gallipoli campaign was to force Turkey, Germany's ally, out of the war. The British had been trying to capture Constantinople but were unable to make their way through the

narrow strait known as the Dardanelles. The naval attempts were thwarted, therefore it was decided for the troops to land on the peninsula to overcome the Turkish defences. Sixteen thousand Australian and New Zealand troops landed at the cove on 25 April 1915, and by the first evening, more than 2,000 people had been killed or wounded.

When it was obvious the stalemate would continue after making no advancement over the next eight months, a general evacuation was recommended. By late December of the same year, the ANZACs were successfully evacuated with few casualties. The campaign resulted in over 26,000 Australian casualties, including more than 8,000 who paid the ultimate price. At the time of the war, Australia was a young federation and was only in its 14th year. For the majority of its soldiers who had landed at Gallipoli, it would have been the first experience of combat.

Despite the failure of the Gallipoli campaign, Australians saw a display of characteristics in their troops that they would continue to identify with in later years of wars and conflicts as well as crisis and hardships. ANZAC came to stand for positive qualities of endurance, courage, ingenuity, good humour and mateship, also known as the spirit of the ANZACs. The spirit of the ANZACs is something that has lived on. As Arthur Burke OAM in his article pointed out, the spirit of ANZAC is not confined to the battlefield but lives on in schools, on the sports fields and all over our great countries of Australia and New Zealand.

Since the First World War, sadly, the world has known further wars and conflicts, all of which have been brutal and costly, often leaving permanent scars for those who have had to endure it and impacting families, friends and future generations to come. On ANZAC Day, we also commemorate the Australians who died in World War II and those who have lost their lives in all military and peacekeeping operations we have been involved in since. It is a sobering reminder of the cost and brutalities of wars and conflicts. In a modern world of screens and digital worlds, it is a reminder of the reality that there is no reset button in war, that the costs are real.

On the eve of this year's ANZAC Day, I had the privilege of laying a wreath at the ceremony of remembrance in Morphett Vale, where I saw young community members from the local youth and cadet groups keeping vigil overnight at the ANZAC memorial. It was great to see the next generation recognise the significance of remembering and honouring the service of our defence personnel. On ANZAC Day, I had the honour of paying my respects, along with many others in the community, at the Colonel Light Gardens dawn service, where I laid a wreath.

Today, we commemorate all the Australian and New Zealand men and women who served and continue to serve and the sacrifices that they make, particularly those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to protect our nation, our values, our ways of life and our democratic freedom. We remember and we honour the sacrifice of all Australians who have served our nation in wars and conflicts. We honour their endurance in hardships and their courage to be daring in what they do. We are grateful for their willingness to serve and sacrifice for our country as well as for the sacrifice of their families and friends. We will remember them. Lest we forget.

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

NICOTINE VAPING

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:09): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that regulated nicotine vaping, for current smokers and for those who have quit smoking, is a safer and cheaper alternative to cigarette smoking;
2. Recognises the growing body of international scientific evidence that supports improved public and personal health benefits of regulated nicotine vaping compared to cigarette smoking;
3. Acknowledges that safer, cheaper, and more effective alternatives to cigarette smoking, such as regulated vaping, ought to be more easily accessible legally for adults who wish to quit smoking and former smokers; and
4. Acknowledges that current vaping policies have inadvertently resulted in a significant expansion of the black market and an increase in youth vaping.

Youth vaping is reaching epidemic proportions. What was once billed as a product to assist nicotine cessation has become trendy and lethal for our kids. Its primary purpose as the most successful nicotine replacement therapy remains severely restricted and our state and federal governments' approach of not regulating vaping is making the situation worse.

A recent poll of 1,500 people commissioned by the Australian Association of Convenience Stores, found that 84 per cent of voters agreed that nicotine vaping products should only be available through licensed retail outlets to adults, the same as alcohol and tobacco products. Australia is the only Western country operating under the prescription model, instead of regulating the nicotine vapes to be able to be legally sold from licensed retail premises to adults, especially those wishing to quit smoking. Tulipwood Economics has released new data indicating that the federal government would raise more than \$9 billion if the ban on vapes was scrapped, allowing products to be regulated and taxed in the same way as tobacco.

I previously introduced my Controlled Substances (Nicotine) Amendment Bill 2022, which would allow for the regulation and sale of nicotine vapes of a prescribed concentration for use in an e-cigarette product. There is growing scientific evidence suggesting that regulated vaping is a far safer alternative to deadly cigarette smoking, the latter of which is shown to prematurely kill somewhere between one-half to two-thirds of continuing users.

In Australia, restrictive and onerous constraints on accessing unregulated nicotine vaping products have resulted in a booming black market where unregulated devices are purchased online or over social media with ease. Recent research suggests that 1.6 million Australian adults are now vaping. A Roy Morgan poll revealed that unregulated vaping has grown by 347 per cent over the last five years.

Despite nicotine vapes requiring a medical prescription, there is evidence that only 2 per cent of nicotine vapes are obtained in this manner. Alarming, 98 per cent are accessed via the black market. The illegal supply of nicotine vapes enables children to access this dangerous product, often with devastating health outcomes. There is a growing body of evidence that even zero per cent of nicotine vapes legally sold in South Australia are hazardous to people's health.

An independent report commissioned by the United Kingdom's Office for Health Improvement and Disparities, released in September 2022, drew on more than 400 published studies from across the globe, including many that investigated signs of harm or levels of toxic substances in the body after smoking and vaping. The review confirmed what previous studies have also shown, which is that vaping is estimated to be at least 95 per cent less harmful than smoking over the short and medium term.

What cannot be forgotten in this debate is the sad reality that 21,000 Australians are dying every single year from smoking-related conditions. An analysis of 171 trials of all smoking cessation medications by the UK National Institute for Health Research found that regulated vaping was the single most effective of all of them.

Evidence from such randomised controlled trials is supported by observational studies, population studies and seen empirically in jurisdictions where regulated vaping rates are high. In New Zealand, which passed the Smokefree Environments and Regulated Products (Vaping) Amendment Act 2020 in August of that year, the government promoted that it is putting 'New Zealand on track to saving thousands of lives and having a smokefree generation sooner rather than later'.

In the United Kingdom, regulated vaping is a formal part of the Tobacco Control Plan and is supported by the Department of Health, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, the Royal College of Physicians, the Royal Society for Public Health and almost all public health, medical and health associations, and charities.

By adopting a regulated public health measure, an estimated \$200 million per year in windfall taxes would flow into the federal government's coffers from regulated nicotine vapes. As more smokers switch to this far safer alternative, healthcare costs will also fall and so the overall benefit to the budget will compound.

I am not suggesting that regulated vaping is completely safe and risk-free. Regulated vaping is not recommended for non-smokers and of course not engaging in either smoking or vaping is the

healthiest option, but the reality we are dealing with is that, compared with smoking deadly cigarettes that contain over 7,000 toxic chemicals, vaping, which generally has fewer than 100 detectable chemicals and at lower doses, is a safer alternative. Based on the substantially reduced number and dose of carcinogens in vapour, the lifetime cancer risk from regulated vaping has been estimated to be less than 0.5 per cent of the risk from smoking.

The federal government's approach, banning vapes unless prescribed, will continue to fuel the black market trade. Regulated vaping products, in the same way as cigarettes, will protect children and reduce the number of the next generation of users as it will smash the black market. Coalition leader, Peter Dutton, has confirmed he will support lifting existing restrictions on unregulated vaping introduced this year by federal health minister, Mark Butler, paving the way for regulated vaping. Mr Dutton has argued these restrictions would not reduce the black market trade and that Australia should treat nicotine vapes in the same way as tobacco.

Vapers should not be faced with high barriers, penalties and restrictions to obtain a product that is safer, cheaper and shown empirically to be effective at smoking cessation. I am urging our state and federal governments as well as my colleagues to re-evaluate their approach and perception of unregulated nicotine vapes and to support this public health measure that will save the lives and livelihoods of South Australians. I commend this motion to the chamber.

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

Bills

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (PARENTAL PRIMACY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:15): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Education and Children's Services Act 2019 and to make a related amendment to the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is a sad reflection on modern Australia that responsibilities of parents and teachers have become increasingly and in many cases deliberately blurred and that some educators are more interested in indoctrination than education. Let me be clear from the outset: One Nation has no tolerance for the targeting or bullying of any individual or group and will continue to promote kindness and acceptance. What we do not support is government overreach and insulting parents by taking away their autonomy on ethical and moral matters.

I believe parents and families should remain responsible for imparting core values such as ethics and morals on developing minds, while teachers should stick to teaching facts, not feelings, so curricula, syllabuses and courses of instruction at all levels of schooling should not include gender-fluidity teaching, as it is a doctrine that is not evidence based. We saw the travesty of a public school getting it so wrong in the case of Renmark High School, exposing year 9 girls to the concepts of bestiality and images of transgender surgery. There was no parental consent and not even a teacher was present.

This bill removes gender fluidity from the curriculum in South Australian schools. This is not a right-wing view; this is a responsible view and the position, I believe, of the overwhelming majority who currently feel browbeaten into keeping quiet on the matter. A recent *Advertiser* poll showed overwhelming support for this bill, with 80 to 90 per cent of the over 600 respondents agreeing that parents should be in charge of guiding their children on these moral and ethical matters.

If a child is feeling confused about their sex, let the school be guided by their parents. It is wrong that the current system allows parents to be excluded from these discussions and the school to take control. Let children be who they are. They do not require the interference of the gender unicorn in the year 7 curriculum, asking them to match their genitalia with the feelings in their heart and brain. Why are we encouraging children to think about what sort of sex partner they might be

and whom they might want to have sex with at this age? This is not the role of schools. Schools need to focus on engendering ambition and developing confidence in our young people.

We have a sex confusion pandemic in our schools. That is what parents and principals in confidence are telling me. I have heard from many South Australian parents who are deeply concerned about what is being taught to their children. Now more than ever people are starting to stand up and question what they have been told to accept. Parents never agreed to this. They never threw their arms up and said, 'We can't do it. We want the government to take charge of moral and ethical matters for our children.'

No. This is serious government overreach and causing division in families, the breakdown of the family unit, another epidemic facing society and causing young people harm. Indeed, this week it was front page of *The Australian* that Maple Leaf House, a gender clinic in Newcastle that takes in most of New South Wales' teenagers who want to change gender, has not kept data on how many children are being put on hormone therapy or what their natal sexes were.

The clinic provides puberty blockers with unproven effects, and this scandalous practice of not keeping data on patients receiving such treatments means that outcomes are not pragmatically assessed. This will surely lead to court cases where adults regret being guided into gender transitioning as children and decide to sue medical practitioners, repeating the UK experience.

The Prime Minister of New Zealand, Chris Luxon, has gone on record saying that he wants a well-defined sex education curriculum, agreed by experts to be age appropriate. He wants parents to be informed about sexual content being taught in the classroom, and for parents to be given the right to withdraw children from class if they have concerns. New Zealand will refocus the curriculum on academic achievement instead of ideology.

With the concept of gender fluidity comes a teaching that hormone drugs, which stop the physical changes of puberty, can transition children to the opposite sex. Now, under increasing scrutiny internationally, Britain's National Health Service recently banned their routine use, outside of clinical trials.

The Cass review, an independent review of youth services in the UK, has published a report on the back of a four-year investigation, finding that vulnerable children had been let down by a system underpinned by weak research and lack of mental health support. Distinguished consultant psychiatrist David Bell wrote a 2018 report about the activities of the Gender Identity Development Service, a clinic at the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust in North London, the only clinic of its kind in England, specialising in treating children with gender identity issues.

It was the subject of a judgement by the High Court which recently ruled that children under the age of 16 were unlikely to be mature enough to give informed consent to the prescription of puberty blockers. These drugs delay the development of secondary sex characteristics in patients, theoretically enabling children to transition into their desired gender identity. The result of this judicial review was brought by 23-year-old Keira Bell, born female. She was prescribed blockers by the Gender Identity Development Service at 16, and now regrets her transition. The High Court ruled to effectively curtail medical intervention for children with gender dysphoria.

Such cases are increasing around the world. The UK alone now has more than 1,000 active court cases where adults who were guided into gender transitioning as children are now suing medical practitioners. Proponents of gender fluidity being taught in schools should take note of these alarming developments. This type of indoctrination will have devastating consequences for many children in the future and has no place in our education system.

I want to see evidence-based treatments that work and want our children educated to make safe and informed decisions. I want parents to be involved every step of the way, and those pushing their political ideology and agenda to get out of the way. I read with interest the comments from senior Australian psychiatrist, Dr Andrew Amos, where he points out that the treatment of people under 18 who are reporting gender dysphoria is not being held to the same scrutiny as other medical practices. This is putting them at risk of overtreatment and harmful long-term outcomes.

He stresses that clinical evidence requires a record of what is being done, then to report on what is being done, and then a review of what the results have been. He says none of this is

happening with gender services in Australia. The very services our children are being taught are potentially an option for them.

This bill includes important safeguards that recognise parental primacy in relation to core values. It also requires schools to consult with parents about courses that include teaching core values and, importantly, it allows parents who object to the content of these courses to withdraw students from classes. This bill is about freedom for parents to nurture and grow their children's values and ethics as they see fit, rather than have them turned on their heads by a system that seemingly pays no heed to the values of families.

In researching this issue, I came across multiple mentions of the UN's International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, of which Australia is a signatory. It guarantees freedom of thought, conscience and religion in teaching, and recognises the liberty of parents to ensure the moral education of their children in accordance with their convictions. This bill preserves parents' rights to choose religious education.

Parents of students at faith-based schools are supportive of such institutions performing in a way that upholds the values and ethics of that particular school. Parents making a significant financial sacrifice to send their children to an independent institution that best suits their beliefs and aspirations have the right to expect that values-based education be delivered unfettered and without the paw prints of the thought police.

It is ironic that, while inclusion and diversity are overused buzzwords, these sentiments fail to extend to a diversity of belief beyond what is currently being approved by a school system more focused on indoctrination than education.

This bill reasserts the traditional role of parents in the moral, ethical and social development of their children. Schools need to stay in their lane: this is the message I am hearing from constituents. This bill is unapologetically on the side of parents, protecting their rights and their longstanding role that helped build this country.

A child should be focused on those early stages of becoming literate and numerate and enjoying those incredibly important early learning foundations. A child should be allowed and encouraged to be a child, not have concepts way beyond the understanding of their tender years dictated to them. I am sure all sensible members in this chamber would agree that politics has no place in schools, but we continue to see political agendas pushed onto students.

Advocating gender fluidity is a political teaching. It is often the thin end of the wedge for activists/educators, who in reality care more about their agenda and narrative than about the education of their students. We cannot afford this trend to continue, particularly given the latest damning report published early last year as part of the program for international student assessment, which shows that South Australian year 10s are slipping further behind other teenagers in all three core testing areas of reading, maths and scientific literacy. How many more alarm bells need to ring before we start prioritising the basics and getting them right? I commend this bill to the chamber.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CRIMINAL JUSTICE MEASURES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:26): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Bail Act 1985 and the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill, informally referred to as the 'post and boast' measures, has two important elements. The first is changes to the Bail Act 1985. Part 2 amends section 10A of the Bail Act 1985, creating a presumption against bail for a child or youth in certain cases where a prescribed applicant is charged with a prescribed offence and an offence against section 21AA of the Summary Offences Act 1953 if (1) the prescribed offence is the alleged principal offence for the purposes of the charge of the

offence against 21AA of the Summary Offences Act 1953, and (2) at the time of the alleged offending the applicant was a child of or above the age of 14.

The prescribed offences to which this applies are the following offences contained in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935: (1) section 86A—Using motor vehicle without consent; (2) section 169—Serious criminal trespass—non-residential buildings; and (3) section 170—Serious criminal trespass—places of residence. There is a transitional provision for this charge to the Bail Act. It applies to a person who applies for bail on or after commencement of this division on assent, whether or not the relevant offence was committed before or after the commencement of this division.

Amending section 10A of the Bail Act 1985 makes it very clear to the court that in these specific circumstances there is no statutory presumption of bail. That is, if the offending and the offender meets the criteria, the onus shifts onto the applicant for bail to convince the bail authority that there are special circumstances justifying bail before the bail authority can grant bail. This will apply irrespective of if they are already on bail or not.

The court still maintains its discretion if special circumstances exist. These are well-established by common law and statute, but the bill makes it very clear that there is a presumption against bail if these criteria apply. Three years after assent, the definition of prescribed applicant (i) and prescribed offence (ii) will expire unless reinstated by legislation, following a two-year review of the effectiveness of these changes.

These provisions ensure young people accused of stealing a car or breaking into a house or commercial non-residential premises and who have posted their exploits online will find it tougher to get bail. The days of turning up at Youth Court on Monday morning after a weekend of trespass and/or car theft, bragging and glorifying these criminal behaviours online via TikTok, Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat or any other social media or online platform and expecting to be granted bail, often yet again, are over.

The community has had a gutful of these unhinged, disrespectful kids seeing bail as little more than a slap on the wrist and licence to get back out there and reoffend, to brazenly snub their noses at our hardworking police, the justice system and their victims, to seek infamy and notoriety amongst their peers.

Make no mistake: these are not victimless crimes. Home invasion, car theft, dangerous pursuits and theft have a huge impact on community safety and wellbeing. One of the lesser considered victims is the out-of-control perpetrators themselves. We know all too well how youth offending can lead to a lifestyle of youth recidivism, adult offending, escalating serious offence offending, substance abuse, mental illness and homelessness. There is also evidence that criminals recruit vulnerable children on social media to commit these crimes. Being remanded in custody puts the brakes on this.

From a safety perspective, it protects these kids from themselves and the dangers inherent in reoffending, such as repeatedly stealing cars and hooning around or breaking into homes and businesses, often violently accosting and assaulting homeowners in the sanctity of their own homes or traumatising innocent staff members working hard to make a living at their local servo or bottle shop.

As the New South Wales Premier, Chris Minns, said recently, and I quote, 'This is an intervention to stop a young Indigenous kid or non-Indigenous kid stealing a car and killing themselves by wrapping it around a pole or a tree, which I don't want to see.' It also aims to prevent new offenders being recruited into co-offending or recruiting others to join in their infamous criminal exploits and from developing an ongoing, entrenched dysfunctional role in our community.

Interstate investigators say alleged foot soldiers are being groomed and recruited by seasoned crooks using encrypted apps such as Telegram and Threema because youth were less likely to face jail time if caught. The *Herald Sun* revealed last year that children, some as young as 11, were common targets on social media by bikie gangs that would connect them with other young budding criminals to carry out burglaries and assaults on their behalf.

Police tell me they are sick to death of constantly identifying, apprehending and detaining youth who are seemingly not only nonchalant about their crimes but are now increasingly bragging

about them on social media, seeking their five minutes of fame. They are often relatively easy to apprehend, as they become more brazen and almost proud of their exploits.

Senior criminal lawyers have given me dozens of firsthand accounts of youth offenders showing surprisingly little concern about being apprehended and facing the Youth Court again and again. Sadly, they also report that these same kids need help. They come from broken homes, lack positive role models, have disabilities, have a lack of education, substance misuse issues, mental health issues or foetal alcohol distress syndrome, are in state care, have no safe place to live, or are homeless and often hungry and cold.

Many wander the streets at night and sleep in the relative warmth of the day anywhere they can. Crime supports their day-to-day survival but, even more tragically, incarceration in jail—or 'in juvie' as it is referred to by this cohort—is often a safer and more reliable alternative to sleeping and potentially dying in a dumpster.

The bill aims to protect the community from these kids and to better utilise youth support, police and court resources for preventative, diversionary and rehabilitative alternatives such as employment, training, education and treatment. South Australian communities, particularly some regional communities, are over the current approach. It is simply not working and the government cannot continue with its kid gloves approach to what is often very serious and life-threatening offending. Labor governments in New South Wales and Queensland have done something. This bill is South Australia's opportunity to do something.

According to the national ABS statistics of 2022-23, after accounting for population growth the youth offender rate increased from 1,778 to 1,847 offenders per 100,000 persons aged between 10 and 17 years. This was the first increase in the rate of youth offending since 2009-10, more than 12 years ago. In South Australia specifically, 9 per cent of total offenders were youth offenders, more than double the national average of 4 per cent.

New laws that recently came into effect in New South Wales have seen a teenager become the first person charged under New South Wales's post and boast laws after allegedly stealing a Ferrari and BMW from a home in Sydney's northwest. In Queensland, police have charged over 120 young offenders under its new post and boast laws introduced in March this year. Queensland deputy police commissioner, Shane Chelepy, said these are not trivial offences.

Queensland police is actively perusing over 300 online sites and has been able to not only deter others from seeking the same kind of infamy but also to detect a range of offending that may have otherwise gone undetected. New South Wales investigations into the footage of a teenager stabbing a minister of religion, which was widely posted on X and other forums, led to the apprehension of other serious teenage offenders, a haul of illegal drugs, knives and weapons, and vital intelligence in relation to individuals and groups planning future criminal enterprises.

Queensland police also established Taskforce Guardian, a specialist group of detectives and youth justice workers flown into regional centres. This is a model I would like SAPOL to replicate in towns like Ceduna and Port Augusta, which are constantly crying out for help due to their crime rates. In Queensland, Taskforce Guardian has so far diverted over 180 people with alternatives including restorative justice and issuing cautions.

Unlike many community members who understandably just want to rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em, as one colourful former politician described as the function of the system, these changes to the Bail Act and the Summary Offences Act alone are not enough. We know education and training are tickets out of poverty and out of a life of crime, but there is often little on offer to disengaged youth, particularly in regional and remote areas, and no trajectory out of the welfare trap and socio-economic poverty that a life of crime offers.

This amendment cannot act effectively in breaking the cycle without critical proactive support in the community and comprehensive rehabilitation programs should a youth enter into custody. We need to fund and support more effective interventions. *The Advertiser* reported on 23 May that when asked what drove his offending one 10-year-old boy from the Downtown gang in Port Augusta said he was bored and had nothing to do.

I know that there are many community leaders and experts in South Australian regional areas and towns, as well as the metropolitan area, who want to see more proactive preventative programs rolled out. Like all South Australians, I would also like to see these young kids steered away from a life of crime and into one where they are making really positive contributions, not only personally but with their families and the communities in which they live.

In a report tabled in parliament late last year, the Justice Reform Initiative reported that South Australia's swelling incarceration rate is collectively costing the state more than \$374 million annually in operation costs alone, so an investment into breaking the cycle of about \$300 million is a sound investment in keeping people, particularly children, out of jail.

Dr Mindy Sotiri, the highly reputable and regarded director of the bipartisan Justice Reform Initiative, said there was an opportunity for South Australia to move away from imprisonment through genuine alternatives, such as early prevention, diversion and specialist courts that address disadvantage. She said greater investment was needed to provide pathways out of the justice system, particularly with First Nations led alternatives.

For example, in Moree, New South Wales, where the break and enter offending rate was a staggering 840 per cent higher than the state average, new post and boast measures have been accompanied by expanding youth support services beyond the hours of Monday to Friday 9 to 5, as well as improving bail accommodation and support options. They have also extended the opening hours for public pools and community centres to give young people more activities.

Connecting at-risk kids with targeted interventions and positive life choices is a body of work that successive governments have neglected in this state. The state budget continues to underinvest in education, training, rehabilitation and prevention. We need therapeutic responses, we need wraparound services and we need diversionary programs, but we also need deterrents and appropriate penalties to deal with the increasing phenomenon of posting and boasting. I will be persistently asking the government about progress against the recommendations of the Justice Reform Initiative report, to ensure we tackle this problem from all angles.

The second element of the bill, changes to the Summary Offences Act 1953, creates a new offence, 21AA, of a person committing an offence by publishing material to advertise (1) the person's involvement in the offence or (2) the act or omission constituting the offence. This new offence carries a maximum penalty of imprisonment of two years.

'Advertise' means attract the notice and attention of the public or a limited section of the public. 'Material' includes (1) any written and printed material, (2) any photographic, electronic or other information or data from which an image or representation may be produced or reproduced and (3) any audio, video or other recording from which an image or sound may be produced or reproduced. 'Publish' means publish by any means, including via the internet, social media or other electronic means.

Amendment to section 21AA applies to offences committed on or after the commencement of this part by anyone of any age. All of the amendments in this bill are subject to the minister reviewing the operation and effectiveness of the amendments made by part 2, division 1, and part 3 of the act after the second anniversary of commencement and a report to be laid before both houses of parliament. At this point, parliament can assess the impacts and decide whether the bill has had the desired effect.

The provisions of section 21AA mean that anyone committing offences and then sharing videos, photos or accounts of their exploits to social media or any online forum or means of publishing commits a new offence, and they could face an additional two years in prison. It is designed to stop offenders posting videos of their crimes to social media in an attempt to claim notoriety and kudos for their offending. Often, this is being done for likes and/or to draw new followers on social media and for the perceived infamy the offender believes they receive by such actions. It is completely and utterly unacceptable, and it has to stop.

There is also strong circumstantial evidence provided by Victorian, New South Wales and Queensland police that this exhibition-like behaviour is encouraging further criminal behaviour. This bill also aims to address this. In developing this bill, I found it incredibly easy to find examples of

offending posted on TikTok, Facebook, X, Instagram, Snapchat and other social media platforms. There is some particularly sickening footage. The recent stabbing of a minister of religion and subsequent affray in Sydney are recent examples.

In one shocking incident in Victoria, four youths, including a 14-year-old ward of the state, posted footage of themselves in a car mowing down two cyclists on a road in Melbourne's bayside suburbs. The 14 year old had been on bail with strict conditions at the time of the incident. The court later heard he had been contacted on social media by other young people who had committed crimes. In another incident, three teenagers posted a video of themselves appearing to push a 79-year-old man off a pier in Victoria.

Social media has changed the nature of post-crime behaviour. So-called performance crimes, where offenders boast about their criminal behaviour to their friends and followers online, are increasingly common. Not only is it easy to find examples of posting and boasting, it is also very concerning how many social media platforms are unwilling or unable to take these posts down.

We have witnessed in recent weeks social media giant X's arrogant owner, Elon Musk, fighting to keep harmful content online. X has challenged an order to remove material, issued by Australia's eSafety Commissioner, Julie Inman Grant, and raised concerns about censorship and the jurisdiction of Australian laws and edicts dictating what overseas users can see. Using her powers under the Online Safety Act, the eSafety Commissioner issued legal notices to companies including Google, Meta, Reddit, X and Telegram in March this year, asking them to explain how they are taking action against violent and extremist material. There are also questions focused on X's new 'anti-woke' generative AI, Grok. The companies have 49 days to respond.

A 2022 OECD report found Telegram hosted more terrorist or violent extremism content than any other social platform, followed by Google's YouTube, X (then Twitter) and Meta's Facebook. The regulator is also involved in an ongoing lawsuit with X after the company failed to pay an infringement notice related to a similar notice issued last year about how the company was responding to child abuse material on its platform.

X has appealed against the eSafety Commissioner's decision, and she is also suing the company over failing to pay a \$610,000 fine. X has said the eSafety Commissioner did not have the authority to enforce what users could see globally, branding the move an 'unlawful and dangerous approach'. Musk argued that global take-down orders also violated the principle of an open internet and threatened free speech. As senior Labor frontbencher Tanya Plibersek said, and I quote:

It beggars belief, doesn't it, that this egotistical billionaire thinks it's more important for him to show whatever he wants on X or Twitter...than to respect the victims of crimes.

Greens Senator Sarah Hanson-Young has called for Mr Musk to front an Australian parliamentary inquiry and answer questions about algorithms that help content go viral and garner attention. She said, and again I quote:

It is no wonder Elon Musk, the narcissistic cowboy, thinks he can just give the middle finger to the Australian government because for too long, we've had little to no regulation.

Liberal Senator Simon Birmingham said it was an 'insulting and offensive argument' to say that the removal of imagery of a terrorist attack was censorship and it should be left unfiltered for children and others to see. I see federal Liberal MP the Hon. David Coleman introduced a new youth crime post and boast bill into the federal parliament on 25 March 2024.

These comments made by all sides of politics show the measures contained in my private member's bill have strong bipartisan support. The growing incidents and examples of posting and boasting criminal behaviour on social media are all the proof we need that we must act now before it becomes a social norm and completely out of control.

Closer to home, I will point out that two journalist colleagues I know—Stacey Lee, who is on FIVEaa, and also Mitchell Sariovski, who works at Channel 7 in the news department—were victims of crime, of breaking and entering and trespass, and then the perpetrators posted their crime online. Not only that, they even then, on social media platforms, boasted and then harassed certainly Mr Sariovski's wife about the crime that they committed. There is certainly a need to stop this type of activity.

I look forward to this bill enjoying the same level of support in South Australia as has been expressed by federal and state Labor, Liberal, One Nation and Independent members in their respective parliaments across Australia. I commend the bill to the Legislative Council.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GROCERY PRICING IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:52): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Select Committee on Grocery Pricing in South Australia to amend its terms of reference by leaving out paragraph 2 and that the Hon. F. Pangallo be discharged from the select committee.

By way of background, when we established this committee, we established a committee with six members. The Hon. Frank Pangallo has since advised the Clerk and myself as Chair of the committee that he no longer wishes to be a member of the committee. This is a simple procedural motion making it clear that the Hon. Frank Pangallo would not be replaced on the committee and the committee would comprise of simply five members.

Motion carried.

Bills

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (RENT FREEZE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:54): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Residential Tenancies Act 1995. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

E-PETITIONS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:56): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that e-petitions are accepted by the federal parliament and all state parliaments, except for South Australia;
2. Acknowledges that petitioning is one of the traditional forms by which citizens can make requests directly to parliament;
3. Recognises that e-petitions are easy to create, easy to share, and will help citizens bring issues directly to the attention of the Legislative Council; and
4. Calls on the matter of e-petitions to be referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration and report.

South Australia is the only jurisdiction in the country that does not facilitate electronic petitions. This is despite e-petitions being accepted by the federal parliament and all other state parliaments. Petitioning the parliament is one of the traditional forms by which citizens can directly make requests. It is an important part of our democracy.

As other jurisdictions have discovered, e-petitions are easy to create, easy to share and will help citizens bring issues directly to the attention of elected representatives. To allow the receipt of e-petitions by the Legislative Council a change to the standing orders will be required. As such I call on the matter of e-petitions to be referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration and report.

The current manual process of collecting signatures by a pen and paper is archaic and does nothing to promote fair and reasonable democratic change. My office has worked hard on these types of petitions, including petitioning for enshrining the rights of families and of unborn children who die in utero because of a prescribed criminal act and to oppose the First Nations Voice bill.

It is onerous on those wishing to bring important matters to the parliament, and there is no credible reason that South Australia remains the only state that does not administer e-petitions. I currently have an online petition to halt Australia's legislated Voice to Parliament, which has collected thousands of signatures from South Australians who deserve to be heard by this parliament.

I respectfully call on the Legislative Council to catch up with the times and recognise e-petitions in the standing orders.

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

CASH IN SOCIETY

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:58): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that Australians are becoming increasingly worried about the country's move to a cashless society and that the government could weaponise digital money to coerce compliance;
2. Acknowledges the dangers of central bank digital currencies (CBDC), including their significant potential for over-surveillance and control and how they pose a risk to financial privacy and financial freedom; and
3. Recognises the startling trend of businesses and banks restricting access to cash through cash withdrawal restrictions, ATM closures, refusing cash as legal tender, and closing regular branches in favour of 'cashless' branches, and how these actions disproportionately impact our rural communities.

There is a war against cash. We are living in a world where cash is squarely in the crosshairs of regulators, governments and businesses, all at the peril of individuals. Australians are worried about going cashless, as evidenced by a recent report released by payments technology business Waave, which found that 41 per cent of respondents are extremely worried about the idea.

A digital Australia will have serious ramifications for everyone; however, the change will disproportionately hurt our rural communities first, as they are the most reliant on conventional methods of finance. Abolishing cash as a means of monetary exchange necessitates movement to other vehicles. With the federal government's passage of the Digital ID Bill, I fear it is the government's goal to eliminate cash and replace it with central bank digital currencies (CBDCs).

In 2007 cash accounted for 70 per cent of payments in Australia. Fast-forward to 2022, and that figured dwindled to a mere 13 per cent. Let's be clear, this trend is not being driven by consumer demand or organic market shifts; no, it is being propelled by the government and financial institutions.

Australian Tax Office initiatives, like the shadow economy action plan, purportedly aimed at tackling the black market, are stealthily incorporating anti-cash policies. Meanwhile, banks are tightening their grip on cash accessibility. The Commonwealth Bank CEO brazenly called for payments over \$500 to be banned, to stifle the shadow economy. Bank branches and ATMs are closing at an alarming rate, with over 700 bank-owned ATMs and 400 branches closing in 2023 alone, as reported by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority.

Traditional branches are being closed in favour of cashless branches, leaving many Australians without easy access to cash, and businesses are jumping on the bandwagon, being legally allowed to refuse cash transactions and prioritising digital forms of payment. They are exacerbating the march towards a cashless society. Even the hysteria of COVID-19 has been weaponised to discriminate against cash as a legal tender, further eroding its usage.

It is widely recognised that the transition to a digital economy disproportionately affects rural communities. The severity of the problem led to the creation of a government inquiry, Bank Closures in Regional Australia, which is still ongoing and is scheduled to conclude on 16 May this year. Despite recognising the need for such an inquiry, the trend of bank closures continues unabated, with APRA reporting a staggering decline in branches across Australia, particularly in regional and remote areas.

This erosion of physical banking infrastructure further isolates vulnerable communities and accelerates a descent into a cashless abyss.

Cash is not just about coins and notes, it is about giving people the choice, something severely lacking in today's age. Pro-cash movements are not merely fuelled by libertarian ideals, they also recognise the practical benefits of cash as a budgeting tool, a means to decrease fees and the importance of a peer-to-peer monetary vehicle. This becomes all the more clear when considering how one might give money to the homeless. Woe be the day that you cannot give \$5 without first obtaining a BSB and account number. Better yet, imagine leaving a receipt rather than a coin under the pillow of your children as evidence of the tooth fairy.

The reality is chilling. The technology underlying CBDCs, called blockchain technology, is being utilised in digital ID systems. This ominous combination heralds a dystopian nightmare reminiscent of George Orwell's *1984*. One such instance is a government-run blockchain network called b-Cadastrors in Brazil, which is used to authenticate people gaining access to public services online, administer and amend citizen ID cards and register taxes. Digital ID is a prerequisite to digital money, the marriage of which opens up fears concerning excessive government oversight where every aspect of people's lives, from purchasing habits to real-time location, is reported to a centralised entity.

It is not just a privacy concern but the huge opportunity for tyranny that is alarming, where digital currency and digital ID are used to control people's behaviour based on their compliance. One need not look into future plans for examples of financial tyranny. The reality is here and now, as seen in Canada where protesters against COVID-19 mandates were labelled domestic terrorists by their government and subsequently had their bank accounts frozen.

And let's not forget the draconian proposals here at home where the Liberal government in 2019 proposed the Currency (Restrictions on the Use of Cash) Bill 2019, which sought to criminalise cash transactions over \$10,000, a bill thwarted by opposition from One Nation Senator Malcolm Roberts. These instances serve as a stark reminder of the risks of centralising money in banks beholden to government whims.

Financial freedom hangs in the balance. Economists like John Adams, Chief Economist for As Good As Gold Australia, warned that the purported motives behind cash bans, such as deterring the shadow economy, are a facade for increased control. John notes that the International Monetary Fund (IMF), a global institution with 190 member nations, including Australia, has outlined a plan for handling financial crises called *Cashing In: How to Make Negative Interest Rates Work*, which involves the use of negative interest rates.

The plan details a scenario in which depositors experience the declining value of their savings in the event that they fall short of depository targets. The availability of cash entirely negates such a plan because it works as an interest rate flaw, as people will choose to hold onto cash when interest rates are zero, and especially when they are negative.

Optimistically, removing cash and replacing it with digital currency may not work out as intended for the government. Research suggests that doing away with cash could promote the use of cryptocurrencies and other digital currencies that are by nature decentralised and thus not controlled by governments or central banks. Though I am not against it, I acknowledge that using cryptocurrencies will present a barrier to entry for those who lack computer proficiency. For this reason I believe peer-to-peer money, like cash, should be accessible to everyone, irrespective of their level of digital literacy.

While some argue for the transition to cashless as a means of security, reality paints a different picture. Despite a decline in physical robbery, cyber crime against individuals in Australia is on the rise, with losses amounting to billions of dollars annually. One Nation asserts that the push for the digitalisation of money, and by extension society, is merely a tactic by the government to exert control over the people. Australians are awakening to the idea that the value of individual freedoms is immeasurable. They understand that, while digitalisation brings about accessibility and convenience, they are not willing to compromise their fundamental freedoms for them.

Honourable members, the dangers of a cashless society loom large. It is not merely a matter of convenience, it is about preserving fundamental freedoms and ensuring equitable access to financial services for all Australians. The time to act is now, before we find ourselves ensnared in a digital dystopia of our own making.

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

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE MIDWIFE

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (17:06): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that 5 May 2024 is International Day of the Midwife;
2. Celebrates the invaluable service that South Australian midwives provide throughout our state, especially in the regions;
3. Commends midwives' commitment, dedication and compassion in delivering outstanding service to South Australian women and their families;
4. Notes, with great concern, the recent loss of midwifery services in regional areas including Waikerie, Kangaroo Island, Kapunda, Gawler and Whyalla; and
5. Calls on the Malinauskas government to invest more seriously in regional birthing services.

I rise to bring this important motion to the floor of this chamber and to emphasise, as I have many times before, the invaluable contributions of our midwives across South Australia, particularly in our regions. Across the world we recognise 5 May as International Day of the Midwife, a day to celebrate those who are often the primary providers of care to women and their families during pregnancy, labour and the postnatal period.

According to the latest data of the Australian Health Practitioners Regulation Agency, South Australia has a total of 2,550 midwives—midwives like my wife, Elle, who again I have spoken about quite a lot in this chamber, but I do love her. She has dedicated over 12 years of midwifery in Mount Gambier. Like Elle, all midwives are pillars of their communities. It is a common sight to see Elle greeted warmly around town, whether it be on Commercial Street or in the supermarket by those whose lives she has touched.

The role of the midwife extends well beyond the delivery room though. They are educators, counsellors and advocates for women's health. They uphold the sanctity of life at its beginnings and ensure the wellbeing of mothers and infants. Yet, despite their critical role, we face a concerning decline in midwifery services, especially in regional locations like Waikerie, Kangaroo Island, Kapunda, Gawler and Whyalla. This loss not only deprives women and families of essential care but also erodes the fabric of our regional healthcare systems.

The reduction of services has come about for various reasons: resource constraints, funding cuts and the centralisation of healthcare services that pull resources back towards larger centres and away from our smaller towns. This trend towards centralisation neglects the unique needs of our regional populations and underpins the principles of equitable healthcare access for all South Australians. I hasten to say that it is Transforming Health-esque in its appearance.

As we reflect on the significance of midwives in all of our lives, I am reminded of the past themes that are more relevant than ever, given the withdrawal of birthing services from our regions. 'Follow the data, invest in midwives' was 2021's theme, and it is pertinent to consider in 2024. Midwives deserve protection, respect and to be valued, not just in the words that we say but through tangible actions and policies that reverse the current trend of service reduction.

The Liberal Party's call to the government is clear: invest in restoring and expanding midwifery services in our regions. This investment will ensure that every South Australian mother and their babies receive the best start in life, irrespective of their geographical location. The impacts of these services extend beyond immediate healthcare outcomes, they enhance community wellbeing and long-term public health. The spirit of Florence Nightingale, who revolutionised nursing and health care during her time, should inspire our approach to midwifery today. Just as she championed the cause of sanitary hospital environments and better nutritional standards, so too must we champion the cause of accessibility and comprehensive midwifery care.

In closing, I extend my heartfelt gratitude to all midwives across our state for their dedication and compassionate service. Your work does not go unnoticed. Your impact is profound and lasting. As we look towards the future, let us ensure that it is one where your profession is as supported and celebrated as it is crucial. I urge all members to support this motion to bolster midwifery services, to ensure that no woman or child is left behind because of where they live. Let us work together to make this a reality. I commend the motion.

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

Bills

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (GREYHOUND RACING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:10): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Since 2015, when it was revealed that horrific and cruel practices such as live baiting were common practice in the greyhound racing industry, states and territories have generally attempted to establish some kind of regulation in this industry. For so long we have been assured by Greyhound Racing SA that there was nothing to see here, that the scrutiny on its animal welfare record was misplaced and that they would take their own initiative, their own systems, have their own integrity reviews, to ensure that their internal purposes not only ensured fairness in their race meetings but upheld community expectations for animal welfare standards.

The Greens have campaigned for many years to shed light on the cruelty of this industry. In the 14 years that I have been a member of this place, I have called for our own parliament to inquire into the greyhound racing industry on three separate occasions, not to mention the number of bills I have introduced, questions I have asked or amendments that I have moved to push for accountability on behalf of the greyhounds, whether that is recognising greyhounds as dogs or whether that is calling for inquiries to ensure that assurances given by the industry are properly scrutinised. But as we have seen, those calls by parliament were unheeded until recently with the Ashton review and, finally, an independent inquiry into greyhound racing in this state, which showed it is not different from greyhound racing in other states.

Greyhounds in this time have kept dying and the industry has continued despite whistleblower complaints, despite images captured of dogs living in cages, covered in faeces and not having access to fresh water, sunshine nor any sort of play. Despite footage of cruelty, dogs being kicked or revelations of live baiting occurring in this state, we have seen time and time again the industry claim that there is nothing to see here. This bill will make sure that there is the ability to see what is going on behind closed doors.

Finally, in August 2023, following the release of the distressing footage that depicted the alleged abuse of multiple greyhounds and the use of live baiting, Premier Malinauskas responded by commissioning former Victorian police commissioner Graham Ashton to undertake an inquiry into our South Australian greyhound industry. When that report was finally published in mid-December, it was harrowing, but to many of us it was not surprising. It was a vindication for the whistleblowers and the animal lovers of South Australia who had called it out for many years and who had known how poorly managed this industry was and is.

We have known for a long time that industry assurances were hollow and that greyhounds were suffering. The Ashton report confirmed it, and confirmed that it was not an isolated incident that we saw on our TV screens that brought such horror from the community. It was, in fact, far too common. The Greens welcome all the recommendations of that report.

We note that the government has accepted some 86 recommendations of that report. We look forward to having all of them accepted and implemented by the Malinauskas government, but I

note that we are still waiting for the first of any of these recommendations to be implemented. Despite a promise by the Premier last December that by Easter we would have an independent inspector for greyhound racing in this state, we have yet to see that promise fulfilled. He promised it would happen by Easter. The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has been there for the photo-ops but not for the follow-up. We are still waiting for an independent inspector.

In the meantime, there is another recommendation of the Ashton review that this parliament can progress, and progress today. It has been almost six months since the Ashton report. The government has failed to execute those recommendations, so the parliament can help the Malinauskas government along. Since then, we have had five more greyhound deaths on the track in this state that we know of and the government has failed, of course, to keep that promise for an independent inspector. That very important large step will be needed for all the other recommendations to take effect.

That inspector was meant to be the wake-up call: the start of a two-year period that this industry had of being given notice that if it did not come up to scratch and if it did not comply with community expectations in two years' time from the inspector's appointment it would be shut down. Instead of a wake-up call, the Malinauskas government has treated the Ashton review as if there is a snooze alarm, and the minister keeps pressing the snooze alarm.

It is not good enough, which is why the Greens will move to ensure that freedom of information requests can be made of this industry, as they always should have been able to be made. Since the government and the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing have not taken it upon themselves to lead with legislative reform, the Greens are here to do so. We cannot wait any longer.

The bill today is simple. It amends our freedom of information legislation to ensure there are no exemptions available to greyhound racing in this state. It is something that has been contested in law but never tested all the way to the courts. It was also a direct recommendation of the Animal Justice Party and accepted by the inquiry by Mr Ashton himself and, of course, also by the Premier and the minister, so I should think there would be no reason for the Malinauskas government not to support this bill and to get on with ensuring the best of integrity and the highest of animal welfare standards are being adhered to, for fear that freedom of information will uncover them.

Greyhound Racing SA has been the only state-based racing body in Australia that has exempted itself from freedom of information. It has been able to operate in secrecy and, indeed, it has only been through the New South Wales parliamentary inquiry that we saw there, led by my former Greens colleague well over a decade ago, that we actually saw Greyhound Racing SA's own internal workings exposed. It was not through the work of this parliament, sadly.

Currently, if an injured dog is not killed by the on-track vet, the South Australian public has no way to find out what happens to it once it leaves the track. I have had communications that dog trainers are encouraged not to have the dog euthanised on track but to wait so that it does not turn up in the figures. Well, with freedom of information these dogs will not be allowed to disappear from the public view and this publicly funded industry will not be able to continue without independent scrutiny.

There is no reason for Greyhound Racing SA not to be transparent about the number of dogs entering and exiting the industry. The data that they release currently is limited to their annual reports and it is very much a 'Trust us, we're from Greyhound Racing, the figures that we show you here are real'. Well, unsurprisingly, the Greens do not buy it and now we will be able to have the full powers of freedom of information laws to uncover what the real truth is. The truth may well set us free; certainly, I hope the truth sets the greyhounds free. With that, I commend the bill.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SUPPORT AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR POLICE

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (17:19): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Select Committee on Support and Mental Health Services for Police to amend its terms of reference by leaving out paragraph 2 and that the Hon T.A. Franks and the Hon I.K. Hunter be discharged from the select committee.

Motion carried.

Motions

CROWN AND ANCHOR HOTEL

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

That this council—

1. Notes that Singapore-based developer Wee Hur Holdings Ltd has made an application for partial demolition and adaptive reuse of the site of the Crown and Anchor Hotel, which was first licensed in 1853 and has been a cornerstone of Adelaide's live music scene for over three decades.
2. Acknowledges an online petition signed by over 15,000 people opposing any attempts at demolition or change in the use of the Crown and Anchor Hotel.
3. Recognises that Adelaide is a designated UNESCO City of Music for the vibrancy of the city's music culture, including its live music venues.
4. Calls on the Malinauskas government to:
 - (a) oppose any partial demolition or adaptive reuse of the Crown and Anchor Hotel;
 - (b) make a submission to the State Commission Assessment Panel indicating that position; and
 - (c) move to amend state heritage laws to ensure that cultural and social value is considered in the development assessment of heritage sites like the Crown and Anchor Hotel.

(Continued from 10 April 2024.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:20): I rise very briefly to support this motion in support of the Crown and Anchor. It has been moved by my Greens colleague the Hon. Robert Simms and I welcome him. He is the portfolio holder for the Greens in planning. I am the portfolio holder for arts, so we both have a great affection for the Crown and Anchor and a great commitment to ensuring that the culture and the vibrancy that the Crown and Anchor has provided to the South Australian community for so long continues unthwarted by developers' dreams—or nightmares.

I will not go into too much detail, but I just wanted to put on record that I have been going to the Cranker since the 1990s, possibly the 1980s. I was trying to remember earlier today. I have seen wonderful bands there, such as King Daddy and Babydoll and so many more. I have danced on a weeknight to DJ Trip on not just dozens but probably hundreds of occasions. There is no place like the Cranker.

I have been to weddings there: not the actual weddings but receptions on the balcony, which had dubious catering, but anyway. There were Jaffas involved; I do not know why. The Cranker is a place that I continue to go to and feel comfortable in. You can go there, as Walter Marsh has noted in *The Guardian*, in a suit or as a goth. In fact, the 'Where will the goths go?' banner at the rally on the weekend really hit home to me, because Enigma has gone, The Coffee Pot has gone, Proscenium has long gone, but the goths are still at the Cranker.

The reason they are still at the Cranker is that everyone is welcome at the Cranker. Whether you are in a suit, whether you are a goth, whether you are a rocker or whether you are simply wandering in from the LIV Golf tournament on the weekend, you go to the Cranker and it is accessible, affordable, alternative. It is a place of beer and live music. It is as simple as it gets, and it is the epitome of what a public house is and should be.

It has a much-loved place in the music culture of this state, because we are the Festival State. Unless we are doing homegrown bands, those festivals will become, as was said again at the rally, fly-in fly-out performers coming to entertain us; they will not be our own. They will not be the wonderful acts that we have seen grow and develop through the Cranker.

I have had friends work at the Cranker behind the bar or as band booking agents. I have launched feminist magazines in the band room. I have run campaigns for responsible alcohol service.

Indeed, the signs that 'Alcohol is not a lubricant' may have been put on the backs of the toilet doors back in the early 2000s through an organisation that I used to work for, called the YWCA of Adelaide, which ran a safe women's partying program and series of events and a campaign, and the Cranker was one of the first venues to throw their arms around and support women's right to be safe in our night-time life and in the life of our wonderful pubs.

We are losing too many pubs. We have lost too many live music venues already in this capital city. The planning laws are rigged against places like the Cranker because they are on prime real estate, but they also have a very special place in the heart of our culture. The East End would not be the East End without all the pubs and the live music that developed it well beyond the time of it being an east end market.

The East End will suffer if we let this development go ahead. There are so many other little bits of land that would happily host student accommodation in high-rise developments without sacrificing the very heart and the very culture that in fact those students will be attracted to stay in Adelaide to enjoy. Finally, to wrap it up, as I thought the most appropriate sign at the rally said, the Cranker is already home to students. It is home to so many more than students, but it will be home hopefully to students for many generations to come if we save the Cranker.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:25): I move an amendment to the motion:

Leave out paragraph 4 and insert new paragraphs as follows:

4. Encourages any member in this place to make a submission to the State Commission Assessment Panel by 11.59pm on Friday 10 May 2024 to enable them to make an informed decision when the application is considered.
5. Notes that the Planning and Design Code under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 can designate a place as a place of local heritage value and local councils may seek to initiate amendments to the Planning and Design Code to designate a place as a place of local heritage value and that the Crown and Anchor was designated as a local heritage place on 1 November 2001.
6. Notes that on 24 April 2024 the Heritage Council received a nomination from a member of the public to make the Crown and Anchor a State Heritage Place and that the council is also anticipating a second nomination imminently.
7. Notes that on 26 April 2024 the Crown and Anchor Hotel was provisionally entered on the state Heritage Register as a State Heritage Place by the Chair of the Heritage Council under section 17 (2)(b) of the Heritage Places Act 1993 which is essentially a determination that a place should be protected while an assessment of its heritage significance is carried out and that an assessment will now be carried out with a decision to be made on the validity of the nomination at a future meeting of council likely in early September.
8. Notes the criteria to list a place as a State Heritage Place is contained within the Heritage Places Act 1993—this means that any future considerations to amend the criteria would be a matter for the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water as the minister responsible for the Heritage Places Act 1993 and that the act already includes a specific criteria centred around a place having a strong cultural or spiritual association for the community or a group within it.

Having said that, moving on to my comments, the state Malinauskas government understands the importance of protecting our heritage places, which provide important character to the city. The Planning and Design Code, under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, may designate a place as a place of local heritage value. Local councils may, and indeed do, seek to initiate amendments to the Planning and Design Code for such places and designate them as places of local heritage value. The Crown and Anchor, as I have mentioned in my amendment, is such a place.

The Heritage Places Act provided for and promoted the conservation of places of state heritage significance. The Heritage Places Act 1993 contains a range of criteria for a place to be recognised as just such a thing. I think the comments of the Hon. Ms Franks in regard to her memories of such a place may meet either cultural or spiritual association, depending upon how that flows down through how they are going to consider it.

The Crown and Anchor Hotel being nominated as a State Heritage Place by a member of the public can meet exactly those standards. Indeed it has been provisionally entered by the chair of

the Heritage Council under section 17(2)(b) as mentioned in my amendment. Where development applications propose to alter state or local heritage listed places, including those provisionally entered on the register, they have to be assessed by the relevant provisions of the Planning and Design Code. This assessment will ensure that the heritage and cultural values of the buildings and structures proposed to be altered are maintained at least to a standard as intended by that committee.

The Planning and Design Code also requires that development applications for the demolition or partial demolition of a state or local heritage listed place undergo public notification. This ensures that the wider community has a fairly wide opportunity to comment on the proposed demolition, and indeed I am pretty certain that has occurred here.

In addition to this, applications for the demolition of State Heritage Places must also be referred to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water as the minister responsible under the act. That minister can then direct that the development application be refused or, should it be approved, that it be subject to more stringent and specified conditions.

The existing mechanisms in place to protect places of both state and local heritage seek to strike a balance between protecting our state's culture and heritage while also providing the ability for landowners to progress with development of property they have purchased. As the Minister for Planning has already outlined, he has no ability to intervene in the decision-making process for the application.

The development application will be assessed by the State Commission Assessment Panel as a delegate of the State Planning Commission. I think it is important that the State Commission Assessment Panel remain an independent committee to assess and determine development proposals in South Australia and not be influenced by the parliament and its politics.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:31): I rise to put some remarks on the record in relation to this motion. I thank the Hon. Mr Simms for bringing this motion to the parliament, and particularly congratulate the board and the organisers of Save the Cranker. A number of us attended the rally on Sunday, and I would have to say it was conducted very professionally and respectfully. I think everybody certainly got to have their point of view heard.

The position of the Liberal Party is that we do support state heritage listing of the Crown and Anchor. The leader of the Liberal Party wrote a letter in support on 17 April, which I will read onto the record. He says:

I write in support of the nomination to enter the Crown and Anchor Hotel onto the South Australian Heritage Register.

The Heritage Places Act 1999 provides for the protection of places which are of heritage significance—including where it has strong cultural or spiritual associations for the community or a group within.

The Crown and Anchor Hotel was first licensed in 1853, underwent a complete re-building in the 1880s, with further remodelling in the 1920s. Since this time, it has largely remained unchanged physically—continuing to be recognised today in largely its original form. Although it has had a varied history as a place of accommodation and as a pub, it has consistently been a place for community connection and congregation.

For the past two decades, it has been a place of particular importance to the live music scene in the Adelaide CBD. It is much loved by both artists and audience alike, ensuring that live music continues to be encouraged at smaller venues, supporting emerging artists who perform across a variety of music genres. The Crown and Anchor Hotel is regarded for being an inclusive venue for professionals and youth alike, which cannot be easily replicated and speaks to the breadth of the community which are connected to the venue.

Often, the places and items which are recognised for being of heritage significance on the South Australian Heritage Register, are places that have lost their relevance to a modern society and are relegated to become places of a time gone by. The Crown and Anchor Hotel is an exception to this, as a place with enduring relevance today.

I support the nomination of the Crown and Anchor Hotel for entry on the South Australian Heritage Register and trust that the Heritage Council will give appropriate consideration to the nomination.

Yours sincerely

David Speirs MP

Date: 17 April 2024.

I lead with that. I cannot speak as extensively as the Hon. Tammy Franks about her personal experiences at the Crown and Anchor. As I often tell people, I do not get out very much, but I do appreciate that there are a lot of people who over many years have enjoyed that venue and still continue to enjoy that venue as a very unique place, particularly for live music and for the capacity of a range of artists to be able to perform there when a lot of other opportunities do not exist.

I think that is very important to this, and this is why we have been supporting the campaign for that aspect of it to be retained. Indeed, we support coexistence. As I have said several times, I cannot understand why overseas students who might choose to study in Adelaide would not love to stay at a place which has a live music venue just below.

So we have been keen to support this motion of Hon. Mr Simms. The first three parts, which are statements of fact, were very straightforward. Paragraph 4 was getting into territory where, as we do appreciate with the rules that we have, planning decisions are made by independent merit assessment; in this situation it is through the State Commission Assessment Panel. That is a robust process which has the capacity to not approve or approve, and approve with conditions.

Having looked at some of the decisions that have been made by SCAP, they certainly do take into consideration a lot of the different views that are put to them; therefore, it is my view that I strongly encourage people to make submissions to that process, and I am very confident that they will be heard.

At the end of the day, it has to be assessed on the rules, but certainly in the decisions I have looked at where, for instance—it is a different context—there are things in the suburbs where locals have had concerns about height or overhang or additional cars in the street and those sorts of things, SCAP will quite specifically make conditions with any sort of approval to ensure that any of those concerns are addressed.

Our support for state heritage listing predated the rally and predated the calling of this motion to a vote, so we are pleased that Sandy Verschoor is looking at that interim heritage listing. Again, it is very important to go through that particular process, and I am sure that will be given due consideration.

I suspect we will be passing this motion. I am sure that Hon. Mr Simms would prefer it to remain unamended. It has been my position that I think we need to be very clear about what the process is. I think there has been some confusion in the community, particularly in relation to subparagraph 4(c), that if this motion is passed unamended rules will be changed overnight.

I think it is very important to note as well that this is a motion of the parliament; it does not have legal effect. Particularly in the context of changing our laws, we are hopeful that the government will live up to its promise through the response to the expert panel to look at the issue of where local listings and state listings sit in different pieces of legislation. I think it has been a universal view across the parliament for some time that those laws need to be harmonised. I do note that under state heritage listing—and I think it is in the government's amendments to this motion—that particular aspect can be taken into consideration when the Heritage Council considers listing.

We certainly do need to ensure that live music in South Australia is kept vibrant. We also often talk, in the context of development and particularly development in city areas and areas of very high density, about livability, dynamism and all those sorts of things; therefore, I believe that the Crown and Anchor certainly fits within that aspect of a city that has unique places. It provides activation on the ground floor, which is important for security and for people who are moving about. It provides activities for people to engage with, rather than some of the buildings that we see in the city which are just office buildings and do not allow for people who live within the CBD to fully enjoy all of the dynamism and activities that we would otherwise expect.

With those comments, I do commend the motion. We will be supporting the government's amendments, which are technically very correct. I thought they were extraordinarily detailed for what is a motion of intent in the parliament, but they are factually correct. I do urge anybody who has an interest in this matter to engage with the SCAP by 10 May and also seek to make deputations at the appropriate point. I commend all the people who have campaigned for this issue because it is so

important that we have an eye to making sure that we have live music retained in Adelaide for generations.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Michelle Lensink, are you moving your amendment?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: No, Mr President, I will not be moving my amendment.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:41): I will keep it short. I must commend the Hon. Robert Simms for his performance. He has pulled a full house here tonight, so who knows if he can pull a full house at the Crown and Anchor after this is over.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Can he sing?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: He may well make it as a roadie, I think. Congratulations to the Hon. Robert Simms, who has led a pretty active campaign that has actually highlighted the need for having live music venues like this and for them to stay alive. As other members have pointed out, there are many pubs that have gone by the wayside. We know how important pubs are for live music and also for local bands to get exposure. Back in my day when I was a teenager, it was very difficult for—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Very recent.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It was a long time, but it was very difficult in those days for some performers who became icons, really, in the Australian music industry to find suitable venues for them. Pubs were often loath to make their venues available to them. There have been some that have survived, and some iconic ones here in Adelaide. The Crown and Anchor is one. The Wheatsheaf Hotel is another, and I hope that continues for a long time to come. I will even chuck the Arkaba Hotel in there. The Arkaba has been a venue for many live performers over the years and has been a part of the music scene here.

The member's intent here is that, under planning laws, the cultural significance of a place is also recognised. I think that is important, because that is what heritage really is all about: having a place like the Crown and Anchor survive in its current state, rather than just having a bland facade and nothing else behind it. I think that would really take away something from that part of the city. There are so many examples around the world of venues that are so closely aligned with the culture of their cities. Can you imagine the uproar in Liverpool if the iconic Cavern Club was going to be demolished? I think at one point there was talk of getting rid of it. That has been the venue for so many great artists—of course, as we know, The Beatles and other Merseyside performers.

Then you look at other places around the world. One place that I made a point of visiting when I was in Nashville was The Bluebird Cafe. In New York, another place that was a must on my bucket list was the Apollo Theater, an incredible venue that has been there since 1914. I went to New York before COVID had it closed, and I had to go past the Copacabana, which is another historic venue.

These cities protect and encourage these venues to remain as part of their culture in their cities. We can learn a lot from those cities like that, and I think we have here in Adelaide. Again, I commend the honourable member for bringing this motion forward. I will support his amendments, and we will go from there.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:45): I want to thank all members who have spoken on this motion: the Hon. Mr Hanson, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Tammy Franks, and the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I also want to put on record my thanks to the Crown and Anchor campaign, the Cranker campaign, for the amazing work that they have done in mobilising so many people in our community on this issue. This motion is not the end of this campaign; in fact, it is just the beginning. It is just the beginning of a new movement that is campaigning to reform our planning laws in South Australia and ensure that we have a planning system that actually listens to the views of the community rather than being captive to the interests of developers.

It is clear that there is momentum to fix South Australia's broken planning system and to actually listen to the views of the community. I am disappointed that paragraph 4 of this motion is being struck out, because the government's amendments take all of the verbs out of the motion. The motion actually called on the government to form a position opposing this redevelopment of the

Crown and Anchor, and it called on the government to support the social and cultural elements of heritage as well, and to ensure that that was appropriately recognised through our planning laws.

I am disappointed that the Liberal Party seems to have changed its position on that. It seems to be a case of saying one thing on the steps of Parliament House on Sunday and doing something a bit different here in the parliament, and that is a shame. I fear that there may be some members here who are capitulating to the views of the Property Council, and that is a shame, because if the Property Council had their way, then our planning laws would not be about people at all. It is a bit like those uni chiefs who talk about unis being great places if not for the students.

The Property Council seems to think that our cities would be great places to live if not for the people who are actually in them. They seem to think that our planning system should not involve any emotion, should not actually consider the views of the residents and the community. Well, our cities are not simply soulless concrete jungles. They are about people—that is what they are about—and the community should have a say in planning the neighbourhoods in which we live. These decisions should not be outsourced to unelected committees, committees of so-called experts. These decisions should be made by communities and involve their local councils.

I do just want to say that one of the deep flaws in our planning system and our heritage laws that has been exposed here is the fact that we have a planning regime and a heritage regime that is really shallow in terms of the protection that it provides to our iconic buildings. It is simply not acceptable that a developer can protect the facade and gut the interior of our iconic buildings. We need to change our planning laws so that that cannot continue to happen. We need to change our planning laws to ensure that a venue like the Crown and Anchor cannot be converted into a soulless building.

This is not the end of this campaign; it is simply the campaign moving into another phase. If this motion gets up in an amended form tonight, that will be a good outcome for all those who have been out there rallying and campaigning, because it demonstrates that the parliament takes this matter seriously. But there is still a lot more work to do, and I want to make it very clear that the Greens stand shoulder to shoulder with all those people in our community who want to see a planning system that actually works for people and not developers. I indicate that we will not be supporting the amendments, but we will support, of course, the substantive motion should the amendments be successful.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes17
 Noes.....3
 Majority14

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.
El Dannawi, M.	Game, S.L.	Girolamo, H.M.
Hanson, J.E. (teller)	Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.
Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.
Scriven, C.M.	Wortley, R.P.	

NOES

Franks, T.A.	Pangallo, F.	Simms, R.A. (teller)
--------------	--------------	----------------------

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

Sitting suspended from 17:54 to 19:46.

*Parliamentary Committees***BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (19:46): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON DOLPHINS IN ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY AND PORT RIVER

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (19:46): On behalf of the Hon. T.A. Franks, I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON RETURN TO WORK SA SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (19:47): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HEALTH SERVICES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. C. BONAROS (19:47): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE TIMBER INDUSTRY IN THE LIMESTONE COAST AND OTHER REGIONS OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (19:47): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON DAMAGE, HARM OR ADVERSE OUTCOMES RESULTING FROM ICAC INVESTIGATIONS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (19:48): On behalf of the Hon. T.A. Franks, I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE GIG ECONOMY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (19:48): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT OF THE COVID-19 RESPONSE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (19:48): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON RECYCLING OF SOFT PLASTICS AND OTHER RECYCLABLE MATERIAL

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (19:49): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON 2022-23 RIVER MURRAY FLOOD EVENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (19:49): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SUPPORT AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR POLICE

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (19:49): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GROCERY PRICING IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (19:50): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WATER SUPPLY NEEDS OF EYRE PENINSULA

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (19:50): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 27 November 2024.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL ETHICAL GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY IN CLINICAL PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (19:51): I move:

That the final report of the committee, entitled Amendments to the National Health and Medical Research Council Ethical Guidelines on the use of Assisted Reproductive Technology in Clinical Practice and Research, be noted.

The Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003 and the Prohibition of Human Cloning for Reproduction Act 2003 provide the legislative framework in South Australia for the use of human embryos in clinical trials and research.

The National Health and Medical Research Council and the National Health and Medical Research Council Embryo Research Licensing Committee are responsible for administering the commonwealth legislative framework through the commonwealth RIHE Act 2002 and the commonwealth PHCR Act 2002.

The NHMRC's ethical guidelines on the use of assisted reproductive technology in clinical practice and research provides a standard for ethical conduct in assisted reproductive technologies, research and clinical trials.

Section 30 of the South Australian RIHE Act requires that any amendments to the ethical guidelines must first be referred to the Social Development Committee. The committee must undertake an inquiry on any changes to the ethical guidelines and table a report in both houses of the Parliament of South Australia before any relevant amendments to the RIHE Act may be given effect to.

The committee received notification of amendments to the ethical guidelines following the passing of the commonwealth Mitochondrial Donation Law Reform (Maeve's Law) Act 2022. The revisions deal with mitochondrial donation in ART procedures along with several administrative amendments. The new ethical guidelines were tabled in the Australian parliament in May 2023. The Social Development Committee is satisfied, based on the evidence presented by the NHMRC and the Department for Health and Wellbeing, that the Australian government has appropriately

consulted with the South Australian government and South Australian stakeholders on those amendments.

The committee notes that the requirement for amendments to the ethical guidelines to be referred to the parliamentary standing committee is unique in the country to South Australia. No other state or territory is required by their own legislation to undertake such an inquiry.

The committee considers that in 2003, when the RIHE Act and the PHCR Act were enacted, there was motivation for extra scrutiny to be had on the ethical guidelines and any proposed revisions to them. In 2023, the committee believed there was limited merit for the requirement under the RIHE Act for the committee to review any proposed amendments to the ethical guidelines and there is generally a more widespread acceptance of ART in society.

The committee believes that the degree of scrutiny is sufficient where the ethical guidelines must first be referred by the commonwealth to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and the Parliament of South Australia with no further requirement for scrutiny by the standing committee. As a result of this inquiry, the committee has made a recommendation to the government of South Australia, through the Minister for Human Services, of section 30(3) of the RIHE Act be repealed to remove the requirement of the Social Development Committee to inquire into and report on any changes to the ethical guidelines. I commend the committee's report to the house.

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

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: FUNDING FOR CHILDREN AND STUDENTS WITH ADDITIONAL LEARNING NEEDS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PRESCHOOLS PETITION

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (19:55): I move:

That the final report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into petition No. 96 of 2021: funding for children and students with additional learning needs in public schools and preschools', be noted.

The committee received a petition No. 96 on a motion of Mr Blair Boyer MP in September 2022. The committee was considered best placed to undertake the inquiry and notes the passage of time since the petition was first tabled in the parliament in 2021. The committee thanks all those who submitted evidence to the inquiry. The petition requested the government increase fundings to schools and preschools to provide immediate support and intervention for children in schools with additional learning needs through the employment of more support staff, specialists, allied health and mental health professionals and teachers.

The Inclusive Education Support Program provides grant funding for the state's public school system to support children and students who have additional learning needs to achieve in mainstream and specialist schools. State schools and preschools received proportional site grant funding based on several factors, such as school location and student numbers. They also receive individualised funding for children and students identified as having greater learning needs.

The evidence to this inquiry identified there were repeated and overlapping concerns about the different grant funding streams and the issues the different funding streams raise in daily school routine. The concerns are complex and multifaceted and during the time the committee was undertaking its inquiry, the government agreed to a new \$1.6 billion enterprise agreement that takes into account salary and workload teachers face along with reforms to the IESP.

This agreement may go some way to resolving some of the concerns presented to the committee. Nonetheless, the committee's inquiry has identified in broad terms that there is an urgent need for the government to:

- ease the administrative burden placed on teachers to complete funding applications;
- ensure the department provides timely learning supports and adequate funding hours to all children and students where it is needed;
- ensure the IESP and individualised funding grants have flexibility and are adequately funded;
- invest more in early childhood education teachers;

- increase recruitment of specialists and school supports;
- ensure student support officers are appropriately trained to carry out their duties;
- expand the autism inclusion teachers program to secondary schools;
- demonstrate inclusive whole-of-school evidence-based approaches to the provision of learning supports;
- review departmental policies to ensure proper supports are provided to children and students with undiagnosed disability or learning difficulties that do not meet the current definitions of disability; and, finally
- continue working to include trauma-informed practice for teachers and educators along with the broader mental health and wellbeing support.

The committee has made 23 recommendations that address these matters along with others identified during the inquiry. The committee notes the initiatives that have been commenced by the department to improve the opportunities of children and students in government schools who have additional learning needs.

The department's evidence shows that during the 2022 school year, over 17,000 students were provided nearly 24,000 specialist services with funding allocated out of the department's annual budget. More than 5,000 of these students were funded under the autism spectrum primary disability category.

The department advised that the government is investing \$50 million over four years to enable 100 FTE mental health and learning support specialists across 28 sites to provide more support to students across South Australia. It is also ensuring that the AITs will be available in schools that offer reception to year 12 and the program will be allocated \$28.8 million over the forward estimates, yet the evidence showed the waiting times for access to some departmental specialists for funding application assessments could take up to 30 months.

The committee learned there were only 25 FTE occupational therapists across the South Australian government school network and even fewer trained teachers for students with hearing loss. The evidence suggests there is a need for further investment in the number of school-based psychologists and for trained teachers of the deaf and speech pathologists. The evidence further shows a multidisciplinary suite of support professionals is best practice in providing children and students with the tools to achieve, and there is a need to invest in critical services within the education setting, particularly during the child's early years.

Greater funding is also needed to support the increased number of children and students with mental health concerns and mental illness, for students with medical illnesses that require complex care, and for children and students who have increased exposure to adverse childhood experiences. This was evidenced to be especially true for schools in the lower socio-economic areas, where children and their families face additional challenges. The committee learned that this is also the case for vulnerable children and students and for a variety of reasons include those who are on temporary visas who live in rural areas or who are of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander background.

To address these additional challenges, the committee has recommended the department engage across government agencies to identify the additional learning needs of children before preschool and again before primary school to ensure family support is provided. The department advised it has rolled out several schoolwide initiatives, including the 'One in Four' reform, the student engagement reform, and the positive behaviour for learning framework, which is an evidence-based framework to promote improved behaviour and learning outcomes for students.

The committee commends the department on these projects; however, it has also received evidence that some students experiencing extreme behaviours, engagement or learning issues may not receive more than two to three hours per week of one-to-one support. The committee has recommended the department expedite and finish implementing the above-mentioned reforms and provide a report to the parliament.

The recommendations of submissions and witnesses to the inquiry reflect some of the findings of several previous inquiries into the state's education system, including the 2023 Royal Commission into Early Childhood Education and Care, the 2020 Graham inquiry into suspension exclusion and expulsion processes, and the 2022 University of South Australia study, 'Teachers at breaking point'.

The committee found, along with the department's already commenced programs for improvement, there are further actions the government may take to make the state's public schools more accessible and equitable and to support teachers to continue providing South Australian children and students with world-class education, and these are addressed in the report recommendations. I commend the report to the house.

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

Motions

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That the Statutory Authorities Review Committee inquire into and report on the South Australian Museum, with particular reference to:

1. Its proposed restructure of research and collections;
2. Its infrastructure and proposed strategic plan;
3. Its funding from government and non-government sources; and
4. Any related matters.

(Continued from 10 April 2024.)

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (20:03): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and to move my amendments as well. I believe it makes sense that if the Statutory Authorities Review Committee is to inquire into and report on the South Australian Museum, it should also inquire into Art Gallery of South Australia. That is the gist of my amendments. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Paragraph 1: leave out 'Its'

Paragraph 2: leave out 'Its'

Paragraph 3: leave out 'Its' and 'and'

After paragraph 3 insert new paragraph 3A: 'Administration and staff management; and'

Museums around the world are such an integral part of our history, our social fabric—a rare, fascinating window into the history of the world—and our beloved South Australian Museum is no different. Some of them are home to some of the rarest artefacts or artworks in the world and attract millions of tourists and visitors each year. Think of the British Museum; the Louvre in France; the Smithsonian in the US; the Acropolis Museum in Athens; Pompeii in Italy; there are dozens of them in Rome, which are free; and the Rijksmuseum and the National Maritime Museum in the Netherlands, where I saw one of the first maps ever drawn of Australia, 300 kilometres of the Western Australian coastline, drawn in 1606, then known as Terra Australis.

In Greece in 2022, I caught up with the head of the Acropolis Museum, the world-renowned archaeologist Professor Nikolaos Stampolidis, who outlined the incredible work done by researchers in digging out remnants of their ancient civilisation and documenting it. History is fascinating, and it has fascinated me since I was a child. Anywhere I travel, museums are my first port of call.

That is why the government's now stalled restructure of the SA Museum is ludicrous. It makes you question the motives of the bureaucrats whose idea it was in the first place. The proposed restructure, if it does eventually proceed, will move the Museum from being a strong, respected research institute by axing its research scientists. Millions of tissue samples kept in cold storage may be lost, along with other research work undertaken and invaluable collections. It will harm more than 100 years of work building its prestigious reputation, and the continuation of significant philanthropic

donations from concerned South Australian citizens—not just to the Museum but also, they tell me, to the Art Gallery—will be at real risk of being turned off.

There are also real concerns it will impact on the Museum's vast and extremely well-documented Aboriginal collection. Major Moogy Sumner spoke passionately about this at the recent rally, which I attended on the steps of Parliament House, along with many of my colleagues, including the Hon. Tammy Franks. We do not want to see exhibits lost or removed, such as the ever-popular but modest Egyptian room with its own mummy. 'Save our mummy,' I say. No major museum anywhere in the world would dare take this step of effectively dumbing it down.

Under the South Australian Museum Act, the Museum's core functions are to carry out or promote research into matters of science and historical interest and to accumulate and care for objects and specimens of scientific and historical interest. This is at odds with the proposed restructure, which is not about giving us a better cultural institution. It already is that, and it is free to the public.

I visited there a couple of weeks ago, and it was packed with families and curious tourists. Each exhibit in there has a story to tell, and that story has been created by researchers who are experts in their field poring over information they uncover. How could we afford to lose this expertise? I am informed that key research and collection positions have remained unfilled while middle management and front-of-house positions have continued to expand, degrading the Museum's capacity to care for collections of natural history and cultural heritage. It is all about saving money, pure and simple.

Fortunately, the might of people power has seen the Museum win a reprieve—for now. The protest movement against the proposed mindless restructure of our treasured Museum was heard loud and clear inside the Premier's department last week. The Premier is a leader who listens, and his judgement is often quite good. Stepping in to put the Museum's proposed restructure on hold with a Premier's review is welcome.

The timing of that announcement was interesting and followed a meeting earlier in that week with the Museum Board Chair, Kim Cheater, and Chief Executive Officer Dr David Gaimster. But what is telling was a meeting the previous week with what the Premier described as a number of interested parties concerned about the proposed changes to the Museum. My information is that these interested parties included some very generous and well-known philanthropists who donate regularly to the South Australian Museum and the Art Gallery—hence my amendment.

I have received information that there are also administration issues that need to be addressed at the Art Gallery by the same concerned parties involved in the Museum protests. There is no reason not to inquire into this beloved institution as well at the same time. The benefactors told the Premier in no uncertain terms that they would stop making donations to both institutions if the restructure went ahead. One was even contemplating changing their will.

According to the Premier, the review will be undertaken with some haste, with the panel expected to make recommendations to the government by the middle of the year. The review is to be chaired by the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Damien Walker, and will include South Australia's Chief Scientist, Professor Craig Simmons, and the Chief Executive Officer of the Queensland Museum, Dr Jim Thompson PSM. According to the Premier, the panel will provide advice on a range of areas including:

- research functions;
- curatorial capabilities;
- repatriation and engagement with First Nations communities relating to their cultural heritage;
- collections management;
- public engagement;
- contemporary approaches to displays, exhibitions and public access to the collection, including digitisation;

- contemporary approaches to how the Museum can provide opportunities for education and knowledge-sharing aligned with the curriculum and early learning frameworks;
- delivery of public value to the people of South Australia, ensuring the Museum utilises its resources to deliver the best possible outcomes for its audiences; and
- any other matters related to the appropriate balance of functions in a contemporary museum of the size and scale of the South Australian Museum.

There are expectations that following the review the restructure will be shelved. How could the Museum possibly function without the generous and regular donations from many philanthropists who have financially supported or propped up the Museum for years so that the government does not have to put even more money in? How could it maintain its status as one of the finest research institutions of its kind in the world without the 27 scientists and research staff who meticulously maintain and develop so many unique exhibits? Curators, as has been proposed, will not be capable of doing the specialised and individual work.

As I have said, I do not know of any major museum in the world that would ever take this path. With those words, I support the motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (20:11): I rise on behalf of the Greens to support this motion calling for a standing committee to take on a referral instead of setting up yet another select committee. The South Australian Museum restructure is an issue that has quite rightly drawn much public debate and attention. I also indicate that the Greens will be supporting the Hon. Frank Pangallo's amendment to also include the Art Gallery of South Australia, and I note that recently there have been some concerning rumblings from that North Terrace institution as well.

We have a cultural boulevard in this capital city, and it is a beautiful one. It is one that people come and marvel at. It is one that is accessible to the public. It is one that is much loved. It is one, in the case of the Museum currently, that is chronically underfunded and yet it still beats all of its KPIs and has bigger crowds going along now than it had even prior to COVID. It is hitting its marks on very little money—indeed, when you consider that it has not had an increase in funding and then you factor in CPI, it has actually had an ongoing decrease in funding.

We all know that currently it costs more to do the same. The Museum has been pumping out and performing with less and less resourcing for far too long. It is at a crisis point, which is why the board has taken the decisions that they have. But a decision to sack 27 people and ask them to reapply for a lesser number of jobs is some sort of perverse musical chairs approach that is not befitting of our beloved Museum.

I would just draw attention to people who might not like the mummy room. I grew up in New South Wales. I grew up with a museum that had quite an extensive Egyptian collection and touring exhibits, and they were very different from the mummy room at the South Australian Museum. The mummy room at the South Australian Museum is unique to Adelaide and South Australia. It is indeed now an institution in and of itself. The fact that it is so old has become part of its attraction.

While I note that the minister has said there has been a lot of misinformation out in the public, and she said the mummy room is not under threat, in the Budget and Finance Committee, when asked outright by the Hon. Michelle Lensink whether the mummy room was under threat, the new chief executive or it may have been the chair's response was, 'No, everything is on the table and the mummy room is potentially for the chop.'

The minister says one thing, and says that it is misinformation to say that the mummy room is going, but the head of the Museum to a parliamentary committee has said, 'Yes, the mummy room may go', so where is the truth here? I have to say, I do not trust a DPC-chaired supposed external review to get to the truth of the matter. I do not trust that process.

I note that the problem here is actually the funding. That is why these decisions are being made. They are driven by a lack of resources. Do you know what could happen? Do you know what the Premier could do? He could actually fund the Museum to its need, but, no, he is happy to pay consultants to do yet another review, and they can take some money. Meanwhile, the Museum continues to limp along in a manner not befitting of our cultural boulevard, not befitting of our ambition

to show off our treasures of North Terrace to tourists and locals alike, and not in a way that will be in time for the state budget. It simply kicks the can down the road for yet another year.

Meanwhile, the staff live with uncertainty, the donors live with uncertainty, and continue to be treated with contempt. Do you know what? It is not even just about government money. Donors have noted that one philanthropist actually donated some \$400,000 or so for a marine biology position. That has not been used for the purpose that the donor gave the money. Do we think that this will be uncovered by the Premier's so-called external review, chaired by the head of Department of the Premier and Cabinet? I doubt it. Certainly the public will not get their say, the professionals will not get their say, and it is three men who are driven, in this case, by science.

Do you know what? We have a Museum which is beyond an arts institution in the arts budget, and we are cutting pretty much 27 scientists, putting their jobs at risk, giving them job insecurity, and then expecting them to continue to do more for less, and offering them lesser number of jobs at lesser pay, and expecting that somehow we are going to get an improved outcome. This is extraordinary stuff. I cannot see that we are doing the people of South Australia a justice without opening this issue up for a proper public consultation; not one through the Industrial Relations Court, not one through the Premier's own office, but a proper public debate.

I think it would be unheard of for the South Australian Museum to start charging an entrance fee, but that is one of the possibilities here if they are not adequately funded to do what they need to do to offer the appropriate level of experience, to keep the collections at the level that the public would expect but, more importantly, to take care of the precious resources.

The Hon. Frank Pangallo has mentioned the DNA collection. We have the largest Aboriginal collection in the entire world and, again, the heads of the Museum were uncertain of that fact when they presented to a parliamentary committee. That is extraordinary stuff. They were uncertain of whether it was the largest collection in the world. Well, it is the largest collection in the world. It is something that we have right here in South Australia, and it is one of the reasons that we were talking about Tarrkarri, something that means 'future'. Now Tarrkarri is up in the air. We do not know what happens next with Tarrkarri.

We know that down on the end of the cultural boulevard in Lot Fourteen there is a big, empty, gaping space. We also know that a lot of capital city funding was devoted to that. We also know that there were conversations about the collection that is currently held within the Museum to be part of that experience, so where is the public conversation about Tarrkarri in the Premier's stopgap, bandaid measure to fix up a minister's mistake? It is not there.

The public conversation is what is important here, and I will just draw members' attention to a few factors that certainly have been of great concern to me. I have received correspondence from Birds SA, which is alarmed to hear of the proposed changes to research capacity and collection management at the South Australian Museum.

They have learnt that currently there are 27 positions in research and collections, natural science and humanities. These are 37 per cent of the total Museum staff of around 73. Under the proposed new structure, all 27 positions are to be abolished and replaced by 22 new positions with different job descriptions, many of them significantly different from current roles. The reality here is that we are losing scientists as part of this process, unless we stop this process. How was this allowed to happen? The parliament surely cannot let this happen.

I have drawn to the attention of members in this place and in the Budget and Finance Committee the South Australian Heritage Committee's grave concerns that not only were they not consulted prior to the news becoming public about these cuts but they have written specifically saying that the staff in the humanities section that they have spent years developing a relationship of trust and expertise with have been responsible for repatriation of their ancestors. They are deeply concerned that that repatriation work is impacted adversely by the measures that the board is currently considering and that the minister appears silent on.

Again, that is apparently not at risk, but the jobs of those people that the communities and the different nations have been working with, who took a long time to develop those relationships of

trust, are now on the line. They may go to someone else. They will certainly be paid less, should this process go through.

How is that respect for the expertise and the experience and the connections of true reconciliation that have been created through the humanities section of our South Australian Museum? It is world leading, it is best practice and it is being potentially slashed and burnt. How will that get a guernsey with some scientists looking at this from that science lens? How will that repatriation work be assessed by these three men, one of whom works for the Premier, which is hardly independent or external?

I draw members' attention to the fact that the Royal Society of South Australia for the advancement of science has expressed their concerns. So many of the donors and philanthropists have expressed their concerns, and they will take their money out and then we will need even more money to support our institution, if we are not careful. This is all about relationships. This is all about public ownership of our much-loved SA Museum.

As I said right at the start, it is not as if people are not going. They are going in greater numbers than they ever have. The KPIs are being met, but the reality is that the arts budget gets cut and cut and cut and the poor old South Australian Museum, which is far more than just an arts institution, is suffering from those cut, cut, cuts and suffering from that negligence and could be supported by this parliament so much better. It will be supported. Those people, those professionals, those communities, those scientists, those humanities professionals will be given a voice by the parliament in a cross-party public forum of a standing committee. Those voices will be silenced should we only have the Premier's intervention.

With that, I urge people to support this referral to the Statutory Authorities Committee. It is in fact doing what the Statutory Authorities Committee should do. The SA Museum is a statutory authority of this parliament. We already had the SA Museum coming before that committee, but this will allow not just the Museum's board to be heard, not just the chair and CEO, but the staff, the donors and philanthropists, the consumers and the public, and the children of the future will actually get a real say, with a true consultation. With that, I commend the motion and the amendment by the Hon. Frank Pangallo.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (20:24): I rise briefly to speak to the honourable member's motion. Although I will not be supporting the motion, I do want to acknowledge the work of the Leader of the Opposition, David Speirs. He has campaigned hard to hold the government to account on this issue. He has consulted stakeholders and listened to the concerns of the people involved in the community.

The Premier has since announced that the proposal to restructure the operations of the South Australian Museum has been put on hold to allow the state government to review the plans. Both the public and staff of the Museum have raised concerns about the future of research and jobs under the proposal, and they do deserve to be heard, but in response to these concerns there has been a panel established, and it is expected to make recommendations as early as June.

Although I am open to considering the inquiry proposed by the opposition and do support the intent, I am holding my support until the outcome of the Premier's panel. Should the panel fail to address concerns then an inquiry by the Statutory Authorities Review Committee can still occur, if the chamber agrees. In the meantime, it is unnecessary to have two separate investigations running concurrently. This matter warrants investigation. I acknowledge the role of the opposition but also the Premier to put the plans on hold and to investigate further.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (20:25): I rise today to support the motion put forward by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for the Statutory Authorities Review Committee to inquire into and report on the proposed restructuring of the South Australian Museum. On Saturday 13 April, the Liberal Party joined hundreds of protesters, Museum staff, the academic community, the PSA and people from all walks of life and across all political persuasions at the front steps of Parliament House to raise their concerns, to demand that their voices be heard and to call on Peter Malinauskas to reverse Labor's brutal 2022 budget cuts to the South Australian Museum.

The South Australian community would like the Labor government to cancel its proposed restructure for the SA Museum. I was one of those protesters who joined the Hon. David Speirs, the

Leader of the Opposition; the Hon. John Gardner; former minister the Hon. Diana Laidlaw; as well as former MP Jennifer Cashmore, who came out in her wheelchair, bracing the cold wind, to be with hundreds of protesters taking a strong stand for our South Australian Museum.

There were many other well-known leaders, including Aboriginal elders Major Moogy Sumner and Mark Koolmatrie, who spoke passionately about their concerns at the save the SA Museum rally. They reminded the crowd that the South Australian Museum's Indigenous Australian collection of 28,000 artefacts stands as one of the world's most significant accumulations of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural and historical material—right here in South Australia.

The Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Frank Pangallo from this chamber were also there. I wish to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks, through her speech at the protest, for publicly indicating her support for this motion today. I also appreciate her shout-out of my name, acknowledging that both of us are members of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, which has the power to inquire into and report on the South Australian Museum as the Museum is a statutory body.

What is under threat with the Museum's proposed reimagining are its beloved galleries, whose future has been put under a cloud, including the Egyptian room, the polar collection and the mammals display, as many other honourable members have mentioned today. The SA Museum is not only a much-loved South Australian institution, it is also home to world-class collections and research. There is no way we could simply sit back and watch all the precious artefacts of historical significance be destroyed.

Our SA community is incredibly angry and concerned about Labor's cuts at the SA Museum, the removal of 27 scientific research roles and the government's refusal to guarantee the future of treasured galleries such as the mammals and the other Egyptian room collections.

The SA Museum plays a crucial role in education, in tourism and in the advancement of knowledge, so Labor must reverse its cuts, save jobs and safeguard one of our state's key cultural institutions. Our Museum is loved by generations of South Australians, including my family, and is globally respected for its commitment to scientific research and reconciliation. It is an icon of South Australia, and some 350 scholars and high-profile leaders signed an open letter published in *The Advertiser* calling on Premier Peter Malinauskas to listen—listen, please—to the community and reverse the proposed job cuts to research and collections, which have achieved incredible feats in the past 165 years. More than that, we want to protect these world-class research capabilities and our collections so that future generations can continue to benefit from our beloved Museum.

Following weeks of pressure from the Hon. David Speirs and the Liberal Party, along with scientists and the South Australian community, Premier Peter Malinauskas has been forced to intervene and put the controversial restructure of the South Australian Museum on hold. The Premier has announced a panel to review the proposed changes. While the decision to put the Museum restructure on hold is a move in the right direction, it is a stunning backflip from Peter Malinauskas, who has been given no choice but to intervene after huge pressure from the opposition and outrage from the community.

The proposed restructure threatens the very essence of the South Australian Museum's identity as a home to world-class collections and research. We will continue to stand side-by-side with the community and fight for the future of the SA Museum, as we do not want to see this restructure simply paused but abolished altogether. We want to see the Labor government restore funding to the Museum and cancel the restructure altogether.

We understand that the announcement of a three-person panel appointed to the Premier's review will be chaired by the chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Reflecting on the significant concerns that the community has shown in the campaign to prevent the restructure of the SA Museum, the Liberal opposition does not believe that a Premier's review consisting of a simple three-person panel, chaired by his department's CEO, is adequate, independent or vigorous enough to address everything that this motion calls for.

Given the South Australian community has already lost faith in the Malinauskas government in its handling of the SA Museum proposed restructure to date, followed by Peter Malinauskas' humiliating Museum backflip, how can the public now trust this Labor government to do the right

thing by them? As a member of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, I strongly believe that SARC is best placed to conduct a more thorough inquiry into the SA Museum with the high level of scrutiny, independence and accountability that the South Australian community deserves. I commend the motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (20:32): I rise very briefly to speak on this motion. I start by saying that I have previously indicated my in-principle support for an inquiry into the Museum. Indeed, I think that in-principle support was reflected at the meeting on 13 April. Since that time, on 26 April the government announced a review, so here we are now dealing with an inquiry and the announcement of a review.

I have had recent discussions with the minister in relation to this issue. I appreciate her concerns around effectively running those two processes concurrently. Perhaps where I differ from other members is that I have had those discussions with the minister who, in my view, takes her portfolio very seriously. I do not think you will find a minister more committed than the current one and I have no doubt that what she wants is, indeed, a positive outcome.

I have seen this particular minister previously take contentious issues, deal with them diligently behind the scenes and come to this place with practical resolutions, and I have absolutely no doubt that, based on the discussions I have had with her, that is precisely what she is intending to do in this instance.

The Hon. Ms Lee has called the Premier's position—and by extension, I guess, the minister's—'a stunning backflip'. I look at that and say that is precisely what happens when public pressure builds. By the same token, I accept that there are those who think that this review may be a stitch-up and going through the motions, and that basically it might not be worth the paper it is written on and we are just trying to buy time.

If this review is a stitch-up, as some are expecting, I have no doubt whatsoever that the mover and everybody else will be back in this place with another similar motion, and the matter will be revisited then if not beforehand. As has been alluded to, it may be that, regardless of this motion, SARC instigates its own inquiry, and that transpires regardless of the outcome of this motion today. For the record, I do not disagree with the views that have been expressed here today. Indeed, I think the Premier and the minister are both on notice that if this review is not genuine in nature then they can expect the review itself to be the subject of any further inquiry that is instigated in this place.

I have looked at the time frame of the review that has been given to me. The terms of reference are broad, the time frame is tight and, importantly, any restructure that has been talked about previously has been paused. I do not make the decision to not support this inquiry today lightly but, as I have indicated to the mover, I am willing to wait for the outcome of that review to see what it is that the government is proposing. I am willing to take a breath to see if anything comes of that review and, as I said, if nothing fruitful comes from that review, given that the restructure has been paused, then I would expect that the mover would double-down on her proposal today.

I have read the message from the chief executive that was published on the website, which acknowledges the public discussion and debate and speculation about the Museum's future. I acknowledge that the CE has said that he wants to reassure you, the public, that the South Australian Museum has heard the strong response to plans to consult on proposed reforms and that they acknowledge the affection in which the Museum is held by South Australians and the passion that discussion about its future promotes. They acknowledge the early discussion of the engagement process has prompted the concerns which have been outlined today, both from within the scientific community and the broader community.

He goes on to talk about the fact that the Museum leadership recently met with the Premier and the arts minister to discuss that planned public engagement and the concerns raised from some sections of the community, and then stipulates that following those discussions there will be this review process, with this review panel made up, as others have indicated, by the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Damien Walker, together with the Director of Queensland Museum, Dr Jim Thompson PSM, and Chief Scientist of South Australia, Professor Craig Simmons—both of whom are said to be eminent experts in their respective fields of science, research, cultural institutions and policy.

As far as the terms of reference are concerned, according to the minister, the Premier and the chief executive, the panel will consider and provide principles of general guidance and advice on a range of areas, including research functions, curatorial capabilities, repatriation and engagement with First Nations communities relating to their cultural heritage, collections management, public engagement, contemporary approaches to displays and exhibitions, and public access to collections, including digitisation and contemporary approaches as to how the Museum can provide opportunities for education and knowledge-sharing, aligned with the curriculum and early learning framework.

That is the remit, and it has been, as I said, made against the backdrop of a tight time frame and a pause to any restructure. My position is that I appreciate the concerns raised with me by the minister about those issues running concurrently, and any practical issues that they may raise in terms of practical solutions. My position is also that I think the minister is genuine in her intent in saying that she wants to see this issue resolved and that a review will assist with that process.

But as I said before, the minister and the Premier are also on notice that, if that is not what we end up with, there is every possibility we will be back here having this debate again, if not beforehand through the current committee processes, which we know can instigate their own inquiries regardless of what we say in here. So I say again for the record that in principle, I have said before and I say now, I am not opposed to this, but I do acknowledge that there is another process that has now been instigated.

I will just say for the record that a lot of the times many of the things that we raise in this place, and certainly that I raise in this place, are with a view to get a review external from this place. In this instance, when I first spoke to the minister, it was clear to me that that was what we were going to get. People might have their views about whether there is any place for the CE of DPC, Mr Walker, on that review or not, but I am certainly open-minded to at least allowing that review process to take its course, to see what the outcomes are and to revisit the issue pending those outcomes.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (20:41): I rise to speak on the Hon. Ms Centofanti's motion, which the government will not be supporting. At the outset, it needs to be acknowledged that the Malinauskas Labor government has made significant investment into the arts and cultural sector in South Australia; in fact, we were elected on our commitment to increase funding, with an additional \$8 million to support small and medium arts organisations, \$8 million for the Adelaide Fringe, \$2 million for the Adelaide Film Festival to ensure it becomes an annual festival and \$10 million to support the live music industry through our See It LIVE campaign.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.T. NGO: However, I also want to note that since coming into government we have gone even further and provided \$35 million to upgrade the Adelaide Festival Centre, \$2.3 million for the Adelaide Festival, \$2 million to increase the Adelaide Film Festival Investment Fund to support the creation of new films and \$5.2 million in partnership with the ABC to support more television production in South Australia. In just over two years, this government has clearly demonstrated that it supports the South Australian cultural sector.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.T. NGO: I have to say that this additional \$72.5 million of funding is in stark contrast to the actions of those opposite. There are senior members of the former Marshall Liberal government sitting on the other side of this chamber who played a part in inflicting significant cuts to all our cultural institutions, including the SA Museum, in their 2018-19 and 2019-20 state budgets. They cut millions in the Museum's budget.

Members will now be aware that the proposed restructure of the South Australian Museum is currently on hold and is subject to the Premier's review to examine the options going forward. I have been advised that the Premier and the Minister for Arts met with the Chair of the Museum

Board, Kim Cheater, and Chief Executive Dr David Gaimster following a constructive meeting with a number of interested parties concerned about the proposed changes to the Museum.

Following those discussions and the community advocacy, I was told the Premier and the Minister for Arts decided it was in the best interest of the public trust in this institution to pause the restructure and further examine its purpose. Consequently, the Premier's review warrants this motion unnecessary.

Importantly, the Premier's review will be chaired by the chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Damien Walker. Its membership will also draw on the expertise of the South Australian Chief Scientist, Professor Craig Simmons, and the chief executive officer from the Queensland Museum, Dr Jim Thompson PSM. Both are eminently respected. I am surprised that the opposition questioned their integrity. Professor Craig Simmons—

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Sit down, the Hon. Mr Ngo. What is your point of order, the Hon. Ms Franks?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I did not hear the opposition question the Chief Scientist's or the Queensland scientist's integrity at any stage. I did not hear that. I feel like the honourable member just misled the chamber.

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: Would you like to withdraw?

The PRESIDENT: I would invite you to withdraw, the Hon. Mr Ngo. It is probably the easiest way we can continue.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: I am happy to withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT: Stick to your script, mate.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Well, they did question the panel.

The PRESIDENT: Move on, the Hon. Mr Ngo.

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.T. NGO: There are two other members—so you are saying they are not independent?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ngo, do not respond to interjections. Just finish your speech.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Professor Craig Simmons has served as an executive director at the Australian Research Council, and he is recognised for his major contribution to science, leadership, education and policy reform. He is a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Science, the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering and the American Geophysical Union.

Queensland Museum is a cultural institution that is comparable to our own Museum. The CEO, Dr Jim Thompson, has an extensive and distinguished career and has performed a range of leadership roles throughout Australia in areas such as research, policy and the public sector. I have also been advised that the Premier's review will consider a range of matters, including:

- research functions;
- repatriation and engagement with First Nations communities relating to their cultural heritage;
- collections management;
- public engagement;
- contemporary approaches to displays, exhibitions and public access to the collection, including digitisation;

- contemporary approaches to how the Museum can provide opportunities for education and knowledge that aligns with South Australia's curriculum and early learning frameworks;
- delivery of public value to the people of South Australia, ensuring the Museum utilises its resources to deliver the best possible outcomes for its audiences; and
- any other matters related to the appropriate balance of functions in a contemporary museum of the size and scale of the South Australian Museum.

It is intended that recommendations will be made to the Premier and the minister by the middle of the year, which is less than two months away. This will ensure the process is completed efficiently and in a timely manner. The Labor Malinauskas government knows that our Museum enriches our cultural fabric in so many ways. We want to support its endeavours to sustain engagement, educate and preserve and showcase diverse cultures.

Unfortunately, there has been a significant amount of misinformation in this chamber about the proposal for the Museum, so it is best that we wait for this review, which is only two months away, and then give it a go. We can debate this matter in two months' time. What is the urgency? The Premier has intervened and he is looking into it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.T. NGO: For this reason, as outlined above, we cannot support this motion.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (20:49): First, I acknowledge and thank the following members for their contribution in this chamber to this debate: the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Tung Ngo and my colleague the Hon. Jing Lee. Whilst we are glad to see that the government and the Premier have taken a belated interest some six or seven weeks into this issue, the opposition is disappointed that the government continues to leave 27 scientists without security of employment. It continues to leave the assurance of over 150 years of work, precious information and specimens, in peril.

While the government and the Premier may believe—and I quote the Premier from a radio interview—that six weeks is nothing, I and, I am certain, the families and individuals affected by this restructure beg to differ. People who have invested a lifetime of work, a dedication that only scientific academic endeavours, beg to differ.

This issue has drawn substantial community interest. A pause by the Malinauskas government does not guarantee answers to numerous questions that have been raised, nor does it allay public concern over the processes taking place. It is critical that a review of this nature is independent of government. The people of South Australia are seeking assurances that their Museum will not only retain its wide variety of exhibits but will continue its scientific, anthropologic and archaeological work.

Therefore, we the opposition and a number of crossbench members feel that referring this to the Statutory Authorities Review Committee is absolutely still relevant. The Museum is a statutory authority and therefore it is absolutely appropriate that this parliamentary committee examines the new Museum's purpose and priorities.

One issue that particularly demands a review that is independent of government is the need to consider the Museum's budget and what adjustments may need to be made in order to ensure that the Museum is capable of fulfilling its legislative duties at an appropriately high level. Therefore, given that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is the responsible department for the Museum's funding and governance, one could easily argue that a review that is headed by the CEO of DPC into their own management of this authority is utterly unsatisfactory.

It is extremely disappointing that we do not have the support of SA-Best and One Nation on this entirely reasonable motion. The public is tired of governments reviewing themselves—it lacks transparency.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: And crossbenchers not being vigilant.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Hear, hear! I think the public would absolutely expect members of this place to support transparency. Again, it is disappointing that some members of this place would rather support a government review into this issue than a genuine independent inquiry of this place, of this parliament.

It is disappointing that some members in this place would rather support a government review that, as the Hon. Tammy Franks points out, will involve consultants and will cost taxpayers money, when there is a perfectly fit body, right here in this parliament, ready to do that work that would not cost taxpayers a cent. Let me be clear: if this motion is not successful and the government's internal review is not satisfactory or unnecessarily delayed, then we will be bringing this motion back to the chamber to once again be debated. I put all members on notice and I put the government on notice.

Before I commend this motion to the chamber, I note that the Hon. Frank Pangallo has an amendment to include the Art Gallery of South Australia in this motion. I indicate that we, the opposition, are absolutely happy to support this amendment because, again, the Art Gallery is another statutory authority that warrants oversight by this parliament through that committee. With that, I commend this motion to the chamber.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes9
Noes.....10
Majority1

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Henderson, L.A.
Lensink, J.M.A.

Franks, T.A.
Hood, B.R.
Pangallo, F. (teller)

Girolamo, H.M.
Lee, J.S.
Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Game, S.L.
Martin, R.B.
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Ngo, T.T. (teller)

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.

Maher, K.J.

Amendment thus negated.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes9
Noes.....10
Majority1

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)
Henderson, L.A.
Lensink, J.M.A.

Franks, T.A.
Hood, B.R.
Pangallo, F.

Girolamo, H.M.
Lee, J.S.
Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Game, S.L.
Martin, R.B.
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Ngo, T.T. (teller)

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.

Maher, K.J.

Motion thus negatived.

*Bills***SUMMARY OFFENCES (PROSTITUTION LAW REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 September 2023.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (21:03): I rise today to indicate my support for the Summary Offences (Prostitution Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2023. I wish to thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for bringing this bill to the chamber and allowing us the opportunity to have a robust and respectful debate on the sex industry and prostitution law reform. The fact that we have found ourselves in this place as legislators engaging in intense consultations, debates, research and deliberations on this issue over many years demonstrates that there is a genuine need to reform our current laws.

I believe there are good people on both sides of this debate who care deeply about people, mainly women, and their welfare and safety in the sex industry. Today we are asked to consider the Nordic model in this bill, also called the equality model. It is a system of partial decriminalisation. It exempts people who work in the sex industry, mostly women, but reprimands those who procure sex for others (such as pimps) and third-party profiteers (such as brothel owners), as well as those who pay for sex (mostly men).

The Nordic model also offers assistance or exit programs for those who want to leave the sex industry. I note that the Hon. Dr Centofanti has already spoken extensively on the specific amendments to the Summary Offences Act 1953 and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 proposed in this bill; therefore, I will not be going into details of those in my contribution. I wish to speak more broadly to the intention of this bill and the very real and empowering impact that it will have on the vulnerable women who are victimised and exploited in the sex industry.

The Nordic model was first adopted in Sweden in 1999 and has also been implemented in Norway and Iceland. This model has now been enacted in other countries, including Canada, Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, France, Israel and South Korea. It is also under consideration in Spain, Latvia and Lithuania, while the European Parliament has shown its support for the model. While men are also involved in the sex trade, over 95 per cent of people involved are women. Of these women, approximately 80 per cent enter the sex industry due to extreme circumstances, such as financial distress, homelessness, addictions and abuse.

Indigenous women and women of colour are also over-represented in the sex trade. These are women who continue to be physically and financially exploited or coerced by their mostly male clients and mostly male pimps or brothel managers. Women who are already often victims of sexual abuse, experiencing domestic violence, drug and alcohol addictions or homelessness find themselves making harsh choices to avoid utter destitution. These women need laws which will protect them, and they need a tangible pathway to exit the sex industry and be free to make their own decisions.

During my consultation with stakeholders on this bill, I have met with Ashlyn Vice, State Director of the Australian Christian Lobby. I have spoken to Hindu and Buddhist community leaders and many multicultural community leaders. They have all expressed views similar to mine and indicated their support for this bill.

Earlier this year, I met with Amanda Brohier, the President of Women Ending Exploitation by Prostitution (WEEP), who was also accompanied by a young woman who previously worked as a prostitute and has since left the industry. To protect her identity out of respect, I will not name her in parliament, but the story she told was very confronting and left a deep impression on me.

She came from a dysfunctional and disconnected family. At 18, she became involved in the first of many abusive relationships with men who used her for sex. She would later turn to drugs to ease her pain, but with no money to support her addiction, she felt that she had no choice but to sell her body. This was the beginning of an even more turbulent and difficult time for her. She was constantly used, abused, threatened and robbed by her clients. She felt she had no choice but to work longer hours, inviting her to further dangers. She became isolated, associating only with other sex workers and drug dealers. She was stuck in a vicious and self-sustaining spiral with seemingly no way out.

While she was eventually able to escape from her horrible life, it came at the cost of her physical health and mental wellbeing. To this day, she continues to suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, a condition that is also all too common amongst women because of their tormenting experiences in the sex industry. I want to thank this young woman for her courage and strength to meet with me and many others so that she can tell her story, share her experience and advocate for meaningful and effective change for women who have become trapped in the sex industry. As she says:

No one enters this industry simply by choice, there are always underlying issues.

Another case study is from Rose Hunter, who is an author and a sex industry survivor. I would like to quote why she supported the Nordic model. She said:

I support the Nordic Model because, in my 10 years in the sex industry, I never saw an exit service, or even dreamed that I might deserve such a service—and I so wish I had.

As part of its exit service component, the bill that will be voted on this year in South Australia suggests assistance in education and training, accommodation, employment, and access to health and legal services.

In addition to the immense help this would have been for me, the assistance of programs like this would have sent me a vital compassionate message: that I deserve more than the sex industry—our laws said so.

I support the Nordic Model because, in my experience, the sex industry cannot be made safe for women—either physically or psychologically. It is not, and cannot be made into, acceptable work.

I support the Nordic Model because it describes a society I want to live in—a society in which men's sexual use of disadvantaged and traumatised women is not acceptable and is not tolerated by our laws.

What kind of society do we want? We can decide that we believe our women and girls deserve better than being exploited in the sex industry.

We can legislate to change societal attitudes. Other countries have already done it. I hope South Australia will be the first Australian state to prioritise the welfare of our women and girls and enact the Nordic Model.

I recognise that those who advocate for full decriminalisation are seeking to help and provide the necessary support for women in prostitution. However, by not proactively tackling the inherent inequalities in the sex industry, decriminalisation will never be able to achieve the ultimate goal of empowering and protecting vulnerable women. The decriminalisation model in other jurisdictions has failed to achieve its goals of increasing safety, improving health and human rights, decreasing stigma and eliminating fear of criminal repercussions.

I now want to point out a case study looking at a jurisdiction that has already decriminalised prostitution, namely, New Zealand. Five years after decriminalisation in New Zealand, a government report found that a majority of sex workers interviewed felt that decriminalisation of prostitution could do little about the violence that occurs in the sex industry, and few reported incidents of violence against them.

According to the report, despite decriminalisation the social stigma surrounding involvement in the sex industry continues. Street prostitution in New Zealand's biggest city, Auckland, increased dramatically, with numbers more than doubling just a couple of years after decriminalisation. Child prostitution also became rampant in some cities, with girls as young as 10 years selling sex.

These case studies found that women had no say in setting the price of sexual services, with prices often changed without consultation. Brothel owners would have workers pay a bond or withhold payment as a means to compel women to work. Workers would get fined for refusing to perform particular sexual acts, and it was difficult for workers to make complaints, due to the control exerted by brothel owners. This is why it is necessary that any reform we consider in this place actively seeks to fix the power imbalance between those who sell themselves for sexual services and those who participate in the buying of sexual services.

This is what this proposed bill seeks to do—to reduce the demand for sexual services, create a platform to restore equality and then provide the necessary help and services that are required for those who may want to exit the industry. It is vital that this bill provides a framework for real support that helps and empowers women to transition away from sex work.

Once again, I would like to thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for introducing this bill, and the many women, individuals and organisations who have advocated and campaigned strongly for this bill. With those remarks, I commend the bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (21:14): I will be supporting this bill that seeks to introduce the Nordic or equality model, which makes the buying of sex a criminal offence along with associated third parties like pimps, while selling sex is decriminalised. I do not think you would ever be able to stop the practice, which has been in society for thousands of years, but there are ways it can be restricted.

I cannot support measures that create an industry from it. The ones who really benefit are the promoters, in particular the pimps who run these rackets and who may be linked to criminal organisations and drug traffickers. This is a far more acceptable model. It works successfully in reducing the practice of prostitution in several European and Scandinavian countries, where it has been in place for several years.

After we last debated a bill to legalise prostitution, which was lost, I travelled to Norway in 2019 to speak with the head of the police unit overseeing sex work and human trafficking, KOM, Chief Inspector Tore Hellebust. Their law was passed in 2009. Previously, prostitution was illegal, much like here. By 2000 the focus was more on human trafficking, and in 2003 Norway ratified the Palermo Protocol made by the UN to prevent and combat trade of humans, especially women and children—slavery. In 2003/2004, Norway had changed its laws to also include human trafficking because of a change of focus regarding sellers and buyers of sex.

During that time, Oslo was inundated with prostitutes from Nigeria. Chief Inspector Hellebust said there were between 200 and 300 girls working on the street daily, indicating these girls were victims of human trafficking. That is when they changed the law to criminalise the buyers and reduce the demand. It proved to be successful. Over time, there were fewer girls on the street. He provided me with Oslo police district arrest data between 2009 and 2018. Pimping dropped by almost 40 per cent while buying sexual services plummeted by 67 per cent.

The Norwegians concentrated more on education programs than on busts, as it was difficult to police because they had to catch people in the act to lay charges. He said fears from NGOs that violence against people would increase against prostitutes who sold sex from apartments was not supported by evidence, although they had reports of rapes and robberies of sex sellers. However, many girls did not report robberies or acts of violence to police in fear of being deported or because they came from a country where they distrusted authority.

Figures of sellers advertising for sex online have stabilised in Norway, as has the number of sex workers. Initial concerns that the laws would drive the practice underground proved unfounded. I met with Ida Elin Kock of the NGO Pro Sentret, who told me that in recent years persons from Romania and Bulgaria have been trafficked in Oslo, forced to work in the sex industry out of

desperation because of financial destitution in their home country, a lack of education, illiteracy, coming from a minority background, or reduced cognitive abilities.

Another Pro Sentret NGO, Ulla Bjomdahl, from Sweden wrote a report, 'Dangerous liaisons', on the violence committed against female sex workers. It found they were frequently victimised privately and in prostitution, with the violence experienced characterised as 'severe to very severe'. A survey of sex workers found they wanted more police presence and severe penalties for those who were violent. Pro Sentret has called for more action to prevent violence against women.

In Sweden, media campaigns were effective in educating society about violent aspects of prostitution, with men's perception of prostitutes changing to viewing it as a more social problem, and a form of male violence against women. The Nordic model there has successfully reduced the number of men buying sex, compared to countries where prostitution was fully decriminalised. It is interesting that critics of this model who support full decriminalisation claim it will pose financial hardship on those wanting to exit the system while claiming decriminalisation would result in a safer environment. The bill does propose to assist prostitutes to find other alternatives of work and support.

Opponents also claim decriminalisation has been successful in New Zealand, New South Wales, Northern Territory and Victoria without providing substantive evidence. In forums conducted here by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, we heard from Ally-Marie Diamond of Wahine Toa Rising, a survivor-led organisation for women and girls in the trade. Their stories were powerful and reflect the difficult and dangerous conditions they endured.

I also had the pleasure of meeting with Jonathan Machler, the executive director of CAP International, the Coalition for the Abolition of Prostitution, which is made up of 35 global organisations. They supported more than 18,000 persons around the world from marginalised groups. CAP showcases the voices of survivors in reports that delve into practices, including human trafficking and exploitation, emphasising the domination of men over women.

Ironically, here we are today in this country with the Prime Minister and state leaders meeting to find ways to reduce the horrendous spate of violence against women, yet there was no mention made of one key area where this also occurs constantly, and that is prostitution. Yet, they raise concerns about violent online pornography and misogyny. You could not find a more misogynistic world than prostitution, where pimps and thieves exploit and harm women.

CAP International's goals are to eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls, including trafficking sexual violence and other types of exploitation. For many women, prostitution is a necessity to meet financial needs. It affects the most vulnerable and the poorest women and children in our society. They do not want to do that work. They are crying out for help. Full decriminalisation is not going to do that.

France, perhaps one of the most liberated and progressive nations in the world, passed an historic law in 2016 to strengthen the fight against prostitution and provide support for prostituted persons. The laws consider them to be victims of violence, and a violation of human rights and dignity. Not only does this law prohibit paid sex and decriminalises prostituted persons, but there is also a mandated national policy for persons to exit the industry. There is protection for those persons, and it is assured, regardless of their nationality. There are stiff jail terms and penalties for those violating these laws. What is interesting is that these laws received overwhelming support from all political persuasions: socialists, lefty socialists, communists and even conservatives.

Prostitution is neither sex, nor is it work. I received a heartbreaking statement from Maz Bell, a member of WEEP, who gave a graphic and disturbing account of her life as a prostitute, and how it eventually descended into a traumatised world fuelled by drugs and then homelessness. She sought help through the Coming Project and, after six years, Maz says she is healing. She said, and I quote:

I believe that regardless of what the women in the sex industry say, how much they enjoy it and how empowered it makes them feel, it is denial and self-preservation. It can also be a coping strategy. No one enters this industry simply by choice. There are almost always underlying issues.

When I look back I admire my own strength to leave. Even though in my head I was convinced that that was what I wanted, deep in my heart I was longing for something more.

With that, I reiterate that I support the bill by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (21:25): I indicate that the Summary Offences (Prostitution Law Reform) Amendment Bill is a conscience vote for the Liberal Party, as is standard practice for such matters in our party. Like many of my colleagues, I have received a large amount of correspondence from individuals and groups sharing their views on how they believe prostitution would most appropriately be dealt with. I thank members of the community for their time in sharing their views.

For many in this place, their position on prostitution or sex work is already recorded for the public record. Being a relatively new member of parliament, my position on prostitution is not yet in the public domain. I seek members' indulgence as I briefly address my position on the decriminalisation of prostitution in my speech. I hope in doing so I can provide clarity on my views on this matter.

I acknowledge the hard work of the Hon. Nicola Centofanti MLC in introducing this bill to the parliament, an issue she is very clearly passionate about. In the contributions members have made, it has been clear that at the heart of their decision on which model of prostitution they support and whether to support this bill or not the safety of women has been at the forefront of that decision. Ultimately, we differ on how that is best achieved.

Throughout my contribution, I will refer to the impact upon women, as those who are prostituted are more often women. I acknowledge that this is not solely applicable to women. Given the existing legislation and the proposed bill use the term 'prostitution', I will too, but I mean no disrespect in doing so.

Throughout my contribution in relation to this bill, I would like to make it clear that when I am speaking about prostitution I am referring to consensual prostitution in which the individual is a willing participant. It is my view that where there is abuse, assault, rape or sex trafficking these are separate yet sometimes interrelated issues but not the act of prostitution and therefore not what is being legislated for here today. My contribution is in no way intended to say that these other offences do not occur or are not issues; they absolutely are, but it is important to remember what we are legislating for here today.

I note that there are existing federal laws that account for trafficking, and of course state laws which account for abuse, assault and rape. I would say that if these laws are not adequate then the federal and state parliaments should address these issues, but that is not what we are debating in this bill.

In my preparation for this debate, I have read *Hansard* and the reflections of some of the previous decriminalisation debates. I wish to share with this chamber an excerpt from the Attorney-General's favourite former member of parliament, the Hon. Rob Lucas MLC, when he said:

...can I say at the outset that I absolutely support the right of members we have had in the past, and if there are members here in this chamber today, whose judgements they bring to bear on this particular legislation or others that are governed almost completely by their personal moral code or their belief system. I defend to the end their right to interpret their role in this chamber as a legislator in that particular way...

He says there is no right way and there is no wrong way. It is largely my values that underpin my view on this debate. In considering the proposed legislation, I believe it is important to reflect on the existing framework. Prostitution in South Australia is currently partially criminalised. Brothels are illegal. Keeping, managing and receiving money paid in a brothel in respect of prostitution or permitting premises to be used as a brothel is prohibited. Authorised police officers may at any time enter and search premises which are suspected on reasonable grounds to be a brothel. Street prostitution is illegal. Escort agencies are not mentioned in legislation and there is nothing in the act specifically about private operators.

Pursuant to the Summary Offences Act, other relevant offences include permitting premises to be frequented by prostitutes, being on premises frequented by prostitutes without reasonable excuse, soliciting or accosting a person in a public place or within the view or hearing of any person in a public place, loitering in a public place for the purpose of prostitution, engaging in procurement for prostitution, knowingly living wholly or in part on the earnings of prostitution of another person.

The Criminal Law Consolidation Act creates offences relating to commercial sexual services, sexual servitude and the use of children in commercial sexual services. Pursuant to this act the common law offence of keeping a common bawdy house is punishable by imprisonment of no more than two years.

In consideration of this bill my office has conducted a series of freedom of information requests to determine how the existing framework has been applied. These FOIs found nil arrests and fines for keeping or managing a brothel during the date range of 25.9.22 to 26.9.23. There were, however, five reports for the offence of keep brothel within this date range.

There were no fines issued for soliciting for the purpose of prostitution during the date range of 25.9.22 to 26.9.23; no arrests or fines issued for living off the earnings of prostitution of another person, including escort services, during the date range 25.9.22 to 26.9.23; and no arrests or fines issued for procurement for prostitution during the date range of 25.9.22 to 26.9.23.

I have had people raise with me that the status quo is not working. I have heard this from those who support the Nordic model and those who support the full decriminalisation model. I appreciate that the decriminalisation of prostitution is something that has been debated many times in this place.

As I have not put my position on the record, I will address the full decriminalisation of prostitution, as I have had multiple groups and individuals approach me in support of a full decriminalisation model. I believe it is important to pin my colours to the mast and stay true to my convictions. I do not see my position changing regarding the decriminalisation model should further bills be brought on this issue.

I do not support decriminalising prostitution. I do not believe that prostitution should be a viable career prospect. I believe that individuals should be deterred from entering prostitution. I equally believe that individuals should be deterred from purchasing sexual services and from exploiting women. I do not believe that decriminalising prostitution is in the interests of society as a whole or of the women who are involved in prostitution. To decriminalise prostitution would essentially serve to be cultural approval and normalise such behaviour.

Sex should not be an expectation. No woman should be able to sell sex or to have their bodies bought for sex. I disagree with the objectification of women that prostitution allows for. The value of women should not be based on their physical appearance and sexual appeal, which is something that underpins prostitution. It is my belief that the right to access women for sex for money reduces prostituted women to a commodity.

As I see it, even if prostitution was decriminalised and heavily regulated and normalised there would always be an imbalance of power. It comes from the very nature of the client procuring a service that is that personal in nature. It comes from the reality that often female prostitutes will likely be smaller than their clients and operate in an isolated and secluded environment. This inherently leaves them vulnerable.

No workplace should ever place its workers in such vulnerable positions. Economic independence should not come with the risk of harm or abuse. I appreciate that those who support the full decriminalisation model will likely say that to decriminalise prostitution would address safety concerns. I respectfully disagree and think that the inherent nature of prostitution will always leave prostitutes vulnerable and subject to power imbalance. This is an unacceptable risk, in my opinion.

The best way to protect women is not to decriminalise or regulate the industry but to reduce it and criminalise it. It is one of the oldest professions, so I am not naive enough to think that it will cease to exist, though it is with the acknowledgement of this reality that I have attempted to balance in my approach the need to reduce women entering the industry, to stop men from purchasing sex and exploiting women, and to provide avenues for support for those who are vulnerable within prostitution and exit strategies for them if they look for them with the reality that there will inevitably still be women who remain within the sex industry.

It is important that those who seek to exit the industry have the support that they need to be able to do so. Just because this is one of the oldest professions in the world does not mean that it cannot or should not be changed. Ultimately, it is my aim that there is a reduction in those who enter

prostitution to begin with, and that those who are within prostitution have exit strategies to leave prostitution, should they choose.

In my belief, the Nordic model does not go far enough. In all honesty, I support full criminalisation of prostitution with what I would call safe harbour provisions. In my conversations with people on either side of the debate and in my consideration of this difficult issue, I must say I fully appreciate there are concerns the criminalisation of prostitution leaves people—often women—vulnerable to physical and sexual violence, which can mean that prostitutes are reluctant to report assaults for fear of themselves being charged with prostitution-related offences.

I have often wondered whether the establishment of safe harbour provisions would be beneficial within a fully criminalised model: a model where both the sale and purchase of sex would be criminalised, but where there is a carve-out, if you will, where the prostitute could not be charged with prostitution-related offences if they fell within set exemptions and where they could declare that they have been operating as a prostitute when reporting offences to the police—for example, if they have been raped or stolen from—and in seeking housing and welfare assistance, health care, etc., without the fear of prosecution.

The intention would be that women would be able to declare that they have been operating as a prostitute in seeking this assistance, without fear of prosecution from the authorities. Importantly, it would assist those who are already within the industry in seeking help and getting out, if they choose. For obvious reasons, these women are currently not able to do this, and I think it is important for them to be able to do so.

I do not necessarily agree with criminalising only one party, whether it be the sale—as it currently is—or the purchase. It is my view that, where one side of the equation is criminalised, the other party knows that they are causing, assisting and/or facilitating an offence by the other person. Both parties should be responsible for their actions and both parties should equally be deterred. I find it peculiar that you would be able to deliver a service you know is illegal for someone else to purchase. In a sense, it is like punishing a drug buyer while the dealer gets off free.

All things considered, my preferred outcome for this issue would be a model where you could criminalise the sale and purchase of prostitution-related offences, but have a legislative framework where those who are seeking police support, health services, HIV treatment and prevention, sexual health services or housing support could not be charged with prostitution-related offences when seeking those supports. I appreciate that at this time the support would likely not exist in this chamber to enable such a model of criminalisation to pass.

With that pragmatic acknowledgement that this place is built on its numbers, I now turn to the Summary Offences (Prostitution Law Reform) Amendment Bill, which is a bill based on the Nordic model. The Nordic model seeks to decriminalise those who are prostituted and seeks to criminalise the purchaser. It looks to provide support services to help prostitutes exit the sex industry, while trying to work to reduce the demand that drives prostitution. For this reason, I can see the benefits of the Nordic model that would allow a prostitute to seek that help to be able to exit the industry and to be able to seek the assistance needed.

In considering this bill, I reflected on a quote I have shared in this place a couple of times now. It reads:

Before we voice a preference on public policy, whether in the voting booth or talking with family members over dinner, we should consider one question with two parts.

First, what are the costs of choosing the wrong policy? And second, who would have to bear those potential costs?

If the wrong solution is chosen, a problem will likely persist as before or even be made worse.

From speaking with those who have previously worked as prostitutes and those who work closely with prostitutes, the existing framework deters prostitutes from being able to seek the help that they need, and some would say it is not working. I acknowledge there is a stigma associated with working in prostitution that can make it difficult for those who may be looking to exit the industry. For this reason, I can see the benefit for a change from the status quo, a change that would see better support

and protection for those working as prostitutes who seek to leave the industry. I can see that the Nordic model presents the opportunity to create that support.

The intention behind the Nordic model is a noble one. It is to protect those who work in the sex industry to give them the support they need to be able to exit prostitution. It also holds the purchasers, who exploit prostitutes, to account through criminalising the purchase. The intention of this is something I support.

In considering whether to support this bill, I thought about what my aim is within a legislative framework for prostitution. I will try to briefly summarise my top three key objectives. The first is deterring women from entering into prostitution. It is my belief that the best way we can support women is to stop them from being in such vulnerable positions to begin with. This is something that I believe the existing framework or status quo better achieves than the proposed Nordic model, as it provides a deterrent for those considering prostitution, as they would be breaking the law.

The second is to stop the purchase of sex and to hold those who are exploiting women to account. This is something the proposed legislation addresses where the existing framework is, in my view, lacking. The third is to provide support to women in prostitution and to those who are seeking to exit the industry. This is something the proposed legislation addresses, where the existing framework is lacking.

It would be remiss of me to not highlight where my views differ from those of the Nordic model. I will place on record the reflections of the Nordic model but, to be clear, these are my reflections on the Nordic model more generally, and not reflections on the work of the Hon. Nicola Centofanti. The Swedish government, which has implemented the Nordic model in its jurisdiction, has been explicit in its understanding of prostitution and why it chooses to implement the criminalisation of the consumer model. The Swedish government fact sheet provided that:

The Swedish Government and parliament have, through the implementation of the Legislation pertaining to the Protection of Women, defined prostitution as men's violence against women.

The official Swedish view is that no prostitution can be said to be voluntary. It should be noted that the rationale behind the Nordic model has not been universally supported. As Ka Hon Chu and Glass state:

Within this framework, all men who purchase are deemed to be aggressors and all women in sex work are deemed to be victims of male violence and patriarchal oppression, a framing that conflates sex work within trafficking, pathologizes male clients, and renders male and trans workers largely invisible.

I disagree with the notion that prostitutes are automatically oppressed victims because of the title of their job, and that all purchasers are aggressors. I agree that purchasers are exploiting women and that those who work as prostitutes are vulnerable. I refute the notion that no prostitution can be voluntary.

I am not naive enough to think that there are not some in our community who want to work as prostitutes. In fact, I have met with and spoken with some. I am not naive enough to think that there are not some who enter prostitution, whether it be for a romanticised notion of what prostitution could be or through desperation and vulnerability. The idea that no prostitute ever can voluntarily enter prostitution, I think, poses a few key issues.

I do query, with that logic, if no prostitute can ever voluntarily enter prostitution, whether that then does not mean that prostitutes are there against their will and, as such, do not consent to sexual relations, meaning in theory we are talking about rape and not prostitution. I do not agree with this as a broad characterisation of prostitution, and I most certainly am not asserting that this is what the honourable member is proposing. I merely highlight the importance of language in this space.

I do not believe the act of prostitution is, in and of itself, an act of violence against women, although violence can be interlinked and, sadly, from experiences I have heard in the lead-up to this debate, something which is all too common. I have heard the phrase 'paid rape' used in my preparation for this contribution. I think it is important to differentiate between prostitution and abuse, rape or assault. It is my view that where there are two consenting adults, where boundaries are respected, the latter is not a consideration. However, in instances where a purchaser has exceeded the boundaries established by the prostitute, then that is abuse, rape or assault.

I would like to think that there would be few in our community who would think that the act of accepting a client gives the purchaser a free pass to do whatever they like, especially when the prostitute says stop or no. I believe there is a power imbalance between the purchaser and the prostitute, and the underworld nature of the industry, which may make it challenging in practice to refuse a request of a client. I do, however, think that language matters, and that in the consideration of this bill it is important to reinforce that no means no, even if you pay for it. To be incredibly clear, rape, assault and other crimes absolutely would and do occur within prostitution.

I am not denying that these life-changing and unforgivable, disgusting acts occur. It is, without doubt, heinous, and any individual who rapes someone should have the book thrown at them and be punished to the greatest extent possible. I raise this, however, merely to highlight that the legislation we are dealing with here today is that of prostitution, not of rape. At the point at which any of the aforementioned offences occur, it is a different offence that would ultimately apply. At the point at which we are speaking about rape, we are no longer referring to consensual sex, paid or otherwise.

Language is so important in this space. No matter what the surrounding circumstances, no means no. Whatever the woman is wearing, no means no. Even if you paid for it, no means no. It is never the fault of the victim, and I really want to reiterate that here today. To any current or former sex workers who have been raped or assaulted in doing what you do, for whatever reason you do it, no-one should ever have to endure that.

I thank the former sex workers who were incredibly brave in sharing their stories with me in consideration of this bill. So many who have shared their stories are incredibly strong and brave to discuss what is no doubt an awful experience in the pursuit of advocacy for those who perhaps are not in a position to advocate for themselves. Whatever the outcome of today's bill, no matter which side of the debate you might sit, please take pride in your efforts to advocate for the safety of women.

As I highlighted earlier in my contribution, I believe all members approach this subject with the safety of women at the forefront of their intentions. It is ultimately how we believe this is best achieved that differs. As I have said from the outset, I absolutely think that those who are prostituted are exploited by the purchaser, most commonly men. I think it is important to differentiate between prostitution and sex trafficking and that these issues are not conflated, although they are obviously interlinked.

United Against Human Trafficking outlines that whilst prostitutes might be exploited, they would be considered to enter the sex industry as a willing participant. Whether through direct or indirect exploitation, they use prostitution as a means for income. That is different from someone who is a victim of human trafficking, who is forced into the sex industry against their will by some measure of force, fraud or coercion. Whilst both of these instances will have women and men who need support in exiting prostitution, their situations are not always the same.

United Against Human Trafficking outlines the elements of sex trafficking and the elements of prostitution. The elements of trafficking: the act is recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons; the means is threat or use of force, coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, abuse of power or vulnerability, or giving payments or benefits to a person in control of the victim; and the purpose is prostitution of others, sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, or slavery. The elements of prostitution: the act is a sexual act or contact with another person in return for giving or receiving a fee or a thing of value; the means is to invite, entice, offer, persuade or agree to engage in prostitution.

As previously highlighted, my ideal model in respect of the issue would have three key objectives. The first is to criminalise the sale of sex as a deterrent for entering prostitution; the second is to criminalise the purchase of sex to hold men accountable for exploiting women, which reduces demand; and the third is exit strategies for women to get out of prostitution, coupled with safe harbour provisions.

To address the first objective, criminalising the sale, I note that I think the existing framework is unfair. It prosecutes the woman for selling sex; meanwhile, the man who is exploiting women who may often find themselves in this position due to desperation or vulnerable circumstances is not criminalised. It is my belief that both the sale and the purchase should be criminalised.

Perhaps I could give the example of selling drugs. I think it would be seen as quite unusual in the community if the person selling hard drugs was not criminalised but just the purchaser alone was. Both parties know that what they are doing is wrong, and both are held accountable for their actions. I note this is consistent with the general approach that is taken when people are involved in criminal activity, even when there may be drug addiction, economic disadvantage or other circumstances involved. If I could use another example, just because someone is on drugs does not mean that they are not charged with theft when they steal.

Even when only one side of the transaction is criminalised, the other willing participant who is not criminalised is aware that they are aiding, abetting and/or procuring the offence. In preparation for this bill, I have heard that prostitution is not a choice, that no-one chooses prostitution, that when it comes down to paying your bills or engaging in prostitution, there is no choice. I respectfully disagree.

As a Liberal, one of the key values in our party is the belief in personal responsibility. At some point, personal responsibility must be taken into consideration. To say that prostitutes do not enter the industry voluntarily removes that personal responsibility for one's actions and the deterrence that goes with it. Whatever the reason, a decision was ultimately made to go down this path, even if through desperation.

Even though vulnerability is involved, this does not necessarily mean that these women are unable to make a decision or that there is no choice. I appreciate that I may differ in my view from some of my colleagues on this. I once again reiterate that I am referring to prostitution—meaning consenting adults—and not to rape, assault, sex trafficking or other offences, offences which, of course, take away that personal agency.

We must also remember that there are some who do genuinely want to work in the industry. No, Mr President, I am not thinking of the movie *Pretty Woman*; I am being realistic. I have met with current and former prostitutes who have told me this. I do not have rose-coloured glasses, I do not think it is a job like any other, I do not think it should be a viable career option, nor that it would be a pleasant existence. If we are to look at how to address the issue at hand, we must be realistic: there are some in our community who, no matter what barriers are placed, will still remain to be prostitutes.

This place exists for the purpose of determining what it, the parliament, believes is in the best interests of society as a whole. There are probably a number of people who want to sell hard drugs for a living, but that does not mean that we should enable this. Preventing entry is at least as important as efforts to help women to exit after they have been harmed. I am concerned that by decriminalising the sale of sex we are removing a deterrent, that we are removing an obstacle from people entering prostitution to begin with, particularly in a tech-heavy world where OnlyFans exists, where the proliferation and payment for sexually explicit material is available at the click of a button and with the tap of a credit card.

Ultimately, in weighing up the existing model that criminalises the sale with the bill which does not, I thought it more important that men be accountable for exploiting women and more important that women have the support to exit the industry. Whilst this bill does not criminalise a sale, I believe it is moving in a positive direction by criminalising the purchase of sex, holding those who seek to exploit women to account. It is by no means a perfect outcome, and I have laboured over whether to support this bill. It has not been a linear process or a clear outcome from the outset for me.

I have tried to grapple with whether decriminalising the sale of sexual services, which is something that I disagree with, is something that sits with my conscience. I am someone who probably could be described as stubborn and firm in my views. In this, I am clear on my beliefs. I have arrived at the decision to support this bill in this instance, but state clearly that it is still my view that it does not go far enough, and I have sought clearly to put on the record my reservations.

I disagree with the language of some of the logic used in the Nordic model but, in putting that one side and looking at the bill before us, this model addresses two out of the three aims I wish to see in any legislative framework around prostitution. Ultimately, when the only options on the table are to either punish the vulnerable woman who is being exploited or to punish the purchaser or abuser who is exploiting vulnerable women, I will take the second option every day of the week.

Where there is currently no option on the table to criminalise both parties, I believe the people who would bear the potential costs of a remaining status quo are those who are vulnerable and will be impaired in their exit from the industry or in seeking intervention when offences are committed against them. I think it is more important in weighing up the two models that we see women exit the industry and receive the support that they desire.

I have given much consideration to whether I should support this bill in circumstances where the Nordic model is not my ideal model. However, I indicate that I will be supporting this bill today. As I conclude my remarks, I acknowledge the immense work that has been put into this bill by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and her office. Her dedication and passion to this worthy cause should be commended. I acknowledge her courage in bringing this bill, a model that is different from what is often brought to this place.

When members bring these bills—conscience matters—they know it will not be an easy path, with legislation that is closely scrutinised. I have no doubt that the Hon. Nicola Centofanti will continue her advocacy in giving a voice to those who may not be in a position to speak for themselves. With that, I indicate my support for this legislation and commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (21:55): I rise in support of the Summary Offences (Prostitution Law Reform) Amendment Bill. This is a landmark day. This is the first time to my knowledge that the equality model of prostitution reform, sometimes known as the Nordic model, is being voted on in an Australian jurisdiction. This is the first time that a model of reform that promotes respect for women is before an Australian parliament. This is the first time that any Australian parliament has the opportunity to vote for a model of reform that has gained traction around the world in places such as Canada, France and Sweden, among others. The very fact that this bill has made it to this parliament is a win for women.

There are four reasons why, and why this bill should be supported. The first is women's equality. The bill supports the status of women as equal with men, with the right to not be objectified and to not be commodified. The second is that the model reduces human trafficking by addressing the key reason sex trafficking occurs, which is the demand for sexual access to women's bodies. The third is that the equality model increases safety for prostituted persons and the fourth is the positive effects for local communities.

I will expand on each of these tonight, but first I would like to outline the key elements of the equality model, which is the basis of this bill. The equality, or Nordic approach, directly targets the demand for prostitution by criminalising the actions of pimps and buyers instead of the actions of prostituted persons. The prostituted person does not commit an offence by being bought for sex.

The model acknowledges that the vast majority of buyers are men and that the vast majority of prostituted persons are women and girls. This approach recognises prostitution as a form of violence against women and that it is incompatible with women's equality. It also incorporates public education programs, discouraging the purchase of sex and encouraging truly respectful relationships. It also provides comprehensive exit programs and social support to assist prostituted persons to leave the industry.

This is a holistic approach to prostitution reform. There are some key points to note about this model. It is often referred to as the Nordic model because it originated in Sweden, but it originated from secular, left-wing and feminist groups. It is a normative and educative approach to change attitudes and behaviour, including public education campaigns to curb demand for sexual exploitation. The model understands the sex industry as a serious site of violence against women and a barrier to gender equality.

On that point, women's equality and the status of women, the equality model is an innovative, holistic form of sex industry policy that is gaining traction internationally. It is a progressive approach, and the only option available that is consistent with a feminist human rights framework. It explicitly recognises the gendered nature of demand for sexual exploitation; that is, women, especially marginalised women, make up the majority of prostituted persons and men make up the vast majority of sex buyers. Figures I have seen are that 95 per cent of the people involved in providing prostitution so-called services are women and 98 per cent of buyers are men. Therefore, throughout my

contribution tonight I will refer to the women in prostitution on that basis, acknowledging, however, that there are others who are also involved in the sex industry.

It was introduced in Sweden and has been in effect since 1999 in that country. Gunilla Ekberg, writing for the Swedish Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications explains the reasoning. She says:

In Sweden, it is understood that any society that claims to defend principles of legal, political, economic and social equality for women and girls must reject the idea that women and children, mostly girls, are commodities that can be bought, sold, and sexually exploited by men.

The law aimed to change attitudes, both those of the general public and those of men who had previously purchased [so-called] 'sexual services'. Thus, the law had a significant normative or educational element. It was not aimed primarily at mass arrests, but rather to deter the purchase of sex in the first place. The passing of the law and the associated public education campaigns have affected attitudes in Sweden. In 1996, only 45 per cent of women and 20 per cent of men were in favour of criminalising the purchase of sex. By 1999 this had jumped to 81 per cent of women and 70 per cent of men in favour of [what was then] the new law. In 2014, the number of women supporting the law had risen to 85 per cent.

When we are talking about the status of women we need to look at the attitudes of men. Members may or may not be aware that there are online review sites where men post reviews and rank the women with whom they have bought sex. Their attitudes to women, as revealed on these sites, are instructive. Some comments include, 'She's a sad waste of good girl flesh' or 'If you want an attractive receptacle for your semen, she will do.'

The study by Farley and others, *Comparing Sex Buyers*, reveals that men who pay to sexually exploit women are aware of the harms they inflict. It found that two-thirds of both the sex buyers and the non sex buyers who were in the study observed that a majority of women were lured, tricked or trafficked into prostitution and that 41 per cent of the sex buyers used women who they knew were controlled by pimps at the time they used her. This awareness, however, did not stop them.

This study—and here the attitudes are clear—found that sex buyers tend to regard the women they buy as less than human and as solely existing for their sexual use and enjoyment. Men who purchase sex are often quite open about their belief that their entitlement to sex should take precedence over the wellbeing of the women they buy.

Common themes emerge: one is that the sex buyers regard the women they buy as mere objects for sexual gratification. They appear to despise the women they buy and require of these women absolute compliance and submission to the sex acts demanded of them. The *Comparing Sex Buyers* study crucially finds that in systems of prostitution, sex buyers are motivated by the opportunity to control and dominate a woman.

We are probably all familiar with the expression 'not all disrespect ends in violence, but all violence starts with disrespect'. Are these the attitudes we want to support? I am sure that there is no-one in this place who does. The question arises: is male sexual entitlement acceptable in Australia in 2024? If we want to change attitudes to women to prevent sexual and gendered violence, we need to address it at all levels. If some women can be bought and sold for sex because men have the social and economic power to do so, the status of all women is undermined.

I have heard the argument that women should be able to do what they want with their own bodies, but prostitution is not about women doing what they want, it is about men doing what men want with women's bodies. This week, we have had attention on the tragic statistic that at least 28 women have been allegedly killed by a current or former partner in Australia so far this year. The commentary has rightly been that attitudinal change is needed. Well here is an opportunity to start that attitudinal change, to say that women's purpose is not to serve men and that men's sexual entitlement is not acceptable.

The second reason to support this bill is in regard to sex trafficking because it addresses demand. Sex trafficking exists because of demand, the demand of men to use women's bodies solely for their own wants. The equality model reduces trafficking because it addresses demand. The Coalition Against Trafficking in Women Australia argues that no effective policy can be developed against the trafficking of women into prostitution, which is the most common form of trafficking,

without an understanding of its connection to the industry of prostitution. Research shows that the full legalisation of prostitution, or decriminalisation, tends to increase inward flows of trafficking.

The equality approach recognises that systems of trafficking and prostitution are largely driven by demand, and accordingly it targets the overwhelmingly male buyers rather than the predominantly female people who are prostituted. The report *Does Legalised Prostitution Increase Human Trafficking?* by Cho, Dreher, Neumayer states the following:

Most victims of human trafficking are women and girls. The vast majority end up being sexually exploited through prostitution.

That was quoted from the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime. Many authors, therefore, believe that trafficking is caused by prostitution and combating prostitution with the force of the law would reduce trafficking. The US Department of State has stated, as the official US government position, that 'prostitution is inherently harmful and dehumanizing, and fuels trafficking in persons'.

It is interesting that this particular paper investigates the impact of legalised prostitution on human trafficking inflows, with two opposing effects. It deals with the scale effect of legalised prostitution leading to an expansion of the prostitution market, increasing human trafficking based on the well-known assumption that an expansion of demand will expand your business—it is a basic business model.

On the other hand, there is an argument that there is a substitution effect, that the substitution effect reduces demand for trafficked women as legal prostitutes are favoured over trafficked ones. The empirical analysis for a cross-section of up to 150 countries in this study showed that the scale effect dominated the substitution effect. On average, countries where prostitution is legal or decriminalised experienced larger reported human trafficking inflows. It is by addressing demand that trafficking will be reduced, which is why this bill is so important.

The third reason this bill should be supported is for the increased safety of prostituted persons. I have spoken to many women who are survivors of the sex trade. Their stories are graphic, confronting and harrowing. In my speech on decriminalisation in 2019, I related a number of accounts of women, their paths into prostitution and the abuse that they endured. I would encourage anyone who wants to know the reality of prostitution instead of the sanitised version pushed by the exploiters to read those accounts. They are the voices that so often are silenced. I will quote one woman. She says:

To say that every woman enters the sex industry by 'choice' is a lie. To make a choice you need to have the facts about what you are choosing. I believe all prostituted women are held captive, not just physically as in the case of trafficked women, but by the lies of the sex industry. The industry knows once you're lured in it's hard to get out.

She talks about the amount of trauma that the industry left her with. The information on the harms of prostitution and trafficking, however, is sanitised. It has to be culturally, psychologically and legally denied, because otherwise it would interfere with the business of exploitation.

The risk of being prosecuted for an offence changes men's behaviour. Even for those who will still choose to use women for prostitution, under the equality bill, the bill that is in front of us, they know that if they do break the boundaries that woman has put in place, if they do physically abuse her, if they do rape her, they are likely to be prosecuted, because simply by buying her for sex they have already committed an offence.

This changes their behaviour. It means that, should they choose to use women for prostitution, they will be constrained. They will have to treat her with more respect and dignity than would otherwise be the case, because just by purchasing prostitution, purchasing women for sex, they are committing an offence. This is not, as I mentioned earlier in regard to Sweden, about mass arrests. This is about changing behaviour. This is about ensuring that those men who do continue to use women for prostitution do not rape her, do not physically assault her. This is about changing that behaviour.

A report published in the *Journal of Trauma Practice* on prostitution and trafficking in nine countries provided an update on violence and post-traumatic stress disorder. It revealed the results of statistical analyses indicate that violence is prevalent within the world of prostitution and tends to be multi-traumatic—71 per cent had been physically assaulted in prostitution, 63 per cent had been

raped, 75 per cent had been homeless at some point and 89 per cent wanted to escape prostitution but had no options. Another 68 per cent met the criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder. The abuse that is inherent in prostitution is why it is so crucial that men's behaviour is changed.

In 'Prostitution and trafficking in nine countries: an update on violence and posttraumatic stress disorder', the following was reported: the harm perpetrated against women who are prostituted is not accidental and should be addressed on a global level as a human rights issue. A study of male customers of prostituted women reported the following:

Advocates for prostituted women argue that one of the characteristics of men who perpetrate violence against women is the expectation of service by women and that prostitution is an institutionalised domination of women that may contribute to this violence.

Further, it:

...suggests a sexual stereotyping of prostituted women that allow some women to be seen as 'other', women whose feelings of pain do not need to be considered. Consequently, violent behaviour perpetrated against prostituted women can be justified [by those men]. It may be that these patriarchal attitudes towards women contribute to some men's violence towards women.

I say again: if any women are considered able to be bought and sold, to be considered commodities, to be considered as not needing to have their feelings of pain considered, then all women's status is undermined.

The fourth reason to vote for this bill is more practical. In a very simple way, it will reduce the harassment of girls and women, including those who are not involved in prostitution in any way; for example, the sorts of things that no doubt many of us here in this chamber and in the gallery would have experienced over time as a teenage girl, a young woman or a not-so-young woman walking down the street—having car-fulls of men call out, 'How much?'

Those sorts of attacks can be laughed off, but they are distressing, they are scary and they are intimidating for many women. There are many examples of girls and women being approached for sex, particularly in areas around Hanson Road, for example, including schoolchildren. Parents in the area have raised this issue on many occasions.

If this bill passes, if you are a teenage schoolgirl walking down the road and a man comes up to you and asks for sex, or offers you money for sex, that man will be committing an offence. This will result in changes in behaviour by such men, and that will result in huge changes for girls and women, improving their chances to live their daily lives without such harassment.

Finally, the features of the bill have some provisions that can allay some concerns that people have. The first is that it allows for an expiation for a first offence of seeking prostitution. It also encourages the option for the court to order an educational program on respectful relationships. The former allays the concerns of those who do not want a criminal record for what they see as simply perhaps a stupid act; for example, an 18 year old being a bit stupid and potentially having his career or future impacted forever. There would be different views on whether that should be the case, but this bill does include a provision to have only an expiation and therefore no criminal record.

The option for the court to order an educational program on respectful relationships—truly respectful relationships—is an important component of ensuring that this bill, should it pass, is about changing attitudes. It is about men learning that women are not commodities. It is about expanding the viewpoint of those who want to use women to realise that is not conducive to equality and not something that our society will accept.

It is fair to say that the equality model is still not well-known in Australia. As I mentioned, to my knowledge tonight is the first time that any Australian jurisdiction will be voting on the equality model. The lobbyists used by brothel owners and profiteers have propagated misinformation about the equality model. Of course they would: it has the potential to destroy their business model. This is something that will be overcome in time as more people examine the positive impacts it has for women's equality and the positive outcomes in the countries around the world that have adopted it.

As an example, I note that the Police Association sent a letter to all MLCs last year, indicating they did not support this bill. But, following a meeting where additional information was provided, they have since indicated that they do not oppose it. While they have not indicated that they support it,

they are keen to watch the debate. This is not uncommon as people realise some of the misinformation that is being spread about the equality model and some of the benefits that come from the equality model: benefits for women's equality and status, reduction in human trafficking and increased safety for prostituted persons. As they become more well-known, there is more and more support for it.

The equality model has been introduced in the following countries: Sweden in 1999, as I mentioned; Norway in 2009; Iceland in 2009; Canada in 2014; Northern Ireland in 2015; France in 2016; the Republic of Ireland in 2017; Israel in 2018; and just last year the US state of Maine also adopted the Nordic model. There are others, and there are others with slight variations.

I look forward to seeing South Australia move forward in true reform of prostitution law, move forward to a society where women are not commodified and not objectified and where the law says that that cannot be done.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (22:18): I will only make a brief contribution because I have said many things in the past in relation to reforming our laws. I think generally it is well understood that our laws in South Australia are poorly understood, and it is unfortunate that we have not been able to reach reform when other jurisdictions have made some changes that I think improve the situation. In some time past I actually chaired a select committee that looked into, particularly, the decriminalisation model. We took a lot of evidence and, as a result of that, further down the track those laws passed the Legislative Council.

We do know in South Australia that our legal framework here has resulted in many workers becoming victims of violence, theft and other criminal behaviour and witnesses to serious crimes. Their fears that disclosure to SAPOL will lead to informants having that information used against them as evidence of sex work activities leads to criminal acts going unreported and offenders free to continue committing crimes. My belief is that this legislation largely continues that regime and is not going to assist the people that it is purported to assist.

I have no doubt about the sincerity of the intent behind it. All of the contributions that I have been listening to tonight show that we all share as a common goal the best interests of, particularly, women who work in the sex work sector. However, the evidence that I have been provided with through that select committee, which had extensive powers to call witnesses and the like, very much has left me with the view that sunlight is the best disinfectant and decriminalisation is the model that serves sex workers the best.

It is a bit dated now, but I did write to the then Minister for Justice, the Hon. Michael Keenan, in 2015 because one of the issues that often gets raised is human trafficking and exploitation. I also commend the Hon. Laura Henderson for highlighting the fact that there are actually existing laws which are often used in debates against decriminalisation and in favour of other models, pointing out that there are laws with severe penalties in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act already in relation to exploitation, for underage children being used and exploited for sex work. There are very strong penalties in those that already exist, and also in terms of human trafficking.

I return to the response that I received from the Hon. Michael Keenan. I will not read it all, but he said at that time in 2015 that:

There is little reliable data about the nature and extent of human trafficking at a global, regional or domestic level. However, when compared to global trends it is clear that instances of human trafficking remain relatively uncommon in Australia.

He quoted some statistics that already exist on the *Hansard* from previous debates.

As I have said many times before, I think the representatives of sex workers in South Australia are against this model. They as a group do not want this model. Their concern is that it will negatively impact their work and will increase barriers to them accessing health care and also police support when they require it.

Our committee was very keen to hear about any of those people who I believe are in the minority, if you like, as a group who represent that underbelly of people who are working against their will. That was very hard to find. Sunlight, I believe, is the best disinfectant and I think we should listen

to the voices of lived experience in this space and also to the women's groups who are represented through the National Council of Women, Zonta and BPW.

I do not accept the sort of infantilisation of women which is the main narrative that opposes decriminalisation and also purports to drive the reason for this bill before us. I just do not accept that argument at all, and I certainly do not accept that it further has an impact in relation more broadly in our community in increasing violence towards women. I think those are very separate issues. Because there is a fairly low number of sex workers, I do not see how that can have an impact on the broader society. I think there are other drivers for that as well, and it is also not borne out in evidence by a number of our domestic violence clearing houses and research organisations, so, unsurprisingly, I will not be supporting this bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (22:25): I also rise to indicate that I will not be supporting this bill. I think this is the first time I have had an opportunity to talk on the issue of sex work during my nearly three years in this parliament, and so I wanted to take this opportunity to make my support for the decriminalisation of sex work in our state clear, and to put that on the public record.

I am concerned that in criminalising the clients of sex work, as this bill attempts to do, there will be negative consequences that will flow on to these workers. We know that laws that criminalise the clients of sex workers have the potential to result in an increase in violence, in sexually transmitted infections, and exploitation within the sex industry.

Criminalising the clients also keeps the entire sex work industry underground and jeopardises the harm reduction strategies that sex workers can use to keep themselves safe, and leaves them vulnerable to predators and to criminals. I do agree with the comments made by the Hon. Michelle Lensink that sunlight, and indeed regulation, is the best disinfectant in that regard.

Sex workers in countries where sex work laws like the ones being debated here have been implemented are frequently threatened and harassed by law enforcement and, indeed, I understand that criminalising clients has resulted in police raids on brothels in those countries, which are psychologically and physically harmful to those workers. These encounters often result in sex workers experiencing isolation and stigma due to being outed in their community.

Sex work is work, and no-one should assume that sex workers do not have choice or autonomy. I am concerned that the patriarchal view of sex work that has been presented in this place by some in this chamber is a dangerous threat to the bodily autonomy and freedom of choice of women, and also other marginalised groups. I recognise the efforts of SIN and other advocacy groups here in our state in terms of advocating for the rights of sex workers.

I also just want to point out that we should not also assume that the clients of these sex workers are seeking to exploit people either and, indeed, I know from representations that have been made in the past from people in the disability sector, for instance, that access to sex work can be a very important aspect of the lives of some people dealing with disability, and there are a range of other scenarios where people may wish to access that service.

I do want to just reference some research in this regard looking at the Nordic model that was published by May-Len Skilbrei and Charlotta Holmstrom of the University of Oslo. It was in 2013, but an extract was published in *The Conversation*, under the title 'The "Nordic model" of prostitution law is a myth'. The article references prostitution law. That is not a term I use, but that is the term used in the article. I will quote an extract for you. It talks about the concerns around the way that this law might apply to particularly marginalised groups. It says:

...prostitution laws targeting buyers have complex effects on people far beyond those they are meant to target. In addition to this complicating factor, the Nordic countries also police prostitution using various other laws and by-laws. Some of these regulations do, in fact, assume that the women who sell sex are to be punished and blamed for prostitution. This goes to show that one should be careful in concluding that Nordic prostitution policies are guided by progressive feminist ideals, or that they necessarily seek to protect women involved in prostitution. The most telling example of this is the way Nordic countries treat migrants who sell sex.

In Sweden this is embodied by the Aliens Act, which forbids foreign women from selling sex in Sweden and is used by the police to apprehend non-Swedish or migrant persons suspected of selling sex. This reveals the limits of the rhetoric of female victimisation, with clients framed as perpetrators: if the seller is foreign, she is to blame, and can be punished with deportation.

It goes on to talk about the experience in Norway, where, the article says:

...we see similar gaps between stated ideology, written policies, and practice. Even though it is completely legal to sell sex, women involved in prostitution are victims of increased police, neighbour and border controls which stigmatise them and make them more vulnerable. The increased control the Norwegian police exert on prostitution markets so as to identify clients includes document checks on women involved in prostitution so as to find irregulars among them. Raids performed in the name of rescue often end with vulnerable women who lack residence permits being deported from Norway.

The research concludes that:

Taken together, the Nordic countries' ways of approaching prostitution have been presented nationally and understood internationally as expressions of a shared understanding of prostitution as a gender equality problem, an example of how women's rights can be enshrined in anti-prostitution law. But after looking closely at how the laws have been proposed and implemented, we beg to differ.

So I do question some of the claims that have been made in support of this bill.

Decriminalisation is the preferred legal framework for the majority of sex workers, and indeed sex work lobbyists. It is supported by a range of human rights organisations, including Amnesty International, the United Nations, the World Bank and the World Health Organization, as the best method to protect the rights of these workers, reduce violence, increase their ability to access the justice system and ensure that they have appropriate access to health services.

I want to recognise the work of my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks in this place, who has long championed the decriminalisation model. Indeed, this is consistent with the policy of the Greens and it is a policy that I am proud to support. We believe that decriminalisation decreases the incidence of violence against sex workers, decreases the incidence of sex trafficking, reduces the stigma of workers and their clients, and increases community health and safety. With that, I conclude my remarks and reiterate that I will not be supporting the bill.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (22:32): I want to first thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for bringing this important bill to the chamber. I wholeheartedly endorse all the measures in this bill and believe that it is a small step but something we must do today to protect women from harm. It is a bill that will protect women from harm within prostitution, a bill that will provide an obligation for the government to support exit strategies from prostitution, a bill that supports women.

Let's face it, the majority of prostituted people are women. Many are vulnerable and impacted by disadvantage, domestic violence, trauma, exploitation and more. The equality model allows for the full decriminalisation of all prostituted persons, provides comprehensive exit pathways, and fights against the demand for the purchase of sexual acts. This bill also fights against pimping and trafficking, through criminalising any form of profit made on the prostitution of another person. Finally, it encourages training for frontline services in the implementation of this model.

The equality model is proven to reduce the number of people entering prostitution, trafficking and other forms of exploitation. It protects women; it provides access to effective exit strategies; it decreases demand, penalising the buyer; and it shifts the criminal mindset aspect of the prostituted person to the buyer. Germany, where more than one million men buy sex every single day, is an example of a country that has legalised prostitution and seen dramatic increases in murders, rapes and organised crime, including brothels run by Albanian clans, the Russian mafia and bikie gangs.

Behind the argument for the legalisation of prostitution lies the massive financial interest of the pimp industry. In 2019, *The Guardian* reported that Germany's sex trade was worth €15 billion a year. In the same article prostituted women who work in German's male wellness centres pay a €69 entry fee, a daily tax of €25 plus an additional cost of a dormitory bed if they spend the night, but sex with one of these women costs a mere €50.

Germany is a model case study of the detriments of legalisation of sex work. Between just 2016 and 2019, 18 prostituted persons were murdered in Germany. In a staggering comparison, since 1999, when Sweden adopted the Nordic model, zero murders of prostituted persons have occurred.

Whilst an accurate percentage of migrant sex workers in South Australia is unknown, research and reports indicate that the majority of South Australian sex workers are non-English-

speaking background migrants many of whom feel that if they were to leave their roles as prostitutes they would face deportation back to their original countries, a system of sexual and economic exploitation.

I know that there are some who choose to enter prostitution. That is their choice. My concern and the reason why I am strongly supporting this bill is that the vast majority of women in prostitution are not there because they want to be; they are there because they have no other option. Many do not speak English and come to this country with no other choice of employment. Some have drug and alcohol addictions. Some have experienced lifelong abuse, and many have partners or other associates forcing or manipulating them into the industry. Under this bill, women in prostitution can continue to work in this industry without fear of prosecution. They will have access to exit strategies if they choose to access them.

I would like to take the opportunity to speak of the stories of three women who have been in prostitution, so that I can better articulate my concerns with our current laws in regard to prostitution. The stories are provided by BaptistCare HopeStreet and Women Ending Exploitation by Prostitution (WEEP), and I would like to thank WEEP for their support and advocacy in this area. All women have had their identity details, such as names, changed for privacy reasons.

I will start with Coco's story from BaptistCare HopeStreet's women's services. Coco, a woman in her late 20s from a financially struggling family in China, faces the dilemma of being unable to afford her child's school fees. Discovering an opportunity to work in a Sydney brothel, she sees it as a short-term solution to find financial support for her family.

Arriving in Sydney with minimal resources and a language barrier, Coco finds herself in a brothel with other Chinese women, where her limited English becomes a significant obstacle. The language barrier proves not only challenging for everyday tasks like navigating the city and making appointments but also hinders Coco from seeking proper sexual health check-ups. Unaware of the laws regarding condom use in sex work and struggling to communicate with clients, she sometimes complies with unsafe practices to avoid confrontation and losing income.

Working long hours without breaks, Coco prioritises earning as much as she can in her limited time in Sydney. Coco's motivation stems from her deep desire to provide for her child back in China. Despite the financial support she sends home, she grapples with the fear of judgement and disappointment from her family and friends. Coco keeps the nature of her work a secret, fearing societal stigma and wanting to shield her loved ones from the reality of her situation.

My next story is Dee's story, which has been provided by WEEP. Dee's life took a dark turn when facing various challenges. She entered the world of prostitution as a means to cope with financial struggles and drug addiction. Initially it seemed like a quick solution, but her experiences quickly spiralled into a nightmare cycle. From dangerous clients to threats and the physical toll of her job, she found herself trapped in an isolating and exploitative environment.

Despite the common misconception that sex work is a woman's choice, Dee reveals the vulnerability and lack of control faced by many in the industry. Condoms breaking, the risk of STDs and the emotion toll of the work became a harsh reality. Dee's story unveils the harsh truth that even within the supposed camaraderie of the industry, individuals are ultimately alone, driven by the pursuit of money and the protection of their clients.

Finally, I would like to share Violet's story. Violet, a young woman with a dream of independence, found herself enmeshed in a series of unfortunate events. Struggling with a physical abnormality, she moved to the city for study and work, hoping to find a better future. However, a deceptive job opportunity led her into a scam, and the ensuing financial pressures pushed her to take on low-paying and exploitative positions, including a stint as a topless waitress. As Violet's financial struggles intensified, she welcomed a seemingly affluent flatmate who, unbeknownst to her, would further exploit and manipulate her. The flatmate's glamorous appearance hid a dark reality, and Violet became a victim of coercion, substance abuse and assault within her workplace. Trapped in a cycle of exploitation, Violet sank deeper, unable to escape the torment.

There is an argument that is often put forward that sex work is work, that it is liberating and that they love what they do. But the supply comes from the demand. Without the entitlement of the

use of a body, the normalisation of porn and the sex industry, there would be no need for sex as a product. Women should be able to feel liberated without selling their autonomy. The sex industry is stigmatised and a taboo subject for a purpose, and that is because it is unfair and it is unbalanced in its power.

This conversation must take place because there are many already in brothels, whether here in Adelaide or throughout the state, and women behind those doors deserve to be able to live without fear or shame. Whilst I acknowledge there are a small number of prostituted people who enjoy their work, the reality is that most women choose prostitution as a desperate last resort, if it is a choice at all. These women deserve an option to be able to escape. They deserve a release from further trauma which will not be caused by another client or a pimp.

This is an incredible opportunity for this parliament to lead the way to support women in prostitution to find a better way, a proven way, a way that has worked effectively in the Nordic model. This bill has my full support and I thank you, Mr President, for the opportunity to speak today.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (22:42): I rise briefly to put forth my views and how I will be voting on this bill. First of all, I would like to indicate that I prefer to call people working in the sex industry sex workers, not prostitutes, and I think that is the general view of people who actually work in the sex industry. I also agree with the Hon. Laura Henderson that it is absolutely ludicrous to make it legal for somebody to sell a service, yet make it illegal for someone to purchase that service.

The actual crux of this bill is not so much to provide an exit strategy—and I will get into that a little bit later—but to force women out of the industry by depriving them of the ability to earn an income. When the Hon. Dr Centofanti introduced this bill, I was listening to the early morning ABC radio program where they were interviewing representatives of the sex work industry. They made it clear on that program that they had reached out to the Hon. Dr Centofanti to speak to her, but she refused to engage in any discussion with them. I find it amazing how someone could actually introduce a bill which has such an impact on people in the sex industry without talking to the actual people who represent sex workers in this state.

I also received a brochure from the Sex Industry Decriminalisation Action Committee. I looked up their website just to make sure there was some legitimacy to this. I will go through that a little bit later.

It is obvious that people who represent sex workers actually do not support the Nordic model. While I do agree that there are some women who are forced into the sex industry because of very unfortunate circumstances that they might find themselves in, many women actually do it because that is their profession. That is how they make their living. Their trade is selling sex, but the only difference is that they do not have the rights that every other worker in this country enjoys, because they are regarded as criminals. I find that absolutely appalling.

My view is, and I have always had this view, that if you want to clean up the industry—you will never get rid of it, so all this fanciful nonsense about the panacea of getting women out of the sex industry is absolute nonsense—what you can do is decriminalise it entirely so that you can then regulate it. You then clean it up. By decriminalising sex work you do not allow criminals to flourish. The criminal activities involved in that industry are still illegal. All you are doing is providing protections for the people actually working in the industry. You are providing protections that are available to every other single person, every other worker.

The Hon. Ms Girolamo made the comment that 18 women sex workers were killed in Germany last year. Germany has a population of about 83 million people. In Australia, we have one-third of the population and over 200 workers were killed in their workplace, and tens of thousands were injured, some terribly. I do not think that is a real argument—that is a really good argument for deregulating the sex industry, so that we can make it safe, make it much safer than what it is now, while still having the laws to prevent criminal activity.

I looked up the website of the sex workers representatives which basically straightaway says 'Say no to the Nordic model'. I will read some of it out to you. I seek leave to hand up this brochure.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: This is from their website:

Decriminalising sex work ensures sex workers can access workers' rights & it ensures the sex industry is regulated by the same laws that apply to other adult industries...Right now in South Australia, sex workers are forced to work under the most archaic sex work laws in the country. Workers are working every day without workplace protections, workers' rights & without being able to unionise.

Sex workers are not asking for extra rights, just the same ones that everyone else has at [their workplace]. Only then will stigma, social and legal disadvantages, risk of violence & discrimination be able to be addressed.

Commercial sexual services between consenting adults are targeted by SAPOL. Soliciting, keeping a brothel & 'living on the earnings' of sex work are offences. SAPOL are able to enter suspected brothels simply based on 'suspicion' & the definition of 'brothel' is so broad that SAPOL mostly use this power to enter and search people's private residences.

Over 2 years SAPOL increased charges laid against sex workers by over 1,000%! SAPOL claimed they were looking for 'syndicates' operating in hotels/motels, drugs & human trafficking. However [freedom of information] shows that over 60% of premises SAPOL entered were private residences. Less than 16% of premises entered that year were hotels/hotels.

South Australia has the most outdated criminalising sex work laws in the country. Criminalisation prohibits sex work or aspects of sex work, putting workers engaging in these activities at risk of entrapment, arrest & charge. 'Soliciting', 'procurement', 'keeping a bawdy house' & 'living on the earnings' of sex work are all current offences & police are empowered to enter any premises they suspect may be used for sex work while officers can also pose as clients to entrap & arrest sex workers. Clients & third parties are criminalised under SA's current laws, but police typically target only sex workers.

A 2015 SA Committee reviewed models available for sex work regulation & reported that evidence submitted to the Committee supported decriminalisation of sex work. Since then, Northern Territory & Victoria have joined New South Wales & New Zealand in decriminalising sex work with Queensland currently in progress.

Decriminalisation repeals laws criminalising sex work & only laws applicable to sex work. Sex work then becomes subject to the same regulations that apply to other workplaces. Decrim does not repeal laws against legitimate criminal behaviour. Crimes may occur like in any other industry & police are still able to take appropriate action like in any other industry. Decrim isn't deregulation because normal regulation will apply as they do in other businesses including taxation laws, health & safety requirements, local planning & business controls.

As I said before, sex work is a profession that has been happening for thousands of years and will continue to happen for thousands of years ahead of us. This bill will not stop sex workers. What it will do is make life very hard for them because sex workers will then be in a situation where they have a legal right to sell their trade but, when they engage with a client, they know that that client is breaking the law.

There is also an issue about people with disabilities. Many people with disabilities rely on sex workers to meet their sexual needs. There are also some people out there who have very strong sexual urges and require or go to sex workers to relieve them of those sexual urges. If you deprive them of that, if you deprive them of that service, one can only imagine there will be people out on the streets with very strong sexual urges that they cannot get relief from.

I think this bill has been pretty poorly thought out. I also believe that the only way forward on this is to deregulate the industry in its entirety. Let us begin to clean up and make safe an industry which, as I said, will be there for another thousand years. With that contribution, I oppose this bill.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (22:53): I rise in strong support of this private member's bill, and I thank the honourable Leader of the Opposition in this place for pursuing this issue with the passion that she has. At its most fundamental level, this amendment bill seeks to shift the burden of criminality away from those engaged in prostitution and onto those who exploit them.

This Nordic model, this equality model, which was pioneered in Sweden in 1999, has also now been adopted in Norway, Iceland, Finland, Canada, France, Ireland, Northern Ireland and Israel. Most recently, the United States state of Maine has adopted partial decriminalisation, making it the first US state to do so. The Nordic model, the equality model, champions empowerment, amplifies prostituted women's voices and guarantees robust support from our law enforcement and social welfare agencies to ensure that those who are in the grip of this exploitative industry have a clear path to exit.

The Hon. Nicola Centofanti aptly summarised its essence in August last year. This bill pledges comprehensive assistance inspired by proven models. From psychological support to

financial assistance, medical care to legal aid, it aims to facilitate a smooth transition for those aspiring a different path. The bill ensures that prostituted women will not be disadvantaged in the labour market should they have a criminal conviction as a direct result of their prostitution.

Prior to addressing the bill in detail, let's consider the global perspective. Following in Sweden's footsteps, Norway adopted the Nordic model in 2009. A study conducted in 2014 by the Norwegian government found that the model had reduced the demand for sex, leading to a decrease in the volume of sex work and a significant reduction in human trafficking. Similarly, in Iceland, where the Nordic model was also implemented in 2009, there has been a marked decline in the visible sex trade. The Icelandic police have reported that the number of individuals involved in street prostitution has decreased and there has been a significant drop in the number of foreign women travelling to Iceland for sex work.

In Canada, where some aspects of the Nordic model have been adopted in 2014, there has been a shift in public perception. The focus has moved from viewing those engaged in prostitution as criminals to seeing them as victims needing support and protection. Furthermore, in Northern Ireland, the adoption of the Nordic model in 2015 led to a 61 per cent reduction in the number of online sex ads, indicating a decrease in demand for paid sex.

France, which adopted the Nordic model in 2016, conducted a review in 2018 and the findings were promising. There was a 30 per cent reduction in prostitution clients, showcasing the model's effectiveness in deterring buyers. In late last year, Germany began pushing to overturn their own decriminalised prostitution laws to reverse their reputation as Europe's biggest brothel. The German Chancellor, Olaf Scholz, has expressed a desire for greater legal restrictions on the purchase of sex, which he considers unacceptable and a practice that should not be normalised.

South Australian parliaments have long debated the issue of whether to fully decriminalise prostitution in this state. Those many attempts have so far failed to deliver meaningful change in this area. We are subsequently stuck with the status quo, which I know many members past and present are not satisfied with, and of course does nothing to improve the many issues faced by those engaged in prostitution in South Australia.

To my understanding, this is the first time we have had a genuine opportunity to deliver meaningful reform in this space. The Nordic model presents us with a compromise between progressive, conservative and libertarian perspectives on how society should legislate prostitution. Past attempts at the progressives' preferred option of full decriminalisation have failed. Given the current make-up of the Legislative Council, should that model get put forward once more it would similarly end in failure.

This amendment bill and the Nordic model, or the equality model that it is centred on, presents us with an opportunity to move forward and to overcome the status quo so that many members and those in the community agree that it is no longer tenable. The bill before us today has four core components: it criminalises the act of offering money or other benefit for the return of sexual services; it decriminalises the current sanctions that apply to those offering sexual services; it criminalises the act of enabling or profiting from the prostitution of another person; and it provides a comprehensive suite of support services for victims of sexual exploitation.

In doing so, the bill would deliver a number of important principles that are at the heart of this issue. Firstly, it would drive down demand for prostitution. When the buyers of sex become criminals, rather than those who offer the services, it will restrict access and reduce interest from those considering the purchase of sex. This was shown to be the case in Sweden, where a 50 per cent reduction of street prostitution resulted within 10 years of its enactment. As demand winds down, it follows that the market for purchasing sex will also contract, and subsequently a second principle is achieved: the exploitation of vulnerable people will also decrease.

Those in favour of full decriminalisation will make the argument that complete legalisation of prostitution will empower women, and that it is their right to pursue prostitution if they choose. The issue here is that many women—and I say 'women' because data suggests that they form up to 95 per cent of sex workers—are not provided with a clear-headed choice in this matter. Vulnerability, exploitation, drug and alcohol abuse, poverty, bullying, standover tactics and control are all factors

that reduce the agency of women who become involved, or are forced into prostitution, and increases the difficulty of leaving the industry where they wish to do so.

The argument that it is right to be able to purchase sex is ultimately a misogynist one. I have no doubt in my mind that there is a cohort of women who have experienced little, if any, of these negative aspects of prostitution and who consider that they have made a rational decision to enter the trade, but I am not convinced, however, that they are either the majority of sex workers or that their considered choice to become sex workers overrides the well-known injustices that occur to many victims involved in this trade.

Honourable members here tonight have spoken about the rights of people with disability, that somehow a person's disability can trump someone else's bodily autonomy, that somehow someone with a disability can, through prostitution, essentially cause a disability in someone else through the trauma that many of these sex workers come to hold and to bear throughout their life.

Should this bill pass, the third principle will also be achieved, by offering a further step towards gender equality as it dismantles a system of objectifying women for male pleasure. Make no mistake: this bill stands as our vehement opposition to the objectification of women. Women involved in prostitution will be provided with greater agency to leave the trade as they will now have the support of police and social services, where they were previously treated as criminals and dealt with accordingly.

As the Hon. Nicola Centofanti passionately referred to—arguably the most important provision of this bill—sex workers will be offered comprehensive support and access to government and non-government services. Accessing a whole range of services will become easier, and addressing any physical and mental health issues faced by these women will be central to that. Exactly what type of support services will be offered will ultimately be up to the responsible minister, but there are many international examples to pick and choose from.

The French model, for example, offers a unique and holistic approach to helping sex workers leave the industry. Their exit strategy involves collaboration with NGOs and social service agencies to provide counselling, psychological support and social reintegration for those wishing to leave. Additionally, financial assistance, health care, legal aid, education and training and housing are also available to make it easier for sex workers to transition into different forms of work. It will be up to this parliament and state governments to decide on the final make-up of these services. This bill provides the framework of principles that will inform what is ultimately to be the South Australian model of partial decriminalisation of prostitution.

Considering these global success stories, it is evident that the Nordic model offers a balanced and effective approach to addressing the challenges associated with prostitution. It recognises the issues' complexities, focuses on reducing demand, while providing robust support mechanisms for those caught in the exploitative web of what those who seek to downplay the harm caused by it deem sex work. It is not work: it is the objectification of women and sometimes men as a means to an end for sexual gratification.

I thank the many survivors of prostitution who have shared their deeply personal stories, which has led to the culmination of this important bill. I thank Amanda from WEEP, Maz, Ally-Marie, Jonathan, Clare, Nathalia and Christopher. I also thank my colleagues the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Tammy Franks, who have long advocated for reform in this space, although I know we do not agree.

The Nordic model offers a proven, effective and compassionate approach to addressing the challenges of prostitution. It is time for South Australia to join the global community in adopting this transformative model. I urge all members to support this bill. Let's make history this evening.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (23:03): I rise briefly to put on the record that I support this bill. I have spoken in this chamber extensively before and have done a matter of interest speech on my support of the Nordic model. I agree with many of the sentiments from my Liberal colleagues who have spoken in support of this bill, and I certainly want to acknowledge the brilliant contribution from the Hon. Clare Scriven—I agree with every word she said.

I want to acknowledge WEEP and all the work that they do for these vulnerable people who engage in sex work. It is difficult to understand that we are here in 2024 having a debate about whether we want to tolerate the abuse of these vulnerable people who engage in sex work to put clothes on their children or food on the table. It really is a fantasy, certainly a male fantasy, that this is in any way a voluntary activity. It really is not. It is not a voluntary activity. Women do not want to be engaging in sex work for money. That is certainly a fantasy that needs bursting.

This bill acknowledges the vulnerable state that these sex workers find themselves in. I just want to put on the record that I have engaged with people with lived experience. I am not sure why we want to say that lived experience views are paramount when we are dealing with people who are very vulnerable, possibly in a poor state of mind and possibly having an addiction of some sort.

When I did engage with these people, and I went in with an open mind, I just thought how tragic to hear them tell me that the purchasers of sex treated them so much better than the boyfriends they had had—they treated them so much better. I am not sure that we can argue that these people are not highly vulnerable people. They are victims, which this bill acknowledges.

We need, as was mentioned by the Hon. Clare Scriven, an attitudinal change. We are talking at the moment, as we rightly should be, about domestic violence. I do not understand how on the one hand an individual can say we need to be doing more about violence towards women but at the same time we need to be tolerating and accepting the purchasing of often a woman or a sex worker, any person really, who finds themselves in a desperate state.

It is actually really hard to think about the moments these people are having for money because they are that desperate, many of whom have children and families at home. With that, I support the bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (23:06): I rise as the second speaker for the Greens today to oppose this bill before us and indicate that the Greens' position is to support decriminalisation of sex work. It is our policy position. It is also our policy position to oppose what is called the Nordic model and which in this case has been called the partial decriminalisation model. It has all sorts of fantasy names actually.

I acknowledge that today is May Day and the Greens' position is born from respecting workers' rights. Sex work is work. Let's talk about who a sex worker is and what sex work is as well. Sex work—according to the Amnesty International definition and, indeed, the definition of many organisations which have long, both authentically and with proper rigour, examined this issue—is the consensual exchange of sexual services between adults for some form of remuneration, money or goods, with the terms agreed between the seller and the buyer. It is not the person selling themselves but selling a service, I note.

A sex worker is an adult person who is 18 years of age and older of all genders who receives money or goods in exchange for the consensual provision of sexual services, either regularly or occasionally. For the purposes of the Amnesty report, they refer to people as sex workers who are engaged in adult consensual sex for some sort of money or other reward. They sell a service.

The first time I had conversations with sex workers when I came to this role as a member of parliament, I spoke to a sex worker who had been a hairdresser. She conveyed to me that it was very similar: she provided a service. Sometimes she might book a chair in a hairdressing shop, sometimes she might do the work at home, sometimes she might be a paid employee on the payroll at a particular salon, but the service was about making the client feel good and providing her expertise to provide a service.

That, to me, really exemplified how a sex worker views their work. They are not selling themselves: they are selling a service, and to insinuate that a hairdresser is bought and sold by providing you with a haircut or a masseuse is bought and sold by providing you with a massage would be the logical extension of some of the arguments that I have heard tonight.

What I have not heard much of tonight—although I note that some speakers have, and I note that the Hon. Russell Wortley did bring the voice of sex workers and sex workers from this state into this—is what sex workers think of this bill. I will share with the chamber, and with those listening at home and those reading *Hansard* and those in the gallery, the position of the Sex Industry Network

on this bill. Their press release with regard to this bill is titled 'Harmful sex industry bill introduced to South Australian parliament'. It states:

The South Australian Sex Industry Network (SIN) calls on all South Australian politicians to reject the Summary Offences (Prostitution Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2023...SIN is the South Australian sex worker organisation that is run for and by sex workers.

If passed, the Bill would add criminal penalties to clients of sex workers, as well as people who 'cause, assist, facilitate, persuade or encourage' sex work. This approach is commonly called the 'Nordic model' or the 'End Demand Model'. The model is internationally opposed by sex workers, but has been implemented—

They go on to list countries. It continues:

In each of these jurisdictions [SIN contends] the model has harmed sex workers. Studies have shown a direct correlation between laws that criminalise clients and an increase in violence against sex workers, rates of sexually transmissible infections, and exploitation in the sex industry.

So on this day of workers—May Day—I would hope that we might reflect on what the workers want in this debate. I also pay tribute to the work of the Sex Industry Decriminalisation Action Committee, which does also have sex workers on it but it has a range of women's organisations, health organisations and human rights organisations as well, and they oppose this bill. They note that the bill calls itself the 'equality model', the 'end demand model', the 'Swedish model', the 'sex purchase ban', 'client criminalisation' and, as has been canvassed several times in this debate, 'partial decriminalisation'.

I found it interesting that the language of partial decriminalisation has been used here because the contention of this bill is that, unlike the contribution from the Hon. Laura Henderson, the debate to criminalise sex work has been lost, so the strategists, the backroom thinkers, have come up with this idea to call it 'partial decriminalisation' and to purport to be there to protect and defend the poor old sex worker who cannot possibly think for herself—because in this fantasy model she is always a woman, she cannot possibly think for herself, she cannot possibly have autonomy and agency and the ability to consent herself—and protect her, this damsel in distress, by this idea of partial decriminalisation.

'We will not punish what are called "the prostituted women". What we will do is we will punish the purchaser of this person or the person who benefits from the exchange of a sexual service.' The logical end result of that is that we have police who will be sniffing sheets and confiscating condoms, as they currently do. We will have clients who will seek to avoid the law, and we will have sex workers told they are allowed to provide a service, they are allowed to do their work, but they are not allowed to be paid for their work. Do you know what I call that? I do not call that partial decriminalisation: I call that slavery.

I am not here to support slavery. I am not here to strip women in particular away from their rights over their own bodies, their ability to work in their chosen profession and be paid a fair day's wage for a fair day's—or night's—work. That is the basis, in fact, of our whole industrial relations system, is it not? We pay people for the services that they provide, for the work that they do. We do not say that they are allowed to do that work but they cannot possibly accept money or any other reward for it and, if they do, the person who attempts to pay them for the service will fall foul of the law.

It is little surprise then that the police have raised their concerns about this bill. I will go first to the police minister's words. In a piece of correspondence, I asked the commissioner—but it was the acting commissioner at the time because the commissioner was on leave—for the opinion of SAPOL on this bill. The response that I got from the former minister Joe Szakacs MP was dated 20 February 2024, and it reads:

I refer to your letter to the Acting Commissioner of Police seeking comment on the Summary Offences (Prostitution Law Reform) Amendment Bill...and information as to whether South Australia Police (SAPOL) supports the Bill.

SAPOL's consistent advice on various bills, briefings and Parliamentary Select Committees over many years is that it does not oppose or support any particular model.

Nonetheless, SAPOL advises that it considers a regulated industry where brothel owners are subjected to fit and proper person provisions is a necessity.

The Summary Offences (Prostitution Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2023 and current legislation criminalise prostitution as an unregulated industry. SAPOL advises that it would continue to monitor and investigate brothels should the bill pass.

So in the opinion of SAPOL this creates an unregulated industry.

It also, I think, provides the police with a very grey area to police. It is no wonder then that in correspondence dated 27 November 2023 written to all members of the South Australian parliament the Police Association of South Australia's president, Mark Carroll, has written to us cautioning us about this very bill:

The Summary Offences (Prostitution Law Reform) Amendment Bill ('the Bill')

We refer to the abovementioned Bill as introduced by the Honourable Nicola Centofanti MLC, which I understand is to come before the Parliament in the near future.

We understand that, in summary, the intent of the proposed legislative amendment is to:

- criminalise the act of offering or providing money or another benefit in return for a person performing sexual services;
- remove criminal sanctions applied to sex workers;
- criminalise the acts of enabling and profiting from the prostitution of another person (so, the keeping of brothels or the conduct of escort services would remain unlawful); and
- to provide for the comprehensive resourced network of support and exiting services for sex workers.

We respectfully advise that the Police Association of South Australia does not support the Bill.

As well as believing that should the proposed legislative amendments become law, policing of such laws by our members would present extreme difficulties, we are persuaded that the Bill ought not to be supported given the type of dilemmas faced in Northern Ireland which (by way of example), has in place laws essentially the same as those proposed by the Bill.

We note that:

- Amnesty International is opposed to the model of prostitution regulation that the Bill is based on;
- a reasonable held view is that the relevant model conflates sex work provided by way of choice and the scourge of trafficking; and
- rather than meeting the objective of minimising harm to those providing commercial sexual services—the vast majority of whom are female—there is a considerable risk that the model would actually force sex workers further underground and increase the inherent risks to their physical, psychological and sexual health.

The Police Association of South Australia respectfully submits that the decriminalisation and effective regulation of prostitution services would be a more worthy outcome than the current state of the law, or the approach proposed by the Bill.

So sex workers oppose this bill. The police oppose this bill.

I have heard some contributions tonight, and I will note that the Hon. Ben Hood noted that the bill allowed for spent convictions. The bill does not allow for spent convictions. That is why there are two sets of amendments filed, the first of which was mine, to ensure that if the fantasy that somehow this was supporting and protecting sex workers was to be upheld perhaps they should have thought about including spent convictions in the original bill. It really shows up the lie of what the intention of this bill is. The intention of this bill is to eliminate sex work, to cast it as a crime and to continue to devote police resources to criminalising it.

If we had wanted people to have an easy way to leave the industry we would have passed spent convictions well and truly by now. I hope that we will, one day in the near future, which is why I have put that up as an amendment. But I also note it is not in the original bill, and I think that goes a long way to exposing the intention of the original bill.

I note also that the Hon. Jing Lee spoke of Auckland and cited girls as young as 10 selling sex. I have a few points there: the New Zealand report that she referred to goes on to further say that in fact street work had not increased in Auckland. Certainly, with regard to girls as young as 10 on the street, that is not consensual adult sex work; indeed, that is a whole range of other crimes, including child sexual abuse, which would be taken very seriously.

Further, the idea that sex workers' voices have not been listened to in this debate is pretty shocking. Where they have been spoken about, people have been either infantilised or dismissed. I do not know of any other industry where we do that. But because this is a predominantly female industry that historically has had criminal attitudes towards it—not always but historically, by and large—we have treated these women with contempt. And it continues: not in the form of locking them up but in infantilising them.

I would also draw members' attention to the country reports, in particular from Norway and Ireland. Amnesty International's country reports on the Nordic model in those two jurisdictions show that workers suffer under this recriminalisation model. They are forced to go further underground, they are forced to not use their safety techniques that they previously had access to, and the ability to screen their clients is diminished. Indeed, they are putting themselves at risk should they report to the police any violence against them. This is not a good outcome.

To further criminalise this industry by presenting clients with the option of being criminalised for rape or sexual assault or being criminalised as a client of a sex worker is not something I think we should be changing the culture of in this state, with the idea that we are somehow going to eliminate the existence of people having sex for some remuneration or other exchange for that service. It has been going on for a very long time. The data shows that the Nordic model, the recriminalisation model, does not actually end the existence of either sex workers or clients.

The cherrypicked data that I have heard tonight is interesting, but it is more fairytale than factual. I look forward to people reading full reports; for example, with regard to the Auckland report in terms of the New Zealand review five years after decriminalisation. I note that the so-called 50 per cent rise in Auckland's street prostitution is often cited, but that report, as I say, goes on to note that the 2006 figures must be treated as an underestimation of the number of street-based sex workers in the region. The report specifically stated:

The Committee endorses the findings of the Christchurch School of Medicine study that 'the number of street-based sex workers have remained stable since the enactment of the PRA, with a comparable number on the streets to estimates done prior to decriminalisation'.

That is the Prostitute Law Review Committee of 2008, the same report that was referred to but actually goes on to say something different at the end of the paragraph. The cherrypicked statistics are all well and good, but if you read the full report they are shown to be a fantasy, much as this bill is.

As I say, it is International May Day. I would love to be at the May Day dinner right now, perhaps singing *Solidarity Forever*, because the union does make us strong. I think sex workers deserve to be recognised for their work, to be paid for their work and to be provided with the ability to make the choices that they want to and not treated as infants who are unable to make decisions over their own bodies and their own lives. With that, solidarity forever with the sex workers. I look forward to opposing this bill and I say bring on decriminalisation for South Australia.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (23:25): I rise to speak briefly to the bill that is before us. I can say in summary that I cannot in good conscience support a bill when we know the devastating effects this model has had on the safety and wellbeing of sex workers in other jurisdictions. This bill in my view is littered with both technical issues and problematic fundamental principles which, if passed, would see profoundly worse outcomes for people engaged in sex work.

I will briefly mention a few of these issues, which are highlighted by the experience from jurisdictions where this model has been in practice for some years. We are fortunate on occasions when we have issues like this, particularly issues that are conscience matters, that we can turn to other jurisdictions and have a look, and look at the proper peer-reviewed evidence of how they have worked.

This bill seeks to criminalise all aspects of the sex work industry other than the workers themselves, that is, to criminalise anyone who either gives money in exchange for sex or anyone who knowingly facilitates that exchange. It is unclear to me whether that would capture—and I suspect it would—examples such as taxi or Uber drivers, a person with a disability, a landlord, a

cleaner, an accountant or family members. They would be potentially criminalised under the model that is being put forward tonight.

Jurisdictions that have introduced this model commonly refer to it as the Nordic model because it includes countries such as Sweden, Norway and Iceland. As the Hon. Tammy Franks mentioned, a report by Amnesty International in 2016 studied the impact of the Nordic model in its effect in Ireland and demonstrated that there was a notable spike in sexual assaults and murders of sex workers since the model was introduced.

Further peer-reviewed studies on this Nordic model have reported that police surveillance patrols aimed at locating clients drive sex workers onto the street and into more remote public areas to be discreet for clients who, if found out, would be prosecuted for illegally seeking such services, and consequently sex workers are made more vulnerable to experiencing violence.

A bill that makes sex workers more vulnerable to experiencing violence is something that I cannot support, and I implore others in this chamber to not support, in any sort of good conscience. It would further do harm by driving the sex work industry further underground, greater stigmatising the profession, and put sex workers at greater risk of danger.

Looking back on some of civilisation's oldest records tells us, as the Hon. Russell Wortley spoke about, that this profession is not going anywhere. This bill is ignorant of that fact, and through that pursuit it will cause significant harm and discrimination to sex workers and anyone who supports the industry.

I am proud, as the Hon. Tammy Franks has mentioned, to stand with the vast majority of sex workers who oppose this bill and indeed hold grave fears for what this bill could mean not just for their livelihoods but, more importantly, for their physical safety. I will not be supporting this bill, and I would implore my colleagues in this place to not support this bill for the effect it could have on sex workers and their safety.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (23:29): Firstly, I would like to thank the honourable members for their second reading contributions: the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Laura Henderson, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Rob Simms, the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Clare Scriven, the Hon. Russell Wortley and the Hon. Kyam Maher.

The Hon. Russell Wortley made some assertions about my consultation process during his second reading speech, and I would just like to correct the record. Let me be clear, I have spoken with and listened to many individuals in the sex industry, including the Sex Industry Network. I sat on a committee that looked into full decriminalisation where we heard from dozens of witnesses, and received many submissions, and I would just like to remind the chamber that of those submissions received by that committee, 50 per cent of those were against full decriminalisation, and the vast majority of those were in support of the equality model.

I have done a lot of listening to people in the industry, and I have been in very close contact with several women who were formerly part of the industry, and they have very candidly spoken with me about the emotional, mental and physical harm that they experienced while they were engaged in prostitution. Their stories have persuaded me more than ever that measures need to be in place that criminalise the user and the procurers, and reduce this industry and, most importantly, protect these women and provide them with exit strategies to safely leave the industry.

I reject the Hon. Russell Wortley's assertions, and I do say to the honourable member that, despite my office contacting him on several occasions, it is a shame he did not see fit to attend any of the forums that I hosted here in Parliament House to ensure that he also consulted widely with sex industry survivors. I think it is also important to reiterate that the Hon. Clare Scriven in her contribution updated the council on the position of the Police Association of South Australia who neither oppose nor support the legislation, and are watching the debate with interest.

Members would be aware that I have introduced some amendments to my bill, primarily to strengthen the assistance given to those wishing to exit the industry, and to spend their convictions. Twenty years ago, the New Zealand parliament voted in favour of full decriminalisation. In 1995, New South Wales voted in favour of full decriminalisation. Twenty years ago, Germany voted in favour of

legalisation and, 20 years ago, Sweden voted in favour of the equality model. This really provides us with an excellent opportunity to objectively analyse the data when it comes to these three different models, and I want to sum up this debate by doing just that.

The first approach is the sex work model, whether that be full decriminalisation or legalisation. By giving a transactional value to sex, it has normalised the purchase of sexual acts and the objectification of women, leading to an increase in male demand for sexual acts as well as sex tourism. This has led to an explosion of the prostitution market, and thus an increase in human trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation. Far from improving the situation of prostituted persons, it has only strengthened the hold of pimps and traffickers on these women who can then hide behind a legal facade.

Let's be very clear, legalising or decriminalising prostitution does not change the often inherently violent nature of the sexual act obtained in prostitution itself. As one prostitution survivor stated in the forum that I organised here in Parliament House, and I quote: 'Prostitution is paid rape.'

The New Zealand model of full decriminalisation, which was instigated in 2003, is failing women, particularly those from marginalised backgrounds. For three consecutive years, New Zealand has been reduced to a tier 2 trafficking country. This means that the New Zealand government no longer meets minimum standards.

In New South Wales, prostitution has been decriminalised since 1995, and in 2015 the New South Wales parliament conducted an inquiry into the decriminalisation model in their state entitled *The Regulation of Brothels*. The inquiry made some damning findings as to the extreme vulnerability of people in prostitution and their inability to exercise free choice. It also found that there was a substantial underground sex services industry still operating in New South Wales, that SafeWork New South Wales found it difficult to protect workers and that the policing of foreign sex workers was near impossible. These findings were made in a decriminalised jurisdiction right here in Australia and they clearly point to the need for a different model.

Countries that have legalised prostitution are becoming hotspots for sex tourism and human trafficking, countries like Germany, the Netherlands and Spain. According to the BBC, Germany is now referred to as 'the brothel of Europe', with one million men going to a brothel every day. In Spain, where prostitution is also legalised, it has become normalised for young people to go to a brothel to celebrate a birthday or a success, and between 32 and 39 per cent of men acknowledge having paid for sex at least once.

In the Netherlands, it is now legal for a driving instructor to request a sexual act as a means of payment from their students. The practice even has a name: 'a ride for a ride'. By comparison, in abolitionist countries such as Sweden surveys indicate that the percentage of Swedish men who purchased sexual acts fell to 7.4 per cent in 2014 from 13.6 per cent in 1996 and that only 0.8 per cent claimed to have purchased sexual acts in the past year.

The equality model, aside from decreasing demand and providing support services for those who wish to exit the industry, also targets trafficking and pimping networks, through improving the relationship between law enforcement and prostituted persons. In France, three years after the adoption of similar legislation a 54 per cent increase in criminal proceedings against pimps was observed, as well as a seven times increase in the compensation received by victims, according to the report by Argus in 2020 on the evaluation of the French law.

The criminalisation of the demand for the purchase of sexual acts has a strong legal basis in international human rights law, in treaties that have been signed and ratified by Australia. My bill is consistent with international human rights law and standards. There is a common observation at the international level that the demand for the purchase of sexual acts is the fundamental reason for the existence and development of networks of prostitution and trafficking in human beings for the purpose of sexual exploitation.

In closing, I would like to express how grateful I am to be here in this place where I can use my position of privilege to help others. I truly believe that the equality model is the way to help protect and empower women, a way that recognises the dignity and value of women caught in prostitution,

a way that provides them with the means to escape the industry, should they wish, and a way that does not stigmatise them but supports them.

It is time that the sex industry is reformed, and I am hopeful that with some hard work and determination we will see changes in South Australia that will benefit some of our most vulnerable. I urge members in this chamber to help South Australia lead the nation in prostitution reform by supporting this bill tonight.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes9
Noes.....10
Majority1

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)
Henderson, L.A.
Ngo, T.T.

Game, S.L.
Hood, B.R.
Pangallo, F.

Girolamo, H.M.
Lee, J.S.
Scriven, C.M.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Franks, T.A.
Maher, K.J. (teller)
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Martin, R.B.

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Simms, R.A.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.

Lensink, J.M.A.

Second reading thus negated.

At 23:43 the council adjourned until Thursday 2 May 2024 at 14:15.