

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 30 October 2024

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:17 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I bring up the 53^d report of the committee, 2023-24.

Report received.

Question Time

DROUGHT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of drought. How many face-to-face round tables has the minister's department held on the topic of drought, and how many of those roundtable discussions has the minister herself personally attended?

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 question. My understanding is that I think so far there has been one departmental, which was held in Naracoorte a couple of weeks ago—actually September, I think it was—and then further ones are being scheduled. The next one is for the Mid North—off the top of my head, I don't have the date for that—but then they will be elsewhere around the state.

I think it's really important, when we are talking about drought, to make sure that there is opportunity for all the peak bodies to ensure that they are able to bring the concerns of individual farmers to PIRSA as well as to me as the minister. I obviously meet one-to-one as well, as well as with the peak industry bodies. Indeed, only a few weeks ago in Mount Gambier, the Premier and I met with a number of local farmers, and then I had some subsequent meetings as well with both stakeholders and some individual farmers as well. That is the approach that I take. I have met with people from around the state.

Of course, Labor's commitment to country cabinet also gives additional opportunities for primary producers to meet, to raise issues and to be heard. All of that is incredibly important in terms of feeding information into government decision-making, and I will continue to do so.

DROUGHT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: how many of the future roundtable discussions will the minister be attending? Did she attend the round table in Naracoorte?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. I wasn't able to attend the one in Naracoorte. I would have liked to have done so, but unfortunately other commitments prevented that from occurring. I am advised that the second round table is actually being held today, so that obviously prevents me from attending, given I have to be here in parliament.

It's also important to understand the purpose of the round tables. Peak industry groups and local associations are able to meet with PIRSA to be able to go into whatever level of detail is

appropriate for them about the way that the drought is affecting them. PIRSA is also able to share information, talk about particular programs that are already in existence and also able to then bring back ideas that might come from those round tables and feed them into the process in terms of whether there is additional support that might be appropriate and what assistance might be able to be recommended to me as the minister.

In addition to that, there is regular monitoring and reporting on seasonal conditions and impacts to primary production and regional communities, which occurs through the PIRSA working group intelligence report as well as the crop and pasture report. A drought advisory group, I think I mentioned in this place a few weeks ago, chaired by the chief executive of PIRSA, has been convened to formally engage with industry and government stakeholders to also identify industry and community impacts caused by drought conditions and other compounding issues.

DROUGHT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Further supplementary: why haven't these roundtable discussions been organised on a day when the minister herself can attend in person, and does the minister concede that by not rocking up to the community she is not acknowledging the dire nature of the drought and its effect on regional communities?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:24): I thank the member for her further supplementary question. Clearly, she is not listening to the answers that are being given in terms of the purpose of the round tables. I think if those opposite did want to listen—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I appreciate that interjections are out of order, but again the member is contradicting herself even in those interjections. Is it about—

The PRESIDENT: Interjections are out of order and so is responding to them.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: So the purpose of the round tables is to be able to hear from industry bodies—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: She's been doing it all night, ref.

The PRESIDENT: You're not that helpful.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —about the way the drought is affecting—

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: It's for you to hear as minister.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —about the way the drought is affecting them and members in their communities. I have a large number of different ways of interacting with the communities, with listening to farmers, as I have already outlined today as well as on previous occasions.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: How can you listen when you don't rock up?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The honourable member obviously doesn't listen to the answer that I give. I talked about just recently meeting with primary producers along with the Premier.

SA DROUGHT HUB

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of drought hubs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: According to the SA Drought Hub website the SA Drought Hub, led by the University of Adelaide in partnership with the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, comprises the hub headquarters at Roseworthy and five regional nodes, at Minnipa on Eyre Peninsula, Port Augusta in the Far North, Orroroo in the Upper North, Loxton in the Riverland and Struan in the South-East. The location of the nodes ensures statewide coverage of all pastoral low, medium and high rainfall agricultural production zones. According to their website, SA Drought Hub states that:

...Nodes are a shopfront where farmers and community members can connect with drought resilience expertise...

Our Node Coordinators live in the communities, enabling them to have a greater understanding of the evolving needs of local partners and primary producers.

My question to the minister is: can the minister confirm that in the middle of one of the worst droughts of this generation the new current drought hub node coordinator for the Loxton Riverland drought hub is currently residing in Port Lincoln?

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. I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a response.

FAB MENTORS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on the FaB mentors program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The minister has often claimed that her government does understand the magnitude of the drought and that part of the assistance includes extra funding for the FaB mentors. Whilst that increase in funding is, of course, welcome, it is disturbing to hear from some of the FaB mentors in our regions that they have found it difficult to engage with farmers and growers, who they know are doing it really tough. This is because the level of stress is so high that the affected people are not really engaging with anyone.

This is made worse by FaB mentors being unable to cold-call people suspected or known to be suffering. Several years ago, FaB mentors were able to cold-call people, and we understand that is not the current practice. One FaB mentor said that he knew of grapegrowers who had not received an income for the past two years, had now suffered 100 per cent crop losses in the frost and were unlikely to get an income next year; however, he could not proactively reach out to these growers. There are numerous people in similar positions.

If the FaB mentors program is to be of value then the mentors need to be able to reach and interact with affected growers and farmers. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is there a system of check and review to assess the effectiveness of outreach being done by the FaB mentors?
2. What is the rate of engagement that FaB mentors are having across the state?
3. Can the minister confirm whether the FaB mentors are able to proactively engage with growers, or are they currently prevented from doing so?
4. If they are currently prevented from proactively engaging with growers, what is the reason for that?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:29): I thank the honourable member for her question. The FaB mentors do a fantastic job. They provide a confidential triage service, which is incredibly important. When farmers or primary producers want to reach out, certainly I have been encouraging in every forum that I possibly can that they start with the family and business support mentors, the FaB mentors, because they are able to provide that service in a confidential manner. They are across what sort of support is available, both federal and state and elsewhere, and are also able to then

tailor the suggestions that they give to primary producers for those particular primary producers' own circumstances.

I think it would be helpful if those opposite actually gave the credit to FaB mentors and the programs that they have been involved in, in terms of the excellent work that they do. We have seen constantly from those opposite an undermining of the FaB mentor roles, downplaying their importance, and I think that is particularly unfortunate.

In terms of the specific question about proactively cold-calling, I don't have an answer to that—I am happy to take it on notice—but I can certainly speculate that issues around privacy may mean that people don't want to have someone turning up on their doorstep unannounced. They may feel there is a stigma attached. There could be all sorts of reasons.

I acknowledge that I am speculating on that, but it does seem quite likely that that could be an explanation, if indeed what the honourable member is saying is true, which of course is yet to be validated, but I am happy to seek some additional information on that.

FAB MENTORS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary: can the minister also seek information about what is the rate of engagement of FaB mentors across the state in various regions? Is there a system of check and review to assess the effectiveness of the outreach done by those FaB mentors?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:31): I think they have certainly demonstrated their worth over recent years and that is the reason why we have increased the amount of funding in terms of an additional \$4.4 million to ensure that the FaB mentors and Rural Financial Counselling Service extended beyond 30 June 2024. That was announced in the state budget.

I think the feedback that we get is highly positive. I would continue to encourage people to reach out to the FaB mentors and also, as I did just this morning indeed at a dairy industry breakfast, encourage everyone who has a connection with agricultural sectors and regional communities to use their sphere of influence to encourage people to connect with the FaB mentors.

COUNTRY CABINET

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the chamber about last week's country cabinet in Victoria—I mean Victor Harbor—Goolwa and the Fleurieu?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: It's a Specsavers moment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, are you going to confess that we have taken over part of Victoria?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): If only we could. If only we could, I think that would be a great thing. The Green Triangle could become part of South Australia, perhaps. I would like to thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in the country cabinet, which I think is shared by all on this side of the chamber. Unfortunately, it is not shared by those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am sure the Hon. Mr Simms shares his interest in country cabinet. I was only talking about those opposite, not those diagonally opposite. I think it is very clear that those opposite are not interested in country cabinet. Their government previously, when they were under the Marshall Liberal government, abandoned country cabinet, and no doubt that was part of why regional South Australia felt abandoned by the then Liberal government.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, please continue.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It is great to be able to talk about another useful and informative country cabinet, this time in Victor Harbor, Goolwa and the Fleurieu region. One of the many things that I do love about my portfolio is the diversity of the sectors and the industries, and that was certainly true in terms of what was represented in last week's country cabinet, which highlighted a range of agriculture, fisheries and forestry activities that occur in that part of the state.

My country cabinet began with a stop at Kuitpo to look at the exciting developments across the forest, including the magnificent tree climb experiences that were completed last year, and the wonderful modern, and some not so modern and indeed rustic, accommodation options available to those who want to immerse themselves in the beauty of the forest.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I wish I did. It certainly is a place that is already special to many South Australian families and, with the recent additions, more and more people will be able to experience Kuitpo like never before. The next stop was Nangkita Dairies run by the Connor family. Nangkita utilised funding under the LUP scheme to install an underpass on the farm, and with the underpass were then able to install a multimillion-dollar robotic dairy, which is actually quite incredible to see in action, because the cows are milked voluntarily.

They have the robotic system, which has provided a range of improved data and efficiency to the Connors in running the farm, but I think they stated that the biggest benefit must surely be the incredibly happy and productive cows who are voluntarily milked; I am advised some of them up to four times a day, most two to three times a day. But hearing about this system and how the cows behave in an environment where they have some autonomy and choice was quite incredible. Their inclination, as told to us by the farmers, is to go and get milked amongst their friendship groupings, and the shyer cows choose to be milked in the middle of the night when not many others are doing the same. It was quite fascinating and, dare I say, a moving insight into modern dairy farming—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and what the future holds. Moving right along, next up was a trip to Goolwa Beach to catch up with RecFish SA about the increase in recreational bag limits for Goolwa pipi. From 1 November, when the new season opens, recreational anglers will have the benefit of a 10 per cent increase in the bag limit for pipi; a limit of 330, up from 300. In an environment where it might often seem that bag limit increases are a thing of the past, it is important that, where science says modest increases are not a threat to sustainability, we are able to balance the desire for recreational access with the need for sustainability of our marine species.

On Thursday night, a huge standing room only crowd packed into Encounter Bay Football Club to hear from the Premier and cabinet ministers, with community members asking a range of great questions with a wide range of topics covered. On Friday morning, it was a pleasure to be part of the strategic cabinet meeting with Victor Harbor, Yankalilla and Alexandrina councils to discuss the challenges and opportunities the region faces, similar to so many regions in terms of managing growth and balancing the preservation of its identity, as well as unique challenges the region faces in terms of the availability of longer term accommodation given the high number of short-term holiday rentals.

To finish, it was actually good to see Mr David Basham, the member for Finnis, in attendance at the community forum. We don't often see Liberal MPs attend country cabinet forums when in their electorates—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and I am sure he would have reported back positively to his party room on the community engagement that can be achieved when you turn up in the regions and you hear directly from regional people.

VIRTUAL FENCING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Supplementary: will the Labor government be committing to legislation or regulation to allow virtual fencing to continue to assist voluntary milking in dairy herds, as requested by the South Australia Dairy Association? She talked about voluntary milking.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: When you are all finished, I am not quite sure: I heard the word dairy and automatic dairy, but that was about it, so—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Please, I am talking. Minister, you can answer it if you wish, but I don't see that it was a supplementary question.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am happy to defer to your judgement.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: A pity you didn't all listen a bit more.

TEACHERS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on the topic of teachers' employment conditions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: On Monday, the New South Wales government, rather than the Victorian government, reached an agreement with public school teachers to improve pay and conditions. The new deal involves a pay rise of 10 per cent over three years, with two extra pupil-free days per year. The teachers in New South Wales will receive cost-of-living bonuses and a right to disconnect after 3pm. It follows a pay increase last year to teachers in that state, which saw their salaries lift by between 8 to 12 per cent as part of the New South Wales Labor government's commitment to reinvest in the state's essential service workers.

In 2022, the University of South Australia released a report commissioned by the AEU's South Australian branch entitled 'Teachers at Breaking Point'. The report found that South Australian teachers work an average of over 50 hours per week, job satisfaction is as low as 52 per cent, and only 6.8 per cent of teachers feel that their views are valued by policymakers in South Australia. My questions to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, therefore, are:

1. Is the minister concerned that South Australian teachers will cross the border to New South Wales to get a better deal?
2. What is this government doing to improve teacher retention, particularly in the public school system?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for his question. I look forward, when there is a public sector deal struck in any of the Eastern States, to getting a question very soon after from the honourable member. I think there was a question about nurses in Victoria, and today it's school teachers in New South Wales.

As I said in relation to his question before, I think there are many, many things that make us a destination that people want to live in and not leave. I think the days that you heard about people choosing to leave Adelaide and the jokes that you heard from other states are well and truly over. I think there are many, many reasons that people choose to come to and to stay in Adelaide.

In relation to teachers specifically, it was only in the last year (I think it was early this year) that we concluded negotiations for a new industrial agreement with teachers in South Australia that included as part of it—and I don't have the details in front of me—if I remember correctly, a right to disconnect, as the honourable member has pointed out, from the New South Wales agreement. Of

course, those negotiations were not easy and they often aren't. The representatives of public sector workers, through their trade unions, negotiate fiercely for their workers' rights and conditions.

That EB was concluded. There are more EBs for public sector workers coming up over the next 18 months that we look forward to negotiating in good faith with public sector unions. It is something that is vastly different from the last government, who had things that they, in the government's view, wouldn't consider that manifested itself most profoundly in the negotiations between the former government and ambulance workers, who spent four years without getting a pay rise due to an EB, and the government took off the table any possibility of backpay.

I am very proud to be a part of a Labor government that, very early on in our term, concluded negotiations with the Ambulance Employees Association that included backpay for every year that the Marshall Lucas Liberal government didn't have that backpay.

TEACHERS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:42): Supplementary: why is the Malinauskas Labor government lagging so far behind New South Wales and Victoria when it comes to paying our state's essential workers what they are worth?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for his question. That is certainly not how I would characterise how we treat our public sector workers. Pay is one part of what is offered. There were other, in terms of the teachers, very important elements as part of that negotiation—the right to disconnect, but also a reduction in face-to-face teaching time to allow teachers to do all that other important work was part of what we did in South Australia as well.

UPPER SPENCER GULF NETTING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Primary Industries on Upper Spencer Gulf netting.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: In 2020, the Upper Spencer Gulf was closed to all netting activity. However, the most recent Marine Scalefish Fishery operator use guide, published in March 2024, shows the Upper Spencer Gulf is now open to large mesh nets and fish nets to take salmon. Over the October long weekend, Fishwatch received a report of kingfish netting occurring approximately 25 kilometres inside the reg 99 Upper Spencer Gulf area.

However, Fishwatch did not act on this report, telling the caller there wasn't anything wrong. These changes give commercial fishers impunity to net this area under the guise of salmon netting, allowing them to retain bycatch of other species, including kingfish, and muddying the waters for reports to Fishwatch. My questions to the minister are:

1. When was the reg 99 Spencer Gulf netting closure changed?
2. What consultation was done with the recreational fishing and tourism sector over these changes?
3. Will the minister commit to closing this loophole and protecting kingfish in the Upper Spencer Gulf?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question. Yellowtail kingfish is a highly mobile pelagic species found along much of Australia's western, southern and eastern coastlines. The species is an iconic recreational fishing target species, with variable commercial fishery importance across its range. It also supports a significant finfish aquaculture industry in South Australia.

Both the west coast and east coast stocks of yellowtail kingfish in Australia are classified as sustainable, which is a key consideration. No formal stock assessment is conducted for yellowtail kingfish in South Australian state waters. PIRSA considers that the low commercial and recreational catches do not necessitate the need for formal assessment.

While commercial catches of yellowtail kingfish have fluctuated, it is an important species that supports the diversification of fishing efforts within the marine scalefish fishery. Management arrangements are in place for both the commercial and recreational fishing sectors for yellowtail kingfish. The minimum legal length for yellowtail kingfish for all sectors is 60 centimetres.

The recreational sector is restricted to a personal bag limit of one and a boat limit of three, where three or more people are fishing. It is noted that the bag limit was implemented in 2016 as a precautionary reduction in recreational take as stock status was undefined until 2020, when it was first classified as sustainable.

There are in excess of 40 commercial NETFISH enclosures throughout the waters of South Australia and 19 marine parks where sanctuary zones prohibit fishing and consequently protect important spawning areas for this species. I am advised there have been no recent legislative changes to the commercial NETFISH enclosures in South Australia.

Commercial fishers provide daily catch and effort return data through a monthly log book return. PIRSA monitors catch using this information. Recent total statewide annual commercial catches between 2017-18 and 2021-22 I am advised ranged between less than one tonne in 2021-22 and 5.2 tonnes in 2021. Further commercial catch information will be available in the coming months.

Recreational catch estimates are available every five to seven years to inform trends in recreational catch of species, including yellowtail kingfish, with the next recreational fishing data to be available in approximately 2027-28. The estimate of statewide recreational catch for yellowtail kingfish in 2021-22 through the recreational fishing survey was 2,004 fish, equating to 39.8 tonnes. There have been very few commercial or recreational offences reported relating to yellowtail kingfish. There are no current investigations in relation to this species, and I am advised there have been no significant offences in recent years.

Formal allocations are in place for yellowtail kingfish, with 0.12 per cent allocated to the commercial sector—0.12 per cent—with 98.88 per cent being allocated to the recreational sector and 1 per cent allocated to the Aboriginal traditional fishing sector. These allocations were set based on previous catch data. Following the release of the 2021-22 survey on recreational fishing, yellowtail kingfish was recently considered by an allocation working group, initial stage 1 allocation assessment, where the species was not recommended to proceed to a full stage 2 assessment.

This recommendation considered allocations as a proportional share of sustainable yield and noted the estimated recommended biological catch (RBC) for yellowtail kingfish was unreliable. The working group noted that, while the commercial sector had exceeded its allocation as a proportion of the five-year catch average as a proxy for RBC, this catch level did not exceed the notional trigger level and therefore no further assessment was required.

Consistent with previous positions, PIRSA considers that the sustainability of the species and low commercial catch levels indicate there is no need to change management arrangements for the species at this stage; however, I am always open to further discussions, and changes can be made if that appears to be appropriate.

WORKING WOMEN'S CENTRE

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:49): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the minister inform the council about the recent AGM and annual report released of the Working Women's Centre of South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:49): I thank the honourable member very much for her question and acknowledge her contribution to the life of working women through the union movement and a career in South Australia spent particularly in early childhood education, which is a predominantly female-based workplace.

As I have spoken about in this chamber before, the Working Women's Centre in South Australia is an extraordinary organisation that represents women to ensure they have access to work, fair pay and good conditions in employment in this state. The object of the centre and its principal purpose for which it was established is to be an organisation whose purpose is the relief of

poverty, suffering, distress, misfortune, disability and helplessness in the context of women in the workplace.

Last week, the Working Women's Centre held their AGM and released their annual report for the past financial year, which reported on many exciting achievements of the centre. Perhaps the most significant milestone of the Working Women's Centre movement for the past year was that South Australia successfully secured commonwealth funding to establish the federal peak body for all working women's centres across Australia. This is a remarkable outcome and an opportunity for South Australia in hosting the working women's centre national peak body, believed to be the first federally funded peak body of its type based in Adelaide.

I and the government are extremely proud of the South Australian Working Women's Centre for winning this role, and we are excited for all centres across Australia to be guided by South Australia's team. My congratulations are due to our South Australian team for their tireless efforts in paving the foundations for winning this position. I particularly acknowledge Abbey Kendall, the director of the SA centre, for driving this outcome.

The past year has seen a significant expansion and strengthening of the work of working women's centres all over Australia, and by the end of this year there will be a working women's centre in every state and territory of our nation. This is an achievement that is good news for working women right across the country. There are now centres across Western Australia, the ACT, Tasmania, Victoria and New South Wales, and we have also seen an expansion of existing services in the Northern Territory and Queensland as well as here in the South Australian centre thanks to additional government funding.

Among many other projects of the centre, the past year has seen further work on the issue of stolen wages and the labour exploitation of Aboriginal women. The centre has also committed itself to addressing the issue of stolen wages in South Australia, which continues to be a significant and relevant matter, particularly in light of the racially discriminatory policies and practices that persisted well into the late 1900s. These policies left many Aboriginal workers either unpaid or grossly underpaid for their labour, often in domestic or pastoral roles, and the SA Working Women's Centre has been actively working with Associate Professor Natalie Harkin and the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement to assist Aboriginal women in accessing employment records.

Since 2021, the Working Women's Centre has recovered more than \$3 million in stolen wages, compensation, penalties and lost income for working women and vulnerable workers across South Australia. Over the past financial year, 2,631 vulnerable workers were provided with advice in relation to their workplace rights by the centre, 220 vulnerable workers were represented in commissions and tribunals, 570 workers were advised by the centre in relation to sexual harassment and discrimination and nearly \$1 million was recovered for clients by the centre.

The past year was one of the biggest years for growth for the centre with expanding services and was particularly relevant as it marked the final year of director Abbey Kendall's time in the role. After five years as director of the Working Women's Centre SA, Abbey has not only led extraordinary growth in the South Australian centre but her championing of women's rights and feminist advocacy has played a significant role in the emergence of centres right across the country.

The past five years have not been without challenges for the centre, and I would personally like to thank Abbey for her tireless efforts in championing all women and her passion for advocacy to ensure that every South Australian woman is treated fairly and safely in their workplace. I would like to acknowledge the work and achievements of Abbey and her entire team, including deputy director Nikki Candy, board chair Ann-Marie Hayes and all members of the Working Women's Centre and the community, who have advocated tirelessly and have expanded their crucial work in South Australia.

PFAS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, regarding PFAS levels and testing protocols in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: PFAS (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances) are environmental pollutants, also known as 'forever chemicals', linked to significant health risks. South Australia was the first state to ban all fluorinated PFAS-containing firefighting foams in January 2018. The South Australian Environment Protection Authority says that in regional areas where water is sourced from groundwater PFAS contamination is not present. Given this assurance, it remains crucial to understand the frequency and thoroughness of PFAS testing across the state, particularly in areas where groundwater is a drinking water source.

International standards, particularly in the United States, are more stringent regarding PFAS levels in drinking water, with enforceable maximum levels set at four parts per trillion for certain PFAS variants, as opposed to Australia's maximum levels set at 70 parts per trillion. This raises questions about whether South Australia's current standards and practices are sufficient for public health. My questions to the Attorney-General, representing the minister, are:

1. Have PFAS levels been tested in drinking water and groundwater across South Australia and, if so, how frequently is testing conducted, particularly in areas where groundwater is used as a source of drinking water?

2. Given the federal government's commissioning of the NHMRC to review PFAS guidelines, will the minister commit to adopting the recommendations from this review, especially if they advise that Australia adheres to stricter international standards, such as those set by the United States?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I will be sure to refer the questions about PFAS to the minister in the other place and bring back a reply.

RARE EARTH MINING

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about rare earth mining.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Australian Rare Earths has been exploring for valuable rare earth minerals at forest plantations and farming properties in the state's southern region of Koppamurra, near Naracoorte in the Limestone Coast. The four rare minerals found are used in electrical vehicles, wind turbines and other sustainable alternatives. It is my understanding that extracting the minerals will involve removing significant amounts of soil, which will be put back after extraction and rehabilitated. Many farmers I have spoken to have expressed serious concerns that the proposed process will harm soil health, compaction and productivity.

At a meeting with the Limestone Coast Sustainable Futures Association local vignerons, farmers and business people expressed the view that the project is one of the greatest economic, environmental and social threats to ever face their community. As the minister is aware, as it is home to her and I, the Limestone Coast is one of the state's largest economic powerhouses. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries are:

1. Has she met with the Limestone Coast Sustainable Futures Association?
2. Does the minister have any information that could alleviate the community's concerns?
3. Does the minister support rare earth mining in highly productive agricultural areas, such as Koppamurra?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have met with a number of sectors that have raised concerns about the proposal in terms of mining rare earths. I am confident that here in South Australia we have robust frameworks in place before any approvals are ever granted and I have certainly spoken with the Minister for Mining in the other place about this. He has certainly reassured me in terms of the robustness of the frameworks. I think that

is something that as South Australians we can be very proud of, that we have frameworks in place which are robust, which are set out clearly for those who seek to utilise any of the resources that are so important to our state.

In terms of the agricultural sector, I might also add that the forestry sector is also one of those that have raised this issue and I am sure that it will continue to be a topic of discussion and close attention.

AG TOWN OF THE YEAR

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:59): My question is also to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister speak to the chamber about the recently announced Ag Town of the Year?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Ag Town of the Year Award was established in 2019 and recognises South Australian towns that are excelling in agricultural practices, as well as the flow-on effects to a township and a community. The award is an initiative of my department, PIRSA, and is managed and delivered by Solstice Media.

The award is so important because it promotes our regional communities and focuses on the vital role that agriculture plays in our state. South Australia's primary industries—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and agribusinesses generated revenue of \$18½ billion in the 2022-23 financial year and this certainly wouldn't be possible without the support of strong, vibrant, regional communities. Entering the award provides regional communities with the opportunity to reflect on their contributions to the state's primary industries and regional development, and it also facilitates public recognition of their town and contribution.

I am so pleased that the town of Penola, from my local Limestone Coast region, was announced as the Ag Town of the Year 2024 at the Regional Showcase Awards held at Beresford House in McLaren Vale. The well-deserving winning town has been rightfully recognised for its dedication to agriculture, agricultural education and its thriving community. Penola was certainly up against some worthy competitors with record nominations and public votes this year, and strong finalists Burra and Kimba were also recognised in the top three towns.

This year, a record 73 regional towns were nominated and over 3,600 public votes were cast. A panel of independent judges visited each of the towns as part of their judging process. Penola's agricultural pursuits, which include dairy, beef, lamb, grains, potatoes, forestry and wine, were highly valued by the judges. Penola has a deep commitment to agricultural education with their local agricultural program 'George the Farmer', which has assisted more than 600,000 children in Australian classrooms in their understanding of farming and where their food and fibre originates.

The judges also noted the high uptake of local ag programs, including in the curriculum at Penola High School. I would like to particularly commend Cory O'Connor who is a teacher at Penola High School and was also involved in the Rural Ambassador Program. I am told that he has been absolutely key in terms of promoting their ag program and is one of the reasons that the uptake has improved so much.

Penola was also praised for its flexibility and innovation, enabled by the town's deep understanding of local conditions. One example was mentioned, which included moving from hemp seed to hemp fibre production when conditions demanded it. It is also important to commend Penola for its strong community spirit and town pride, which contributed to the judges' decision.

Penola is the sixth winner of the Ag Town of the Year award after Cleve, 2019; Pinnaroo, 2020; Kimba, 2021; Myponga, 2022; and Wudinna, 2023. Penola is the first town in the Limestone Coast to win the coveted award. I would like to congratulate Penola and everyone who contributes to making Penola a great place to live and work.

The community of Penola should be incredibly proud of this wonderful achievement. It is the strength and spirit of the community which ultimately contributed to the town being named South Australia's Agricultural Town of the Year 2024. Congratulations.

AG TOWN OF THE YEAR

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:03): Supplementary: the minister referenced Burra as a finalist in her reply. Does the minister consider that it would have more favourable consideration from the judges if it was serviced by a regional rail network?

The PRESIDENT: I can't even keep a straight face! Minister, if you choose to answer that, it is most generous.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:03): One of the benefits of the Ag Town of the Year, the awards process, and the judges visiting each of the finalist towns, is that the towns are able to get feedback on the process and feedback on their application. The towns put in a lot of work to prepare their applications to engage with the judges as they come to visit, and that is, I think, a testament to how valued the award is. I would encourage all of the towns to seek that feedback and encourage them to look at applying again in future years.

AG TOWN OF THE YEAR

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): Supplementary, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: If it's got anything to do with regional rail, I am going to rule it out.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I promise it doesn't. Did the minister consult with these finalist agricultural towns on her Biosecurity Bill?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Interjections are out of order, especially when you are not in your seat.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:04): The Biosecurity Bill which is before parliament at the moment has had a long iteration. It has been in development over a number of years, and I think that is why it's very important to look at now moving this legislation forward. The review of the existing legislation started under the previous Marshall Liberal government. It then stalled for probably about 12 to 18 months before the election, and then we were able to reinvigorate it upon coming to government.

There has been a long amount of consultation. Given that the former government didn't release the consultation response paper when they were in government, we needed to go over a lot of that ground again. The opportunities for feedback on it have been extensive. No doubt, the fact that we now have multiple commodity groups—Primary Producers SA, for example, as well as their member organisations—all indicating that they would like to now see that legislation progress as soon as possible is, I think, a testament to how important it is.

STALKING-RELATED HARMS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney a question about strategies to reduce stalking-related harms.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The Australian Bureau of Statistics released new data last week revealing that one in seven adult Australians have experienced being stalked in their lifetime: one in five women and one in 15 men. We have legislated extensively on the issue of stalking in this jurisdiction; however, a low-cost, straightforward measure the state and federal governments could potentially take is the establishment of a national stalking helpline that is able to provide specialist information, advice and advocacy. The UK established such a helpline in 2010, and since then some 65,000 people have been supported through the service. As outlined in *The Conversation* on

24 October, the helpline provides online and telephone advice to potential stalking victims, and this includes basic risk assessment, advocacy and links to local support services.

While stalking is a complicated and multifaceted societal problem, the assistance that such a helpline could potentially provide in Australia is potentially life-saving for victims, and life-changing. As a relatively inexpensive measure, a national stalking helpline could potentially represent something material that we as a community, and indeed a country, could establish simply and expediently. As such, my question to the Attorney is: has the Attorney engaged in conversations with his interstate federal counterparts to discuss the implementation of a national stalking helpline? Is this on this state's or the federal government's radar? Will the Attorney undertake to look into the establishment of such a helpline?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for her question. As the honourable member points out, it is an issue that affects far too many South Australians and Australians generally. It is certainly an issue that we have considered and for which we have strengthened laws. I know that we don't talk about bills that are before this chamber, but, in discussions that we have previously had, we have particularly looked at how new technology affects stalking and the use of internet platforms and things like drones and tracking devices and how to account for them in our stalking laws.

In relation to a national helpline, it's something that hasn't been discussed or considered. We have meetings twice a year with all the attorneys-general from around Australia, and that specific idea of a national stalking helpline has not been on the agenda. I will ask my officials to look around and see if it can be considered.

But there would be limitations in the Australian context, though, I suspect, for a national helpline. Unlike some other jurisdictions around the world, our criminal law is generally the province of each state and territory. While being able to access help and support would be benefits of a national helpline, the actual how of getting the authorities to intervene would vary from state to state. I am happy to get my officials to have a look and consider it, but it might be that state-based ones in the Australian context might be more useful.

YOUTH CRIME

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:09): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding youth crime.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: *The Advertiser* reported on 23 October this year that there were three teenagers who allegedly stabbed a teen three times in the torso during a brawl at the Elizabeth shopping centre, which left a teen fighting for his life. Earlier this year we also saw teenagers who were allegedly armed with weapons who also had a brawl that plunged Westfield Marion into a lockdown. It was later reported by *The Advertiser* that one of these teenagers had a machete. My questions to the minister are:

1. In light of reports of youth crime, will the government rule out raising the age of criminal responsibility?
2. What new measures are being put in place to ensure that youth gangs are being held to account and that members of the community can feel safe in their place of work?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): I thank the honourable member very much for her question and ability to talk about this subject. In relation to the later part of her question—what new measures are being put in place—I am happy to repeat to a large extent the answers that I was able to provide to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I thank the honourable member for her question and for departing from the strategy of asking my colleague all the questions today to essentially repeat the question her leader asked yesterday. It is very helpful when that happens.

Some of the new measures that we talked about that are going to be put in place include an extensive and comprehensive review of knife laws in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I was able to inform the chamber yesterday, we once led the nation in terms of knife laws. What we have done is release a discussion paper. I believe there were more than 100 submissions to that, looking to do a whole range of things. One very small element of that is raising the age at which you can buy a knife, an element where I am very pleased to see the sincerest form of flattery being engaged in by the very inexperienced leadership team from another place where the very new shadow police minister, the member for Bragg, Jack Batty, and the L-plate Leader of the Opposition, Vincent Tarzia, have taken that one very small element and have flattered us by copying it and drafting a bill to raise the age from 16 to 18.

Of course, that in itself kind of ignores the fact that many 17 year olds could go to their kitchen cabinet or knife block in the kitchen and have access to a knife, but I applaud the Liberal Party for at least copying a tiny bit of what we are doing and looking at raising the age, although of and in itself I think most people would shake their head and think that by itself isn't going to be particularly effective.

That's why in relation to these new measures we are also looking at a number of other things in legislation we intend introducing very early next year that will include things like expanding authorities' ability to undertake metal detector searches—expanding them to things like public transport hubs and shopping centres, which I think will please greatly the honourable member who asked the question specifically in relation to a shopping centre, and expanding the definitions of schools in relation to increased fines for carrying a knife from just things like primary schools and high schools to other areas such as universities, TAFE campuses, preschool or childcare settings.

That is in addition to other measures we have already announced in relation to exactly what the honourable member has asked. Just this weekend—just this weekend—we announced, together with the independent retailers association and together with the SDA, the union that represents workers in retail settings, that we are looking to introduce workplace protection orders in South Australia.

These will be modelled similarly to something that already is in place and that from all the feedback that we have received is working very well in the ACT. That would give the ability, as it works in the ACT, for a workplace to seek an order from the Magistrates Court to bar someone from that workplace—that shop, in this instance—who was engaging in threatening or intimidating behaviour or in property damage that threatened people's safety or who has done those sorts of things. But we are looking to go further than what the ACT does and not just give workplaces the ability to do it but whole precincts, like shopping centres. We are also looking at giving things like industry associations the ability to apply for those workplace protection orders. So, absolutely, we are looking at things that we can do to protect South Australians in a retail setting.

That is in addition to some of the things we have already done. But wait, there is more. That is in addition to some things that we have already done, like significantly increasing the penalties for assaulting a retail worker. If my memory serves me correctly, we have already passed legislation that increases the penalty for basic assault of a retail worker from two to five years and aggravated assault from three to seven years, more than doubling, if I am remembering the exact amounts of penalties correctly.

In answer to the honourable member's question—are we doing anything?—absolutely, we are doing quite a lot in relation to the protection of not just people who work in the retail sector but also those who use the retail sector. The first part of the question from the honourable member was in relation to raising the age of criminal responsibility. Let me repeat very clearly what I have said before: this is aimed at what the evidence tells us makes the community safer. We will only look at doing anything in this field if it makes the community safer.

As I have said before in relation to the Hon. Robert Simms, who has asked questions about the minimum age of criminal responsibility a number of times, we do not have a policy position as a government, but if that was something that we did in South Australia it would be on the basis of evidence where it has happened before and making sure that there were other things in place rather than the criminal justice sanctions, therapeutic or family supports that would make the community

safer, working as we currently are with SAPOL to look at the evidence from around the world where these things have happened.

I do note that in many of the instances I think we see reported in the media, it wouldn't apply even if we did have a policy—which we don't—to raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility to many of the ages of people who are reported as offenders. The proposal that went out with the discussion paper was to raise the age to 12. From the reports that I have seen, most of the offenders are in the mid to later teenage years, not 10 or 11 year olds, but, as I say, we do not have a policy in that respect and anything that we do will be informed by the evidence, solely focusing on what makes the community safer.

PAIRING ARRANGEMENTS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:17): Mr President, I apologise that I haven't had an opportunity to give you prior notice of this, but I seek leave to ask you a question following a personal explanation given by the Hon. Jing Lee in this place yesterday.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I wasn't here at the time but, referring back to *Hansard*, I understand the Hon. Jing Lee gave a personal explanation in this place yesterday, which talked of the pressure and stress and the discomfort and vulnerability that she felt on the previous Wednesday when we were debating a bill in this place and said that that was brought on by interactions with a visitor who was here on that evening.

Reading what Ms Lee has said in her personal explanation, it appears that some of those matters may give rise to issues of privilege and, indeed, matters that may involve the police. As such, my question to you is: have you had a discussion with the honourable member in relation to those issues, and has it been disclosed to you who that visitor that she referred to was?

The PRESIDENT (15:18): Thanks for the question. Yes, it has been disclosed to me who the visitor was. I would probably need to talk to the Hon. Ms Lee, because whilst I haven't had a face-to-face conversation with her we have had a phone conversation. In conversations I have with members, I do respect their privacy. I will take the question on notice and try to talk to the Hon. Ms Lee when I can with regard to the substance of your question.

PAIRING ARRANGEMENTS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:19): Supplementary: I expect nothing less, and that is the respectful thing to do, but as such I would also ask if that is going to, with the member's permission, form part of the review that you are doing into the incident that took place on that evening?

The PRESIDENT (15:19): The Hon. Ms Bonaros, yes, it could, but I will say that I have had already quite a bit of damning correspondence with regard to the issue, and I will very carefully, with the advice of the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk, return to the chamber tomorrow with a statement outlining how we move forward from here, but it is not something that I am ready to discuss at the moment.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LEGALISATION OF MEDICINAL CANNABIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:20): My question to the Minister for Industrial Relations is: have you read the report and recommendations of the joint parliamentary select committee into medicinal cannabis, and what leadership role will you and your department play in implementing the recommendations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for her question very much. I have looked at the recommendations that were made. One of my colleagues in this chamber, once the recommendations were published, has helpfully referred me to them. I note that there are a number of recommendations that touch on legal issues that we will look at as the Attorney-General's Department, but I note there are a number of other issues that are much more broad than legal issues and we will, as a government, look at them more broadly.

I do note and appreciate the honourable member's very strong interest and advocacy in this area. I note that under the former Labor government the honourable member was instrumental in legislation that allowed for an industrial hemp industry in South Australia, and was also instrumental in the establishment not just of a medical pathway in South Australia—for which we led the nation for medicinal cannabis—but also, and importantly, what is a growing industry in South Australia in medicinal cannabis and the supply of that form of treatment, which is now legal right across Australia to people in Australia.

I think I have read a report about the potential for an export industry from South Australia in that respect as well, so we will look at it. I have seen the recommendations and we will consider them as a government.

Matters of Interest

FIRST RESPONDERS

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:22): I rise today to pay my thanks to the many South Australian police officers and frontline workers for their unwavering dedication and commitment to serving and protecting our community. As everyone in this chamber would know, I have a deep connection and respect for first responders who put on a uniform every day to make sure they keep South Australians safe, at times to the detriment of their own safety. It is something that no doubt presents different challenges and sacrifices for each frontline worker and, more broadly, for their families as well.

It is hard to miss the reporting in the media of late of assaults and antisocial behaviour that has been targeted towards police officers and first responders, behaviour that is quite frankly unacceptable. Only a few days ago it was reported that two officers were allegedly attacked in the early hours of Sunday morning on Hindley Street. It is also reported that in the early hours of Wednesday the 23rd, an officer was allegedly assaulted and bitten in Woodville and, on the same day, another officer was assaulted in Elizabeth.

In early October, two officers were attacked and taken to hospital after a serious incident at a CBD bus station and in September a female officer was glassed in the face in Ceduna. Just this week, we saw reports of a police officer who was brutally bashed while she was pregnant back in 2021. I have no doubt that there would be many more incidents than the ones I have listed here today, whether it be physical or verbal abuse that is targeted toward police officers, police officers who are just trying to do their job, people who are trying to keep our community safe, police officers who deserve to go to work and to come home to their families safely.

These brave members of SAPOL are mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, family members and friends. They, too, are human beings and deserve to be treated with respect. The officers who have been assaulted will now have to live through the trauma of being assaulted at work—a job that is ultimately fundamentally rooted in service and protecting our community. It is the least that can be done to repay their service and their dedication to our community that they are given respect so that they are able to do their work and then return home safely.

So today I acknowledge the service and sacrifice of our many frontline workers to say thank you. Today, I also shine a light on the importance of providing protections for our police and frontline workers so they can return home safely, as we are all able to do from our jobs. To the officers involved in the incidents I have just mentioned, my thoughts go to them and their families, and I acknowledge their service.

We talk often in this place about employees' rights to be safe at work. These officers deserve to know that they should be able to start and end their shift safely with the full support of the community, the parliament, the courts and their employer. Most people do the right thing in our community. Most people have respect for our men and women in blue and are grateful for their work and their service.

I, like so many in our community, am very supportive of our frontline workers and their contribution, so today I reaffirm my dedication to protecting those who protect us. I thank our police and all of our frontline workers, who face uncertain circumstances every single day. We are indeed very much indebted to the service you provide.

VAILO ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:26): With the Vailo 500 around the corner, it is a great time to once more reflect on the fact that Adelaide is, to borrow a phrase, the place to be. It is easy to see why, too: it is an event that continues to draw, frankly, enormous crowds. Almost 261,000 people attended the last event, with almost 20 per cent of those people coming from interstate and overseas. But, really, more than this, it is an event that saw a record over \$61 million in benefits to South Australia's local economy, with an increase in number of visitor nights to those choosing to stay just that little bit longer in our state.

The total number of visitor nights that last year's event drew to our state was 121,631. That is an increase of over 25 per cent on the original return of the event back in 2022. So it really seems that we are more than just the place to be—we are 'the place to be and to just stay a little bit longer' would seem more apt, and is that not great reflecting on whoever once had that title. We could not be more proud to have the race back and it is really great to see so many elected members of every stripe enjoying the event on race day. I am sure one day I will see the Hon. Mr Simms or the Hon. Tammy Franks there—I am sure I will.

To change gears ever so slightly, reflecting on the success of such a large event also brings me to reflect on those smaller events or those small clubs that make our state great. Local sporting and licensed clubs in South Australia are the backbone of sorts to what makes our community great. With over 1,272 licensed clubs in South Australia, our state has the highest number of clubs per capita in Australia, and with it a huge asset with the sole purpose of delivering back to our communities.

At the recent Clubs SA Clubs and Community Awards, it was fabulous to see so many of these fine clubs get the recognition they so richly deserve. I would like to mention them all, but with over 50 finalists and clubs and individuals receiving merit, the time limit on my contribution here today would not allow it. I will name a few, though: the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club received the Grassroots Sport award; the Glenelg Golf Club received the Environmental Awareness award; and the North Haven Surf Life Saving Club received the Inclusiveness award, and that is, by the way, for the third year in a row. The Murray Bridge Club received the Outstanding Community Service award; Chef of the Year went to Sarah Jones from the magnificent SA Jockey Club; and the Best Function Event Venue—little surprise to me—went to the SA Jockey Club in Morphettville.

In particular I want to mention two very specific awards: Employee of the Year and Volunteer of the Year, two great awards from Clubs SA that I think specifically highlight just how in touch with the community so many clubs are. The winner of Volunteer of the Year Award was Dennis Johnson from the Port Football and Community Sporting Club, located in Port Pirie. Importantly, Dennis' efforts were integral in turning around the club's fortunes, when not that long ago the club was actually facing insolvency. It is now thriving once again. Dennis gave and continues to give his time without hesitation and exemplifies I think the importance of people, who are the heart of so many community organisations.

The winner of Employee of the Year was Michelle Jones of the West Augusta Football Club. So many clubs have hearts of local and committed employees who give more than just sweat and tears to the club, and having been dedicated to West Augusta for over 20 years, Michelle is truly, I can assure you, one of those people.

In a quick plug for Clubs SA too, not every club is a Clubs SA member. I do hope those who have not yet signed up realise the competitive advantage they could receive—more than just awards—when they join. It seems that there has never been a better time for a good bit of collective action. To put the efforts of all these fabulous people who did receive awards in sharp relief, there can be little doubt that COVID taught us all just how important your local club can be, not just to have a pint and a parmy but also to meet friends or perhaps even make new ones.

The awards this year make it clear that, with the immediate pain of COVID having passed, all clubs and their volunteers and employees deserve to be congratulated on their forward thinking for what comes next and for how to adapt to a very different world of patrons, for sporting clubs and their participants.

QANTAS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:31): It seems that Qantas has been in free fall since the end of the turbulent Alan Joyce era. The national carrier's once proud brand and reputation has been badly tarnished through a series of scandals, particularly from the COVID era to the present day.

Where do you start? With the hefty penalties imposed following its brutal and ruthless treatment of staff during the pandemic and outsourcing their jobs, while banking hundreds of millions of dollars in JobKeeper that was designed to keep them in their jobs? With their unreliability with cancelled flights at the last minute, selling non-existent flights, substandard service, the obscene \$24 million golden handshake the board gave to departing CEO Alan Joyce, which was later slashed by a mere \$9 million? With the airline's objection and support for the Albanese government's inexplicable decision to not allow more flights by Qatar Airways, which was judged as the best airline in the world, and which then generated a lame excuse that part of the reason was the treatment of some female Australian passengers at Doha airport after a newborn had been found abandoned in a toilet?

But now we know that Qantas and its former CEO Joyce have enjoyed quite a cosy relationship with Prime Minister Albanese, going back to the days when he was Minister for Transport. The national headlines today will give no comfort to Qantas, nor the floundering prime ministership of Albanese, if the claims by author and journalist Joe Aston in his book *The Chairman's Lounge* that Albanese asked and got flight upgrades when he was a minister of the Crown are true.

In a train wreck press conference yesterday—probably one of the most embarrassing I have seen from a serving Prime Minister—rattled Albanese stumbled and bumbled his way through the questions fired at him, without being able to refute the allegations. More embarrassing for him and his 11 media advisers was that he even got it terribly wrong when he accused Aston of not declaring conflicts of interest.

His relationship with Qantas and Joyce is certain to be blowtorched when federal parliament resumes next week. It begs the question: whose interest does Qantas, now a publicly listed company, really serve? Its customers or its political masters? Albanese said his government always stood up to Qantas; after the latest revelations, perhaps that should read they 'stood up for Qantas'.

Australians continue to pay very high fares to travel overseas and, for that matter, interstate. The disgraceful decision to not allow more Qatar flights restricts competition. It was to Qantas's advantage, and Joyce lobbied hard to stop them because he claimed it would distort the market. What it has done is keep fares high for Qantas and boosted its bottom line, which is what its shareholders want.

That brings me to Qantas's attitude towards Adelaide and South Australia: they still treat us like some hick country town. It has been more than 10 years since the last international flight operated by Qantas flew out of Adelaide to Singapore. We remain the only mainland capital where the flying kangaroo does not have international flights.

Yesterday, the Premier spruiked the return of Qantas's alliance partner, Emirates, to Adelaide this week. It is a welcome return, and we would like to see more airlines follow suit to give travellers a greater choice of international destinations direct from their own city and to bring down fares; however, now that its partner Emirates is back in town, why would Qantas even want to offer any international flights that can be covered by the UAE carrier? Sure, we have Qantas's discount affiliate Jetstar with flights to Bali, but that is about it. A direct flight to Tokyo would not be a bad idea.

Former Labor Treasurer Kevin Foley revealed on radio yesterday that Joyce, when he was CEO of Jetstar, approached him and Premier Mike Rann about making Adelaide a Jetstar hub. They rejected the offer, and for good reason. Only as recently as July this year, Qantas International CEO Cam Wallace and group CEO Vanessa Hudson revealed a shortlist of new international routes to fly with the new planes they have on order, destinations like Seattle, Las Vegas, Chicago and Athens, which is probably one of the most popular cities for South Australians. They spoke about direct flights out of Brisbane and Perth—Adelaide is not on the radar.

The Premier last year spoke of his disappointment that Qantas continues to give Adelaide the short shrift. It is time he ramped it up again. In the meantime, I will be starting an online petition for Qantas to bring back international flights to Adelaide.

DECRIMINALISATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY 50TH ANNIVERSARY

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:36): I rise to reflect today on an important milestone for the queer community in South Australia soon to be celebrated next year. I have spoken many times in this place on the murder of Dr George Duncan, who was thrown into the River Torrens by SAPOL vice squad officers and drowned on 10 May 1972. I have reflected on how Dr Duncan's murder catalysed gay rights reform in South Australia, leading to decriminalisation of homosexuality in this state. This happened on 2 October 1975, with the passing of the then Attorney-General Peter Duncan's Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Act after having introduced it three times.

Duncan first introduced his bill in September 1973, but it was amended and watered down, falling short of decriminalisation. Speaking to the bill, Peter Duncan said:

The effect of the present position is that a minority of otherwise law-abiding citizens are declared criminals and are unable to make to society the useful contribution that they would otherwise be able to make.

While it passed, the amendments ensured that homosexuality remained a criminal offence in South Australia. The two years following this first attempt by Peter Duncan in 1973 saw very open and very public vitriol directed against gay South Australians. As a 12 year old and 13 year old at the time, I lived through that, wondering how it was going to impact me and my life as I was growing up, knowing exactly what I was and seeing exactly what I was being torn apart on the front pages of the papers. This frequently characterised gay men as being sick and pitiable. The Festival of Light, for example, claimed in its submission to parliament that:

...homosexuality is an abnormal development of sexual interest and contrary to nature; is personally and socially degrading; and is both an expression of and a contributor to the breakdown of the family in our society.

On a better note, *The Advertiser* has run a number of editorials in its time in which it came out for the decriminalisation. An editorial on 22 November 1973 stated:

The present law on homosexual behaviour is unsupportable, it needlessly intrudes into the private lives of many citizens and quite unjustifiably attempts to impose a particular code of behaviour upon them. It is one of the reasons why some homosexuals lead unhappy, sometimes tragic lives.

I have not spoken often in a kind sense of *The Advertiser*, but in this situation I must give them credit for their editorials at that time. Peter Duncan introduced his original bill again in August 1975, following two years of changing public sentiment and debate. After passing through the House of Assembly unamended, the bill was introduced in the Legislative Council. It lost, then it was introduced again immediately. It lost again and was reintroduced a third time, at which time it passed—such a drama for such a big change.

This achievement is variously described as the first gay decriminalisation legislation to pass either in the English-speaking world or in the commonwealth or in a Westminster system jurisdiction. We are not quite sure which first it is. Hopefully, soon we will find out, but it was certainly the first place in Australia and it was a remarkable thing for our state and is mentioned often around the world.

Former President of this council Anne Levy is quoted in *The Advertiser* on 22 November 1973 about Peter Duncan's first bill when it was discussed, saying that:

This Bill is part of a worldwide trend to reform law in this area. I believe there is wide community support for a bill of this nature in Australia.

There are many, many quotes from *Hansard* during many of those debates that I could reference that have rather negative sentiments. Some of them are quite ugly to our ears today, including many contributions from the honourable members in their wisdom. There are also a number of unattractive positions put in *The Advertiser* in letters to the editor and other articles quoting members of this parliament. One day I might get up and remind the chamber of some of the attitudes that were openly espoused in this place 50 years ago.

I would like to instead indicate how far we have come in the 50 years since the legislation passed in 1975. I will quote from a more recent debate, one which I think most of us were here for. In his speech on 1 December 2016, Premier Jay Weatherill apologised for the past discrimination to the queer community. He said:

We are acknowledging that all LGBTIQ people are valued citizens of this state and must be treated with fairness and decency. We are saying in law that difference must no longer translate into discrimination and disadvantage. We are saying that the wrongs of the past must never be repeated but that there is still more work to be done.

I look forward to further commemoration next year of this milestone 50th anniversary of a piece of legislation.

FARMERS' MENTAL HEALTH

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:41): Today, I rise to highlight the challenges facing our South Australian farmers, challenges that impact not just their work in the paddock but their mental wellbeing as well. Mental health struggles of farmers are gaining attention, with reports of an unprecedented drought crisis and rural mental health crisis laid bare. The facts are stark: farmer suicide rates are double those of other workers, yet they are half as likely to see a GP or mental health professional compared with others. This is not just a statistic. It reflects the isolation and the immense pressure that many of our farmers are facing daily.

The organisation ifarmwell points to a troubling stigma that keeps many farmers from seeking mental health support. Known for their independence, a reluctance to complain and a 'farm comes first' attitude, many farmers end up bearing these burdens alone. On top of that, the public often misunderstands their struggles. Brad Perry, CEO of Grain Producers SA, spoke out recently in the *Stock Journal* against some of these misconceptions. Comments like 'Farmers should just sell another beach house or the LandCruiser' or 'It's only been one bad season' reveal just how disconnected these views are from the reality of life on the land.

The reality is that farmers are crucial to our state's economy. Last year, they contributed over \$18 billion, making up more than half of South Australia's export revenue. With such a huge responsibility to keep the state thriving, it is no wonder that many farmers feel the weight of the world on their shoulders.

Their costs are enormous, from machinery to fuel, chemicals to feed, and more. These are some of the highest input costs in any industry and they are only going up. Cost-of-living pressures are hitting South Australians hard and farmers are feeling the pinch even more. Electricity, water, groceries and insurance are all on the rise and for many of our farmers these increases mean an extra strain on budgets that are already past breaking point. Unique expenses of farming and rising costs have led many to face deficits in the hundreds of thousands. For them, a failed crop or a season of drought is not just a setback, it is a crisis.

Mental Health Australia's recent national report highlights the impact of these rising living costs on Australian's wellbeing, but farmers are facing even bigger pressures. A recent study by the University of South Australia revealed that the economic cost of mental health issues in Australia ranges between \$200 billion and \$220 billion annually. For farmers who face financial uncertainty and external stressors, these challenges are especially acute.

Ifarmwell's findings emphasise that major stressors for farmers include financial pressure, unpredictable regulations and the growing disconnect between rural and urban perspectives on farming. One farmer put it pretty bluntly: 'We are ready for droughts, for floods, and for fires, but not for the additional stress from government interference.' This year has been exceptionally tough. Farmers are dealing with a live sheep export ban, the most severe vineyard frost in decades, an undeclared drought, issues with sheep eID and the recent tomato virus outbreak. Each of these adds to the daily stress and sense of being left behind. We are fortunate to have organisations like Beyond Blue, R U OK?, FarmHub, ifarmwell, Head to Health and Fat Farmers stepping up to support our farmers.

These groups are working to shift the culture around mental health, reminding farmers that seeking support is not a weakness. While this is a positive step, we need government support that

acknowledges and respects farmers' unique needs. Our farmers are not asking for special treatment, they are just asking for a fair go and an understanding of their realities. They are the heart of our economy and they need solutions that match their specific challenges. We cannot just pat them on the back and tell them to be resilient; they need real, targeted support.

I am very keen that in the future this parliament will play its part in being able to get out into the regions and to listen, and I certainly will be advocating for that from a community perspective for us to look into an inquiry into this. To close, I will share the words of a South Australian farmer who said:

As a nation, we say we love our farmers. If that's the case, then we as a nation should be greatly concerned about one of the biggest issues farmers are facing every day. And we need to start now—because for some, tomorrow may be too late.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:46): I rise today to speak about Breast Cancer Awareness Month, which occurs every year during October. It provides us with an opportunity to focus on the impact of this disease and on those affected by it in our communities. Breast cancer remains the most common cancer among Australian women aside from non-melanoma skin cancer. It is the most common cancer experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and is the second leading cause of cancer death after lung cancer. Research shows that survival of this disease is lower in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women than for the rest of the population.

We all know someone affected by cancer, be it a friend, a family member or a colleague. A breast cancer diagnosis and treatment not only affects one's body but also one's mental health. Emotional distress such as anxiety and depression has been increasingly associated with disease outcomes, as well as a patient's quality of life. A diagnosis is a critical event with a potentially traumatic nature that is complex to navigate, particularly for those women who are diagnosed under the age of 50.

This October, the Breast Cancer Network of Australia is commemorating Breast Cancer Month by shining a light on the connections between us, and recognising the community that supports those affected by breast cancer. The chosen theme this year is 'connection and community'. Community plays an important role in uplifting those who are navigating a diagnosis. Their support can be a major influence on the mental health of those impacted by cancer and their families. Everyone should have access to the support they need from community, peers and healthcare providers, whether they are a woman in metropolitan Adelaide or a woman in rural South Australia.

I am in awe of women who navigate the minefield of a cancer diagnosis with dignity and strength and my thoughts are with those who do not have the support networks in the country, and those in rural areas who have limited access to breast screening programs. Early detection of breast cancer provides the best chance for effective treatment. Knowing what to be on the lookout for is essential. However, there is often a cult of silence around women's health issues, from fertility to sexual health to menstrual issues to menopause and diseases such as breast cancer.

To know the early warning signs, we must communicate and destigmatise discussions about women's health care. Having interacted with women from all different communities in South Australia, I can tell you that there are women who report emotional barriers to screenings, or face greater challenges in understanding health information well enough to know what to do or what to look for.

The Australian Red Cross, in collaboration with the Multicultural Centre for Women's Health and funded by the Australian government, is delivering the Screening Saves Lives program aimed at improving migrant and refugee communities' participation in breast, cervical and bowel cancer screening through the delivery of health education sessions and community engagement activities.

It is not all bad news. It is encouraging that survival rates continue to improve in Australia: 89 out of every 100 women diagnosed with invasive breast cancer now survive five or more years beyond diagnosis. I would take this opportunity to encourage all women to reach out to their GP or any other health professional to talk about prevention, screening and resources that may be available in their native language.

Although Breast Cancer Awareness Month is coming to an end this week, it is important to keep the conversation going in order to address disparities, improve the lives of people affected and minimise breast cancer's impact.

STEVENS, CMMR G.J.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:50): I rise today to recognise and honour our Police Commissioner Grant Stevens, a man whose steadfast leadership and dedication to South Australia has always been exemplary but has been especially evident and appreciated in more recent times.

It is difficult to believe that it has now been almost one year since we learnt of the tragic passing of Commissioner Stevens' beloved son, Charlie. It was not only an incredible shock to the police community in our state to learn of Charlie's untimely death in a hit-and-run accident when he was out enjoying the schoolies week celebration on the south coast, as most high school graduates do, but also to the wider South Australian community, which has become familiar with our police commissioner over the past nine years that he has fulfilled that role.

Last week, we of course learned the fate of the driver who killed Charlie, Mr Dhirren Randhawa, who fled the scene after striking Charlie with his vehicle and leaving him with an irreversible brain injury that later caused him to die. As members would be aware, Randhawa pleaded guilty to aggravated driving without due care and leaving the scene of an accident after causing death.

Randhawa has now rightly lost his driver's licence for 10 years, and although he was sentenced to one year in prison he will walk free, given the sentence was suspended upon the 19 year old entering into a \$1,000 good behaviour bond. Although there would be no penalty great enough to compensate for the loss of a child, the consequences of such deadly conduct on our roads should still serve as a deterrent, and this sentencing outcome, in my opinion, does not serve as a sufficient deterrent.

After learning of Randhawa's fate, Police Commissioner Grant Stevens displayed his characteristic dignity, diplomacy and grace outside of the court. In the face of the unimaginable anguish of losing a son, Commissioner Stevens has continued in his unwavering service to our state, leading our police force with integrity, compassion and commitment.

It was therefore not at all surprising to hear the recent announcement that Commissioner Stevens has been nominated for the 2025 Australian of the Year Award. He, along with his wife, Emma, have demonstrated immense bravery in the wake of Charlie's death through using their experience as an opportunity to advocate for positive change during their deep bereavement. For instance, they brought awareness to the need for organ donation and greater youth engagement, and they also called for donations towards Operation Flinders in lieu of laying flowers. I am aware that this particular appeal has resulted in some \$217,000 being raised for the organisation to support at-risk young people, which is an incredible achievement. These actions are indeed commendable.

I am sure all South Australians would agree that the police commissioner's nomination for Australian of the Year is a fitting tribute, one that aptly acknowledges his dedication, sacrifice and exemplary service to our state. Throughout a number of crises South Australia has endured, from devastating bushfires to the recent COVID-19 pandemic, Commissioner Stevens has never failed to be an admirable leader in his endeavours to ensure the safety and wellbeing of South Australians.

His leadership has been marked by not only an unwavering resilience but by an empathy that reflects his genuine care for the people he serves. It is a recognition of his exceptional career and, equally, of his personal strength in what were undoubtedly the most difficult, challenging and devastating moments of his life.

In paying tribute to Commissioner Stevens today, I take this opportunity to extend my sincerest condolences to him and his family. May they find some comfort in knowing that, through their efforts, Charlie's legacy will continue to benefit and touch the lives of many South Australians. We owe him and his family a great deal.

*Bills***AUTHORISED BETTING OPERATIONS (USER BANS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:55): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Next week, hundreds of millions of dollars will be splurged on the Melbourne Cup, the horse race that stops the nation. A lot of money will be won and a lot more money lost through various gambling channels, including the biggest area that has emerged in recent times, the online betting platforms. But what if I told you that winners can only be losers on these platforms? Yes, you heard me correctly: winners can only be losers.

Today, I rise to present the Authorised Betting Operations (User Bans) Amendment Bill 2024. This bill tackles one of the most underhanded, exploitative, underpublicised and little-known tactics employed by betting companies: banning or restricting punters simply because they have dared to beat the system. Betting in Australia has long been a system rigged against the punter—consumer—or, dare I say it, suckers.

The thrill of the bet—punters versus bookies—has been one of Australia's colourful pastimes, each trying to beat the other at their game. The world of gambling today is far more sophisticated and expansive than it was in the pre-internet/computer era, when the only tools punters relied on were form guides, tips or shady practices. In the old days, the unscrupulous types would resort to all manner of deceitful ways to improve their odds of winning and beating the bookies: fixing races, nobbling runners, using whips that would release an electric charge, even trying ring-ins like the infamous Fine Cotton case back in the 1980s. You would not get away with that skulduggery today, as racing is heavily regulated.

I can vividly recall the hysteria that followed one particular punter who struck fear into the cold hearts of bookmakers around the country in the 1970s: Eddie 'The Fireman' Birchley, given the nickname because he really was a fireman. He made headlines with his raids on bookies, placing huge cash bets on short-price runners in smaller fields, with lots of success. He made some spectacular losses too.

When the Queensland TAB and bookies in that state cottoned on to his gambit, they changed the rules, forcing Eddie to ply his luck in the crowded betting rings in Melbourne and Sydney, where he became quite a celebrated figure, taking on the likes of Bill Waterhouse, Terry Page and Lenny Burke.

One of his biggest wins was in 1974, plonking \$200,000 on a six-to-one pop at Flemington called Caboul, a brilliant sprinter I remember well, as I also followed him in my younger years when I lived and worked in Melbourne. The Fireman collected \$1.2 million plus his money back that day. I reckon I had a modest \$5 each way.

The traditional bookie is all but a relic of bygone days, when there would be dozens of them in betting rings at racecourses, laying off big wagers to other bookies to avoid losses. Today, the sophistication in their operations is unmatched. Their algorithms pick up on every tiny detail, from the way you swipe on your phone application to the IP address you use when making bets. If you are banned, every IP address you have ever used will be similarly blackmarked, just in case you pass on your strategy to another person.

To highlight just how sophisticated these betting operators are, let me give you some figures. Flutter Entertainment, the conglomerate that owns Australia's Sportsbet and myriad other international betting agencies, has a market capitalisation of \$60 billion, of which Sportsbet contributed \$2.2 billion in 2023 alone.

Tabcorp, which owns TAB and Sky Racing, had a 2023 revenue of \$2.34 billion. Then we have Entain group, a multinational operating in over 30 gambling markets worldwide, including Australia's Neds and Ladbrokes, which turned over \$9 billion in 2023. The technology, data capabilities and resources of these companies are unrivalled, and with a progression in technology come smart and well-resourced gamblers attempting to improve their chances of landing winners.

Some punters are just really good at analysis. Others utilise complex computer algorithms, and of course those betting companies have wised up and devised their own way to ensure they still hold the upper hand. They simply ban the punter. The Fireman would not stand a chance of collecting big pots of cash these days.

These multinational sports betting groups know there is no such thing as responsible gambling, and the idea that any of these companies play fair is the biggest con they have ever pulled on the public. For too long we have allowed these operations to profit from the misery of losing gamblers, all while they very quietly remove the winners from the equation.

But does the public understand their business model? Do the people in this chamber? Have any of you ever read and understood the terms and conditions when you create an account? Have you read that tiny paragraph in there that allows the platform to restrict or ban you at any point without notice or reason? Of course not, and herein lies the problem.

At the heart of this legislation are the fundamental principles of fairness and commercial viability. Betting operations are one, if not the only, business model that sustains its viability by arbitrarily restricting or banning users who pose a threat to their profit margins. They want losers, sucker punters.

These companies have departments of people in risk management whose sole job is, and I am not kidding, to identify, limit or ban perceived profitable players or those who do not bet with the status quo (who lose). And when they do ban you, they do not even have to give a reason as to why. If you do not believe me when I say this happens, just ask my adviser. He has been restricted from all major Australian gambling platforms since 2021. This is not an isolated case; it is industry practice. Essentially, it is only possible to lose and, for those suckers, these greedy, some might say unscrupulous companies, are more than happy to incentivise and take your money.

This legislation seeks to introduce specific measures to counteract those grossly unfair practices, and provide greater transparency and fairness for punters. So what does the bill do? Most importantly, betting companies will no longer be allowed to ban, refuse or restrict punters simply because they win or have a certain betting strategy. No more banning winners or changing the odds on specific players just to save their bottom line.

These companies enter the market freely, and they need to play by the rules, not rig the system in their favour. In fairness to smaller betting operations, the bill does allow a company to refuse a bet that pays out more than \$5,000 over the stake if they cannot afford it, but that is the only exception.

Betting companies enter the market willingly, and pocket billions of dollars from losing bets willingly, so they cannot cry poor when it comes time to pay out a winner. If they cannot manage the financial risks inherent in the industry without fixing it, then perhaps they should not be operating at all.

The bill will, in the case a punter is restricted, force these companies to give written reasons why they refuse or restrict your bet. No more hiding behind silence or arbitrary decisions. If they are going to block you, they will have to explain themselves. Punters deserve transparency, not cloak-and-dagger tactics.

Moreover, betting companies will not be able to exploit minimum payout or withdrawal limits to hold on to your money. You win? You get paid. No sneaky barriers or limits designed to stop you from collecting what is rightfully yours. If these companies step out of line, they will face fines of up to \$500,000 or two years' imprisonment for repeat offending. This is not just a slap on the wrist; it is a warning shot across the bow to stop exploiting users.

This bill does not stop betting operations from taking action in circumstances of suspected unlawful activity, like in the instance of soccer players gaming the system through participation in exotic bets, or where a punter has sought self-exclusion. I will note here that some of these betting companies have now quietly opted out of offering markets on exotic betting on reality television programs. So they have quietly stopped that, but they should not be allowed to punish individuals for simply having a certain strategy or being successful. If a business cannot handle the risk inherent in their business model, then they should not be in the business at all.

Let me be very clear: this is not about banning gambling. Far from it. This is about people being taken advantage of, and not knowing what they are up against. It is time we stopped letting betting companies operate like cartels, profiting from the misery of losing punters or shutting out the few who manage to succeed. We can no longer sit back and allow these companies to limit or ban those who play by the rules and win fair and square. If we are going to allow them to operate, they operate like every other company and if they cannot survive without exploiting both winners and losers, then they should not be in business.

Unfortunately, this bill creates a dilemma for our state government. It says gambling is destructive and that it is here to help people. It lists its principles as, and I quote, 'a better future for South Australians where everyone deserves a fair go'. But it knows its betting operations tax, which lines the government's coffers with \$60 million of the over \$600 million in annual gambling tax, will be affected if more people are winning.

The bill is a straightforward proposal: stick to your principles and give everyone a fair go. Ensure that if betting companies want to continue exploiting losers then they must be held accountable and assume the risk that there will be winners. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and I commend the bill to the council.

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

Motions

SURVEILLANCE DEVICES ACT REGULATIONS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:10): I move:

That the regulations under the Surveillance Devices Act 2016 concerning prescribed circumstances, made on 6 June 2024 and laid on the table of this council on 18 June 2024, be disallowed.

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

VETERINARY INDUSTRY

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

1. That in the opinion of this council a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the effects of long hours, financial strain, high workload and high pressure on the poor mental health and wellbeing of veterinarians in South Australia, with particular reference to—
 - (a) quantifying the significant economic, social, and emotional benefits that veterinary industry brings to society and having this acknowledged by government and industry;
 - (b) measures that can be taken to improve veterinarian retention rates, including incentives for working in rural and regional areas;
 - (c) working conditions, including remuneration, unpaid hours, safe workplace culture and client conduct standards;
 - (d) measuring and identifying initiatives to prevent the high rates of suicide and burnout among veterinarians, particularly in regional and rural areas;
 - (e) the role played by veterinarians in providing care to lost, stray, and homeless animals and injured wildlife, dealing with emergency situations, and the financial burden incurred by veterinarians in these circumstances;
 - (f) reviewing the roles and responsibilities of veterinary nurses with a view to relieving pressure on veterinarians, as well as the training of veterinary nurses and the related workforce;

- (g) regulation of veterinary practices, including compliance with psychosocial legislation for the workplace, maximum work hours and after-hours practices;
 - (h) strategies to improve access to veterinary care during a cost-of-living crisis, including pricing transparency, pet insurance, and other support for disadvantaged animal owners;
 - (i) the role of universities in preparing veterinarians for practice and the transition to the workforce; and
 - (j) any other related matter.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
 3. That members of the committee may participate in the proceedings by way of telephone or video conference or other electronic means and shall be deemed to be present and counted for purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member.
 4. That this council permits the joint committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.
 5. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 15 May 2024.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:12): As many members would know, I have previously spoken on this issue relating to my personal experience as a veterinarian. The reason why I became a vet and the reason why veterinarians choose this occupation is that we care for the wellbeing and welfare of animals. You would certainly choose another job if you were unwilling to work hard and were motivated only by material gain.

I have personal experience with the working conditions mentioned in this motion by the Hon. Sarah Game through my 16 years working as a country veterinarian. It is a job that requires constant commitment and always being on hold waiting on a call that may come at any time, at any hour of the day or night to treat a family pet or a farmer's livestock. There are often long days of work with little rest and the need to be at the ready for days at a time, which can be incredibly draining.

There are also extremely positive experiences as well. The bond between a human and an animal is a wonderful thing to witness. It is these positive moments that keep many veterinarians going. As veterinarians, we care deeply about animal welfare. It is often distressing when encountering animals in pain, either from injury, disease or abuse, and feeling the pressure of having to treat them and relieve their pain as quickly and effectively as possible.

This pressure is often intensified when stressed pet owners, dealing with highly emotive situations, are verbally abusive or even violent towards veterinarians. This is why so many veterinarians are prone to anxiety and depression and, unfortunately, the suicide rate amongst veterinarians is three to four times that among the general population.

Around 75 per cent of these tragic cases are young people, under the age of 65. If this rate of loss of life among young people took place due to negligence, disease or road trauma, there would be widespread community commitment to action—and so there should be. This is why South Australian based initiative Sophie's Legacy was established in recognition of Dr Sophie Putland, a young veterinarian who took her own life at the age of 33, after the pressures of the job became unbearable. Sophie's parents, Garry and Kate Putland, launched the public campaign entitled We're Only Human to raise awareness of the problem and to change attitudes towards veterinarians.

I specifically pay tribute to Garry, Kate and their wider family for their strength in championing this cause for the sake of all veterinarians around our state, our nation and around the globe. A similar program in the US called Not One More Vet is also campaigning against veterinarian suicides and has now engaged over 26,000 practising veterinarians worldwide.

A New South Wales government inquiry into veterinary workforce shortages in that state resulted in 34 recommendations, with some of those recommendations focusing on addressing the problems with mental health within the profession. I do hope this parliament in its inquiry also takes note of that interstate inquiry and the recommendations of that inquiry in its deliberations.

This issue and this motion has the strong support of the Liberal opposition. There is a case to integrate mental health and self-care education into the curriculum for veterinary students to ensure that aspiring future veterinarians are equipped with the skills to deal with the challenges the job may present. These are the types of measures that may be found through such an inquiry, and the types of measures that will be needed to achieve the necessary reform in the veterinary profession. As a lead speaker on behalf of the opposition, and as a veterinarian for over a decade, we absolutely support this motion, this inquiry, and I commend it to the chamber.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:17): I rise on behalf of the Greens to support the motion of the Hon. Sarah Game and support an inquiry into the veterinary industry, driven of course by, as she stated in her speech to this motion, the need to support veterinarians in what is, I am sure, a rewarding but very challenging profession. As she said:

We associate veterinarians with compassion and love for animals, with intelligence and hard work. It is all true. What we do not hear so much is just how resilient and capable veterinarians are and yet they are topping the list for dying from suicide. Let's not keep asking veterinarians to be more resilient and manage stress better, while insisting that they work in toxic work environments so brutal that almost no-one else could stand it.

Incredibly powerful words from the honourable member, and I think a really important matter to bring before this place, so the Greens welcome the establishment of the inquiry and we will look with interest at its recommendations and work.

It is of course well known to many members of this council that some of the momentum around this issue, unfortunately, comes from tragedy and from those vets who have died by suicide—as the Hon. Nicola Centofanti noted, somewhere between three or four times more likely than the rest of the population. This is an horrific figure. It is put down to issues such as the pricing, lack of insurance, the long hours and the nature of the work. One particular case, that of Dr Sophie Putland, who died by suicide in 2021 at the age of just 33, and the work of her parents, Garry and Kate Putland, to raise these issues really is a testament to why we need to support this inquiry today and why more must be done. We cannot simply turn away from these issues.

We do need to be looking also at what compensation there is for vets who care for lost, stray or homeless animals or, indeed, injured wildlife. I deal a lot in my portfolios with animal welfare issues. I cannot but commend the work of the vets and those rescue groups and carers who attempt to pay the costs, which are not covered in any public insurance scheme but are expected by the public. People love their pets as well, and people love animals, and emotions are often very high at these extreme times when a veterinarian is needed, particularly with an acute response or euthanasia.

It will come as no surprise to members of this council that some things are above politics, and the Greens are very happy today to support a One Nation member's motion to put a really important issue on the table. We note the words of the opposition as well and can only imagine that this is beyond politics. With that, I commend the work of the member and look forward to her progressing this.

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (16:20): I rise on behalf of the government to indicate our support for the motion to establish a joint committee to investigate the mental health and wellbeing of vets. Vets play a key role in animal, human and community wellbeing by maintaining the health and welfare of our pets. They also play an important role in maintaining the productivity and growth of our livestock industries.

Everyone who has a pet or animal they love has at some point been extremely grateful for the presence and service of a vet. They are key members of our communities and deserve to work under conditions that reflect their value and support a long-term career. Last year, the government passed the Veterinary Services Act 2023, recognising the significant changes that have occurred to the profession in the last 20 years. These include changes to practice models and location, employment type, species serviced and specialties offered, and also reflect an increase in mainstream non-veterinary services.

The state government are aware of the challenges facing vets in South Australia and are happy to give our support for the establishment of this committee. We look forward to what we may learn about the impact of various stressors on the mental health and wellbeing of vets in order to better understand them and continue our support for the profession.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:22): Thank you to the honourable members, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Hon. Mira El Dannawi and the Hon. Tammy Franks, for speaking in support of the motion to establish the veterinary inquiry. It is a real privilege to do something for all my veterinary colleagues who I have worked with. I have the utmost respect for them. They are highly intelligent, highly responsible, highly resourceful, highly compassionate people working in a very difficult environment.

There is something very concerning going on with the veterinary industry. We have highly resilient, highly capable people, yet they are taking their own lives and leaving the profession. I really hope that this inquiry starts to bust the myth that they are just very sensitive people who need to learn to build resilience or gain tools in this area. We know that they are resilient people. They have done very well at school, they have done very well at university, and they are surviving incredibly difficult work environments.

I hope that this inquiry will bring about real change to the extraordinary financial hardship, the very long hours and the incredibly high-pressure environment that these people work in. I want to acknowledge Garry and Kate Putland: I do not think there is anyone else who has done more for those suffering in the veterinary profession. With that, I conclude the debate.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING

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

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the release of *A decade of inequity* report commissioned by the Australian Education Union which found:
 - (a) public schools in South Australia educate proportionally twice the number of students from low socio-educational advantage backgrounds compared to private schools and 3.5 times the number of First Nations students than private schools;
 - (b) under current settings, South Australian public schools will continue to be underfunded by the commonwealth and state governments by \$1.8 billion over the next five years, while private schools will be overfunded by \$79.7 million;
 - (c) every public school student in South Australia will be underfunded by \$2,003 in 2024, rising to \$2,259 in 2028; and
 - (d) on a per-student basis, every private school student in South Australia will receive \$598 above their full School Resource Standard in combined state and commonwealth funding this year.
2. Calls on the federal government to increase their share to a minimum 25 per cent of the School Resource Standard funding to ensure South Australian public schools are fully funded.

(Continued from 16 October 2024.)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (16:24): I rise to indicate that the government will support the motion of the Hon. Robert Simms MLC with some amendments. I would like to thank the Hon. Mr Simms for bringing this important motion to the Legislative Council. The government supports the call on the Australian government to increase their share to a minimum 25 per cent of the Schooling Resource Standard funding to ensure South Australian public schools are fully funded. I might just take a moment to explain why we are moving the amendments that are standing in my name.

Under current national school funding arrangements, South Australian government schools are funded up to 95 per cent of the Schooling Resource Standard (SRS). The SRS is an estimate of how much total public funding a school needs to meet the educational needs of its students. The Australian government contributes 20 per cent of the SRS entitlement for government schools, while the state government contributes up to 75 per cent. This creates a legislative funding shortfall of

5 per cent for government schools, which equates to approximately \$190 million per annum in a 2025 value, I am advised.

I am committed to continue working with the Hon. Robert Simms on this matter and to ask our minister to continue his campaign, along with the AEU and other advocacy bodies in this area, to work for 100 per cent fair funding levels for all public schools in Australia.

The Hon. Mr Simms is absolutely right to call out in his motion that public schools are underfunded. He is also absolutely right to call out the fact that public schools have educated proportionately twice the number of students from low socio-educational advantage backgrounds and 3.5 times the number of First Nations students. This makes the task of getting to full funding that much more important.

The South Australian government's focus is to support all our students to have access to a quality education so they can learn and thrive not only in school but later in life. To do this, we need full and fair funding for all schools. However, the government does propose to amend the Hon. Mr Simms' motion as I will outline. We seek to amend (b) to call out the underfunding of public schools, but do not seek to suggest that any particular sector is overfunded and to correct the figures that are in the motion, which I have been advised are not correct. It is therefore not fair to suggest that any school is overfunded; it is just a relative comparison that is made between schools of certain sectors.

Further, the government proposes to remove (c) and (d) from the motion. These figures would require further investigation to ensure the accuracy and I do not have that accurate information at hand. The Department for Education has also queried some of the figures, so out of an abundance of caution I am seeking to remove (c) and (d) from the motion. Therefore, I move to amend the motion as follows:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the release of *A decade of inequity* report commissioned by the Australian Education Union which found:
 - (a) Public schools in South Australia educate proportionally twice the number of students from low socio-educational advantage backgrounds compared to private schools and 3.5 times the number of First Nations students than private schools;
 - (b) Under current settings, South Australian public schools will continue to be underfunded by the commonwealth and state governments over the next five years.
2. Calls on the federal government to increase their share to a minimum 25 per cent of the Schooling Resource Standard funding to ensure South Australian public schools are fully funded.

With that, the government will continue to advocate for full funding of public schools. It was a Labor government that initiated the Gonski reforms, and it will be a Labor government that finally gets schools to 100 per cent of the SRS and I welcome all members of this chamber working with us to achieve that outcome from the federal government.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:27): I rise on behalf of the opposition to speak on this motion. School funding has been a complex discussion in Australian politics for many decades. State and federal governments and government and non-government schools all have slightly different points of view. Ultimately, most Australians agree that all schools should receive an appropriate level of support based on the needs of their students.

The current framework for needs-based school funding in Australia was designed by a committee led by business leader David Gonski. It may not be perfect, but the current arrangements probably represent the most widely accepted resolution to this question that has been put forward and is in place under federal law. In honour of David Gonski's work, funding committed under this framework is still known as 'Gonski funding'.

The basic framework effectively identifies how much funding the state and federal governments should provide to schools based on their needs. The model starts with an assessment of average cost to educate a student and then provides loading for extra funding to students in six sets of circumstances:

1. Students with disability;
2. Regional and remote;
3. Low SES;
4. Aboriginal students;
5. Lack of English language proficiency; and
6. Small schools.

This combined calculation applied to the student at any given school results in a Schooling Resource Standard, or SRS as it is more commonly known. This effectively represents the amount of money that schools or school systems should be given. I note that public schools and Catholic schools are run by systems which provide a range of centralised services—learning support, allied health, human resources, etc.—which are managed centrally, and those centrally managed programs also count towards the Gonski spend.

For public schools, the current settings require states to fund 75 per cent of the SRS, or Schooling Resource Standard, and the commonwealth funds 20 per cent. For non-government schools, the current setting sees the commonwealth fund 80 per cent of the SRS and the states fund 22 per cent, less parents' capacity to pay, as assessed by analysis of the tax returns of parents of students at the school.

Paragraph 1(d) of the motion claims that non-government school students are receiving more than their SRS in state and commonwealth funding. This is simply untrue. Even the most disadvantaged non-government schools are assumed to require that at least 10 per cent of the SRS will be provided by parents. The most advantaged non-government schools are required to fund at least 80 per cent of the SRS from their parents. The only exception to this is a very small number of special assistance schools. These are schools such as Youth Inc., the Compass Catholic Community, and the Specialised Assistance School for Youth, better known as SASY, which seek to serve some of our most disadvantaged students.

Many of their students are returning to education having previously spent extensive periods of time outside of formal education. These schools have to be formally designated by ministers and, once that takes place, funding is adjusted without the presumption of any parental capacity to pay. As I said, there are very few of these schools, and I do not believe they are the intended subject of the Greens' and the Hon. Rob Simms' criticism today.

Despite what the AEU say, and despite what the motion implies, a non-government school with exactly the same student profile and population as a neighbouring government school will still receive substantially less government funding than its neighbour. Therefore, the second half of paragraph 1(b) and the entirety of 1(d) are just factually incorrect. For that reason, the opposition will be supporting the government's amendment. The opposition had put forward its own amendment seeking a similar change, and subsequently we are happy again to support the government's version.

We all want to do better for our children and young people, and for state members of parliament it would certainly not be unusual for us to seek extra support from the commonwealth government, but we cannot support a motion that includes factually incorrect statements and which is therefore offensive to the tens of thousands of non-government school families who pay their taxes, as well as their school fees, and whose children have an entitlement to an education too.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:33): I rise to address the Hon. Robert Simms' motion on Schooling Resource Standard funding and the opposition's proposed amendments. Like everyone in the house, and as a mother of three children, I understand the importance of giving every South Australian child the opportunity for a good education, and part of that is adequate funding for both public schools and private schools. I note information from the Independent Schools Australia body which says funding for independent school students is, on average, less than the government contributes to students in the public system.

The ISA (South Australian branch) told my office that, in 2022, independent schools in South Australia received an average of \$13,290 per student in total commonwealth and state

government annual recurrent funding. It said Catholic schools received \$15,270 per student while government schools received an average of \$21,579 per student.

The ISA also points out that independent schools rely on parents for funding, with more than half of independent schools' recurrent income coming from private sources, although the proportions vary between schools. The ISA said the only meaningful way to compare funding between school sectors is to compare combined commonwealth and state territory funding, and that the Schooling Resource Standard funding model referenced in this motion will always give state government schools more total government funding per student than non-government schools. That is because only non-government schools have their funding reduced according to parents' income; this reduction does not occur in government schools. In discussing and considering this issue, it is important that misleading comparisons using manipulated data are not used as a basis for arguments.

I put on the record that I will be supporting Labor's amendments and addressing specifically the motion's call for the federal government to increase its share to a minimum of 25 per cent of the Schooling Resource Standard. I am happy to support an increase, provided it does not come at the expense of non-government schools.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:35): I thank honourable members for their contributions: the Hon. Mr Hunter, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and the Hon. Ms Game. I want to also thank the education minister's office for alerting me to their amendments before this session. I understand there is some conjecture about the figures that are contained in the motion and on that basis I am happy to remove those figures and to support the government's amendments so that we can expedite this motion through this place.

In doing so, I also think this does potentially strengthen the arm of the government in their advocacy work. I recognise the work of the Minister for Education, the Hon. Blair Boyer, who I know is somebody who is very passionate about public school education and is taking up this fight over in Canberra. Hopefully, this motion strengthens his arm in those negotiations with his federal counterparts.

I briefly want to address the contribution made by the Leader of the Opposition, who has suggested that it is somehow offensive to imply that private schools are being overfunded. I think that is a gratuitous remark. I do not think there is anything offensive in the motion that I have put forward. In fact, I think most South Australians would find it offensive that we have public schools being neglected when it comes to government funding.

Public schools are by their very nature public; they are accessible to everybody in the community, not just the elite few. Access to public schools is not based on the size of your bank balance or what your mum and dad do. Everybody in our state has a right to access a public school and, as such, public schools should be funded accordingly. Public schools should set the benchmark in terms of quality education in our state, and they should be resourced as such. To suggest that it is offensive that a member of this place has suggested that public schools are getting a raw deal I think is a rather unusual contribution to the debate.

I make no apologies for fighting for public schools to get more resources. The Greens make no apologies for doing that. Rather than bending over backwards to curry favour from private schools, we need more members in this place to be advocating for public schools to get the funds they need. That is vitally important. The Greens make no apologies for that. I thank members for their support of the motion.

Amendments carried; motion as amended carried.

COMMUNITY HOSPITALS

Order of the Day, Private Business, No. 11: Hon. R.A. Simms to move:

That this council—

1. Notes that not-for-profit, community-owned hospitals such as Burnside Hospital, Glenelg Community Hospital, North-Eastern Community Hospital, and the Stirling Community Hospital, play a pivotal role in providing health care for local communities.

2. Recognises that these hospitals partner with local health networks to deliver critical services, playing an important role in reducing the patient load burden on public hospitals.
3. Notes that the new national standards introduced by the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Healthcare on December 14, 2023, in particular standard AS4187:
 - (a) imposes tighter minimum requirements for health service organisations' compliance with reprocessing of reusable medical devices in health service organisations; and
 - (b) will necessitate major multimillion-dollar infrastructure upgrades at some health service organisations to remain compliant.
4. Calls on the Malinauskas government to make available no-interest loans to community hospitals to allow them to undertake the necessary infrastructure upgrades to remain operational.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:39): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

THE JOINERY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:39): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that since 2014, the former Franklin Street bus station, known as The Joinery, has been a unique space for South Australians to gather and connect;
2. Acknowledges that The Joinery is currently used by groups such as the Conservation Council SA, the Adelaide Community Bike Workshop, the Adelaide Sustainability Centre, the Common Ground community garden, the Modern Money Lab, the Wilderness Society SA, SAGE and several smaller community groups that see the space as their home;
3. Recognises the state government have announced the redevelopment of the site to deliver 392 apartments, including 35 per cent affordable housing for rent and purchase; and
4. Calls on the Malinauskas government to work with community groups to find a suitable alternative site to continue their activities.

In moving this motion I should disclose that the Greens are also an organisation that use The Joinery for some of our meetings and activities, and of course I am a member of the Greens. I want to put on the public record that our party organisation uses this meeting space as well from time to time.

Community spaces like The Joinery are vital to thriving, active, connected communities. People need somewhere to gather, to share ideas, and to develop innovations for the future. The Joinery has been a vital community space for over 10 years and is much loved by community groups. The site, previously the Adelaide Bus Terminal, was taken over by the Conservation Council in 2014, and it became a place to connect and create.

The space hosts rooms of all sizes and function spaces to cater for different community needs. There is a bike workshop, a community garden, an exhibition area and a cafe. Put it together, and it is the perfect space for communities to get together. I first became aware of The Joinery's activities during my time on the Adelaide City Council back in 2014, and it really did develop a reputation as a beloved community space.

The hosts of The Joinery, the Conservation Council SA, have allowed the space to be utilised by many different groups. These include the Adelaide Community Bike Workshop, the Adelaide Sustainability Centre, the Common Ground community garden, the Modern Money Lab, the Sustainable Prosperity Action Group and the Wilderness Society.

Beyond the regulars who use The Joinery, the space is also used by 300 different community groups. These include the monthly South Australian Grassroots Ecosystem evenings (SAGE). This is where people can come together, share a meal, learn about new ideas and create projects. Regularly these events are attended by between 50 and 100 people, and SAGE uses the entire Joinery space to conduct their workshops and sessions.

Recently, we learned of Renewal SA's plan to turn this old bus depot into a development with apartments, a hotel and retail spaces. The Greens always welcome more housing, and I want

to congratulate the government on making a 35 per cent allocation for affordable housing in the development. I think that is a really significant thing, and the government should be commended for doing that.

The Joinery is in a vital location in terms of access to community amenity. It is well serviced by public transport. So it is a very good location for affordable housing. I just want to make it very clear that I make no criticism of the government for making this space available for affordable housing, particularly given the scale of the housing crisis we face.

What this means, of course, is now that the government is making that space available for this housing, which, as I say, is a high priority at the moment, the question then must be for the government: where else are they going to find to accommodate these groups? I think that is where the government needs to now step up and do some work.

We understand that there have been conversations with community groups that there may be spaces in the new development made available for public use; however, these groups will only be able to use the space if they are charged a commercial hourly rate, and a commercial hourly rent would be prohibitive for a lot of community spaces.

I used to work in the community sector and many years ago there was a community space, the Torrens Building, which operated to the benefit of community organisations. I worked for the Youth Affairs Council; there was Amnesty based there, I believe; environmental organisations; I think SACOSS also had an office there for a time. That was a really good community space.

Unfortunately, the Rann Labor government, for reasons unknown to me, thought a better use of that key civic and community space would be to turn it into a private university. I think that was a very short-sighted and disappointing decision that the then Rann government made. I believe it was the Rann government. I do acknowledge the work of my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks. I believe she was quite vocal on that at the time. It was outrageous to see the loss of that community space.

The Joinery has stepped in and filled that gap in many ways, in terms of being an open access space for community organisations. The government now needs to step up and find another location. There is a lot of vacant space in the CBD that they could turn to. Over the last few decades, we have seen community controlled spaces disappear. These spaces are vital parts of our community. They allow people to get together and to connect face to face. They reduce social isolation and they give people more agency in their lives.

It is important that such spaces are fit for purpose, free, easy to organise and not based on an hourly rent system, which is prohibitive for community organisations. These spaces need to be reconfigurable so that they can suit different community needs, and groups must have a level of agency in their management.

In what is an increasingly isolated world, where people mostly connect through their screens, it is so important that we provide spaces in our cities for real-world interaction and organising. This motion calls on the Malinauskas government to find alternative locations for these groups to connect and continue their activities. These activities promote wellbeing, they build relationships and they help people to develop ideas.

It is vital that this new location suits the needs of the groups that will be affected by the closure of The Joinery. What we are really calling for the government to do is to engage in negotiations with these organisations in good faith, so that a solution can be found. I feel confident that a solution can be found. I feel confident that the government can find a pathway through here, but they need to work in unison with the impacted organisations and find something that is going to really suit their needs.

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

NATIONAL FAMILY BUSINESS DAY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (16:47): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 19 September 2024 is the National Family Business Day;
2. Notes the significant contribution made by family businesses to the South Australian economy and the South Australian community; and
3. Recognises National Family Business Day as a time to acknowledge the significant role family businesses play, accounting for up to 70 per cent of Australia's businesses and employing around half of Australia's workforce.

It is a great pleasure to rise to recognise and give thanks for the significant role that family businesses play in the South Australian and national economies, accounting for up to 70 per cent of the Australian workforce and providing opportunities to so many to build successful lives around their great family businesses, often providing for the next generation to do the same.

One of the great things about being Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development is engaging with so many small and family businesses, each of them unique and all of them contributing to their industry and their local community. I recently had the pleasure of visiting a number of small businesses, as well as some not-for-profits, in Kapunda to hear their concerns and to provide information about the Small Business Energy Efficiency Grants Program, which seeks to assist small and family businesses through cutting electricity costs by helping to fund the upgrade or procurement of energy efficient equipment.

One of the small and family business owners I met with in Kapunda was Jarrod, who owns the Kapunda Tyre Service, a small family business on the south side of Kapunda that offers a selection of tyres and services for vehicles, trucks, heavy farm machinery and even sack trolleys. Jarrod is also, I found out, an avid recreational angler and enjoys going out to catch whiting since the snapper ban has had to be instituted.

I also met with Odet, who is a senior volunteer at the Kapunda Community Craft Shop, located on the same premises as the Kapunda Light Community Church, along with a bookstore, craft shop, op shop and small kitchen. This mixture of services is run by the pastors, assisted by some amazing volunteers who take it upon themselves to run community events for community members, young people and the elderly. Odet stated that they are always keen for help with leadership training and also for running events for young people in the community.

I spoke to Rayna, who is the owner of Plant Pot and More, which is a lovely plant shop on the main street of Kapunda selling a variety of plants and pot supplies and goodies for indoor and outdoor plants. Rayna stated that, yes, business has been a little tough for some of the local small businesses lately. They are experiencing a lower number of visitors to the town since the Kapunda bypass was built, but she was interested to hear of how the energy efficiency grants might assist small businesses.

I also had the pleasure of meeting with Kylie, who is the owner of 2B Nourished, a lovely vibrant little cafe in the heart of Kapunda that serves delicious and nourishing smoothies, cakes, snacks and other goodies perfect for a good breakfast or lunch. Com Viet is a Vietnamese restaurant on the main street of Kapunda owned by Maggie, who has recently opened the restaurant and said that business has been good since the opening, with a few nights being so busy that she actually ran out of food to sell for the next day.

For lunch I stopped at Litl Mo's Bakery and Cafe where I had, I must say, a delightful apple strudel and sausage roll. I would recommend to my colleague the Hon. Kyam Maher that he must make sure that he has tried the sausage rolls at Litl Mo's at Kapunda. I know that he tries most of them around the state, so he has probably been there.

I also met with Robyn, who is a volunteer at the Kapunda Community Gallery. The gallery showcases a beautiful collection of artworks from various local artists that could be purchased. Robyn informed me that the Kapunda Community Gallery is the longest running volunteer group in South Australia. I was not able to visit every small and family business in Kapunda, but I did make sure that information on the energy efficiency grants was provided to as many businesses as possible.

Small and family businesses need the recognition they can get through things such as the awards that we often mention in this place, as well as other opportunities, so it is great to be able to

promote small and family businesses through this motion today. But, more than recognition, they need the support of fellow South Australians to get out and spend their money in small and family businesses that put so much back into their communities. Given Kapunda is only an hour from Adelaide, I would certainly encourage people to start there and then continue throughout the rest of the state in supporting our small and family businesses in our regional communities.

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

GIG ECONOMY

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

That this council calls on the government to refer to the South Australian Productivity Commission the operation and impacts of the gig economy in South Australia, requiring the commission to investigate and report to the government on matters including:

1. The emerging nature, incidence, scope and complexity of the gig economy and in particular digital platforms that offer labour hire, rideshare, disability and aged-care services or a goods and services delivery function;
2. The extent to which workplace health and safety laws and regulations currently apply to digital platform businesses engaging workers as contractors, sole traders or employees;
3. Consider the role of workplace health and safety laws in creating a safe working environment for all South Australians with regard to the emerging ways of working in the gig economy;
4. The extent to which the Return to Work Act 2014 currently applies to digital platform businesses engaging workers as contractors, sole traders or employees;
5. The application of the Fair Work Legislation Amendment (Closing Loopholes No. 2) Bill 2023 (Cth) to South Australian legislation;
6. The taxation regime that applies to the gig economy at both a federal and state level, including the recent decision of *Uber v Chief Commissioner of Revenue NSW*;
7. Experience of other jurisdictions, whether that be in Australia or overseas to identify potential opportunities for reform to ensure that equitable arrangements exist for platform providers to contribute to the community in which they operate, including the potential for gig economy businesses to pay payroll tax; and
8. Any other related matters.

This motion calls on the government to refer to the South Australian Productivity Commission the operation and impacts of the gig economy in South Australia, requiring the commission to investigate and report on a range of matters. I will not go through all of them because they are quite clearly detailed in the motion. I think one of the key elements that I am interested in is around payroll tax and the potential of whether or not these businesses, gig economy businesses, should contribute payroll tax.

This was a key issue that came up in the inquiry into the gig economy that the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos initiated and chaired initially during her time in the parliament. You may recall I then took over the chairing of the committee towards the end of the committee's life. One of the key recommendations was looking at this issue of payroll tax and what that means for the gig economy.

We did receive a number of submissions from stakeholders, and unions in particular, that said it is not fair that businesses that have fixed employment arrangements, or traditional employment style arrangements, have to pay payroll tax and yet those that operate off these platforms, like Uber for instance, are not subject to the same payroll tax requirements.

I think the Productivity Commission should consider this question. There may be the potential to alleviate some of the costs that are paid by other businesses, for instance, were these gig economy businesses required to pay payroll tax. I do not know how much money such an arrangement would generate. These are the sorts of things the Productivity Commission could investigate.

I think the other element that is really important here is requiring the Productivity Commission to look at the role of workplace health and safety laws in creating a safe work environment for South Australians who are working in the gig economy. There are also some elements here that look

at fair work legislation and also the complexity of the gig economy and what that means for labour hire, rideshare, disability, aged-care services and the like.

I think this will be a really interesting piece of work that the Productivity Commission could undertake and I hope that members of parliament will support it and that this is an issue the commission takes up and considers worthy of investigation.

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

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the room.

A quorum having being formed:

Bills

ROAD TRAFFIC (PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN OFFENCES WITH CHILD IN VEHICLE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961.

Second Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to introduce the Road Traffic (Penalties for Certain Offences with Child in Vehicle) Amendment Bill, a simple but vital measure aimed at protecting children from the reckless and dangerous actions of drivers who disregard not only the law but also the safety of young passengers. This bill strengthens penalties for drivers who engage in excessive speeding, reckless and dangerous driving or driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol while a child under 16 years is present in the vehicle.

This bill is a response to alarming statistics uncovered through a freedom of information request my office made to SAPOL and the Attorney-General's Department earlier this year. In the period from January 2022 to July 2024, 449 court matters were finalised, with a finding of guilt that involved drink or driving convictions, with at least one child under 16 present in the vehicle. Of these, 46 per cent involved drink driving, while 28 per cent involved methamphetamine and 15 per cent involved cannabis. These numbers reveal a distressing pattern of reckless conduct endangering young lives, reinforcing the urgent need for stronger deterrents.

Unfortunately, both SAPOL and the Attorney-General's Department do not hold specific data on convictions for excessive speeding or dangerous driving in circumstances where a child is in the car, but I can tell you that happens more often than you would like. For example, let me quickly read out a media release from SAPOL dated 29 April 2024:

A woman has been issued a hefty fine for speeding in excess of 60km/h in the Far North over the weekend. About 9am on Sunday 28 April, Far North Highway Patrol members spotted a car travelled south on Stuart Highway at Marla.

At this time police detected a Ford Territory station wagon travelling at 177km/h in a 110km/h zone. Police stopped the car and spoke with the driver, a 31-year-old woman from Huntfield Heights. Police also observed two children sitting unrestrained on the rear seat of the vehicle.

Two children were sitting unrestrained in a vehicle travelling on a regional road—it is not exactly the best road—at 177 km/h. You can imagine the tragedy that would have unfolded had that vehicle—the driver had lost control of the vehicle—either rolled or perhaps even collided with another car. It is just simply unacceptable to drive a vehicle at that speed with two children not wearing seatbelts in the back.

It is deeply concerning that in recent years there has been a rise in cases where drivers, often impaired by drugs or alcohol, endanger the lives of children in their vehicles. Police crackdowns have highlighted other shocking examples, such as drivers being caught under the influence during

school drop-offs and pick-ups, adding another layer of risk to our roads. This bill ensures that such irresponsible behaviour will no longer go unchecked.

As proposed, the new law introduces what is essentially a circumstance of aggravation to several offences under the Road Traffic Act whenever a child is a passenger. This includes the following key provisions:

1. For excessive speeding and reckless and dangerous driving, the maximum penalty will be increased to three years' imprisonment, higher than the current two-year limit for other aggravated circumstances. Additionally, the penalty for repeat offending will also be increased to three years' imprisonment.

2. For driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, new penalties are replacing the insufficient existing provisions, including fines ranging from \$1,900 to \$2,900 or imprisonment of up to six months when a child is present.

Before I conclude, I want to again emphasise the urgency of this legislation through a few other recent incidents. In Glenelg in May, a driver with a young child in the car blew .282 after public reports of poor driving and slumping at the wheel. Less than a fortnight ago, on 19 October, there was a single vehicle crash in Murray Bridge, where the driver blew .148. Two children were in the vehicle at the time and had to be taken to hospital. Finally, a month ago in Mitcham, on 24 September, SAPOL pulled over a woman using her phone with two children in the back seat. They tested her blood alcohol. She blew .333, over six times the legal limit.

For those who do not understand the characteristics of someone with a blood alcohol content of .3, let me explain it. At .1, you end up with slurred speech, significant impaired judgement and poor coordination. At .2, you have nausea, double vision and vomiting. At .3, you have alcohol poisoning, stage 1 anaesthesia, an inability to walk and a loss of bladder control. Those examples of the dangerous situations children are being subjected to are just a couple. This bill seeks to address these reckless actions with appropriately severe consequences.

These reforms send a strong message that South Australia will not tolerate such irresponsible behaviour on its roads. Not only are these drivers endangering their own lives and the lives of other road users but, more critically, they are risking the lives of innocent children in their vehicles. The penalties introduced by this bill are designed to deter this behaviour and ensure those who engage in it face the full weight of the law. I urge all members of this chamber to support the bill and join me in making our roads safer for everyone, particularly for the children who rely on us to protect them from harm. I commend the bill to the chamber.

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

SURVEILLANCE DEVICES (PRESCRIBED RESIDENTIAL PREMISES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak on my private members' bill, the Surveillance Devices (Prescribed Residential Premises) Amendment Bill 2024. As members in this place know well, when I commit to resolving an issue I am a bit like a dog with a bone. This is my second attempt to lift standards to provide for the necessary security and protection of residents in nursing homes and those with disabilities receiving aged-care or disability supports through the installation of cameras and/or listening devices in their own private spaces and rooms.

Members in this place will recall that in 2019 I introduced a bill to have CCTV cameras installed by the relevant providers in all private aged-care facilities and state-run institutions. This was pre-COVID when abuse of our senior citizens in some public and private nursing homes was disgraceful and often covered up and pre the royal commission into aged care abuse, which yet again shone a light on systemic problems and appalling practices in the aged-care sector.

It was post 2015 when Noleen Hausler brought the shocking and sickening abuse of her 89-year-old father, Clarence Hausler, in the Japara Healthcare facility to our attention.

Noleen Hausler tried and failed to get staff of the facility to address her concerns, so she installed the camera. To her horror, the camera provided irrefutable evidence that her father was regularly assaulted, mistreated and abused by staff. Ms Hausler knew there was a problem, but she was shocked and horrified at the extent and frequency of the abuse.

It was post concerns being raised in 2017 by Barb Spriggs, the wife of Bob Spriggs, who was mistreated while he was a patient at the now notorious Oakden. Mr Spriggs was admitted to Oakden suffering from multiple illnesses, including Parkinson's disease. He was given 10 times the amount of his prescribed medication and left with unexplained bruises before his death. A subsequent Senate inquiry report into the Oakden facility confirmed that 'poor or inappropriate training' and 'a culture of fear, silence and cover-up among staff' contributed to the mistreatment of residents.

It was pre the death of Ann Marie Smith in 2020 for which 'paid carer' Rosa Maria Maione was charged with and pleaded guilty to manslaughter. Ms Smith suffered from cerebral palsy and was 'cared for' in a home by Ms Maione, who was employed by a registered service provider. Rosa Maione was jailed for at least five years and three months for her criminal neglect.

As with Ms Smith, not all abuse occurs in public or private residential facilities. It can occur in the home of an elderly or disabled resident receiving at-home care services, an arrangement that many people prefer over moving into a nursing home or aged care, that is of course if you can get aged-care support in your home at all.

I was recently appalled to hear about an 86-year-old South Australian who has applied to end his own life because of extended delays with getting aged in-home care support. The situation confronting Cyril Tooze was brought to public attention by my independent colleague the federal member for Mayo, Rebekha Sharkie. Mr Tooze, who has a terminal illness, was approved for the highest level of home care assistance under the federal government's My Aged Care scheme in January 2024 but was told he would have to wait up to nine months to receive it.

Rather than wait in pain for any support, Mr Tooze applied to end his own life using South Australia's Voluntary Assisted Dying Scheme. After publicity for his case, he has been granted temporary assistance. This is simply an appalling situation where someone wants to end their life rather than wait for care.

We know that when care is finally provided it is often substandard or inadequate. Has much changed since the findings of the 2021 Royal Commission into Aged Care, Quality and Safety? Sadly no. That somewhat ironically titled Royal Commission into Aged Care, Quality and Safety, Final Report: Care, Dignity and Respect, did not even canvass the use of CCTV despite such systems being implemented with excellent results overseas. There are only five very high-level recommendations made by the royal commission, all of them very focused on compliance and enforcement.

Abuse and neglect of our elderly, infirm and disabled continues to happen in many aged-care and nursing home facilities and settings around the country. If anything, it has gotten worse since COVID and the royal commission report. I continue to receive complaints every week about substandard care, neglect, abuse, over-medication, under or incorrect medication and terrible food served to residents in some facilities. Despite the wonderful work of South Australian culinary legend Maggie Beer to improve the standard of food on offer in such facilities, the bottom line, not nutritional value, often determines the menu in many facilities.

Families tell me their loved ones are restricted in how many consumables they are provided with, for example, vital things like incontinence pads and clean linen. Only recently, I was sent more photographs of the food—in fact, I will call it slops—that was served up at an aged-care facility in the north-western suburbs. The resident who sent me that just could not eat the food that was presented there—if you can call it food. You just did not know what was there. It was a pile of dark-coloured meaty substance on rice and that was it.

On another occasion, the same resident, and he is 85, had forgotten to fill in his menu form that morning for dinner, so when he turned up in the dinner room, what was served up to him? Two slices of toast. It is not uncommon in that facility for residents to either have sandwiches—vegemite

sandwiches—hot dogs (if you can call them that), party pies and pasties, and also, most recently, what they call a pizza, which is basically a muffin with some melted cheese and tomato sauce on it.

That is the standard of food and care that is being given still to aged residents in aged-care facilities. Of course, many of them in those facilities are often afraid to complain. They are just thankful that at least they have a bed and are able to stay there and they do not want to complain about what is going on there, but some do and they bring it to the attention of members of parliament like myself to raise the alarm that we need to be more vigilant and pay attention to what is happening in there. Sometimes even their own families, though many do not get visits from their families, fail to take notice or ask what is going on.

As I said, I continue to receive these complaints. The ratio of staff and carers to residents is still not good enough. The standard of training and the requirements of certificate III and certificate IV are still reported to me as being inadequate. Data shows that three in four aged-care homes face years of financial losses, leading to closures, and 50 per cent say that they are operating at a loss and that it is going to lead to closures. There is also a significant bed shortage.

Standards have fallen because of rising costs and the shortage of trained workers. Profit margins are under pressure and aged-care packages that could support aged and disabled people to remain in their homes are again in short supply, as Mr Tooze found. With an ageing population of around nine million baby boomers aged between 64 and 80, demand is only going to increase and perhaps even outstrip what is available. This is why the federal government is now looking at reforms that will mean that older Australians may have to pay more to access aged-care support.

Shamefully, both Labor and the Liberals refused to back the bill I introduced in 2019. In doing so, unconscionable conduct and abusive behaviour have been able to flourish unchecked in some places. For those of us with memories longer than an election cycle, let us not forget that it was Labor that was responsible for completely ignoring the whistleblowers at Oakden until it became impossible for it to do so.

What we got from the Marshall government in response to my private member's bill of 2019 was a bungled trial in two state facilities, instead of the five facilities the trial was meant to cover, soaking up the \$500,000 that had originally been made available by the federal government. Those funds were supposed to be used for a trial of a proven and sophisticated system developed by a UK-based company, Care Protect. But SA Health decided it wanted to go it alone and develop its own system, thinking it would try to replicate Care Protect's copyrighted intellectual technology. It was, as I expected, a disaster.

SA Health contracted a local security firm that had no expertise in aged-care surveillance and installed a handful of unmonitored cameras in only two facilities. The South Australian trial had none of the sophisticated tried and tested features of the UK system that had been rolled out so successfully there. The report that eventually came from the trial yielded nothing worthwhile. It was a waste of resources and a great opportunity was missed—or perhaps, as I suspect, the trial was deliberately set up to fail, as the aged-care lobby would have hoped.

The trial of an inferior, limited system led to claims that there were too many false alarms and that it took up too much of the staff's time to attend to false alerts. We know from the families and workers who have daily experience in these facilities that many of these organisations' management and staff do not want this type of scrutiny.

When I spoke about this bill on the radio recently, a caller texted in, claiming to be an aged-care worker, and said, and I quote, 'If I know there's a camera in a room then I won't be going in there.' What selfish arrogance is that? I wonder what this worker had to hide: why they would actually fear the fact that these cameras were there to observe and ensure that there was a high standard of care being delivered? These workers should have little fear if they are doing their job to an accepted standard.

Indeed, Care Protect reported from their UK experiences that staff like the extra layer of accountability that CCTV provided. They said it worked both ways: they felt their patients and residents were safer and that they, similarly, were professionally and physically protected while in private spaces that had CCTV installed. Aged-care facilities in the UK are continuing to achieve

outstanding results and positive outcomes for residents, while here there are still unscrupulous operators who will exploit their staff and look at ways to save money anyway they can.

While there are many aged and disabled residential homes that do have cameras in common areas, unlike hospitals they are not in rooms. What this new bill does is allow families/residents to legally install their own optical surveillance devices—cameras—and audio devices in rooms so that they can keep a check on the welfare and care of their loved ones. The spaces in which they can be installed are clearly defined in the bill to include private rooms in facilities and private residences in which services are being delivered.

Residents, family members and their appointed representatives will need to arrange for and meet the cost of installing the device and covering any monitoring costs, should they apply. As they are responsible for the equipment, they will also be able to best place the device so as to preserve the privacy and dignity of their loved one receiving care. Importantly, they will also be able to tightly control who has access to the footage or the audio obtained. This deals with any opposition to institutions installing and monitoring footage.

They will, however, need to notify the facility in writing of the intention to install the device and remove it and reinstate the room afterwards. There is a requirement to have a sticker or sign that a device is installed at the entrance and within the space so residents, staff and visitors alike know they are in place.

The bill clearly prescribes the use of footage and/or audio obtained and outlines the restrictions on publication and dissemination. It also outlines the need for consent and exceptions to this—for example, if it is in the public interest or disclosed to a legal practitioner.

The bill adds a powerful layer of security and protection for not only residents but also staff. Sadly, dementia and other mental health issues can lead to aggressive residents who sometimes abuse other residents and staff. CCTV will enable better protection, monitoring and management for all residents and staff.

I have been consulting stakeholders continuously on the bill and can report it is strongly supported by aged-care advocacy groups, families and representatives of those in care. I would like to acknowledge the tireless work that Ian Henschke did as an advocate for older South Australians. Ian has retained his strong support for this bill even though he is no longer in the sector. I am confident this bill will also lift the standard of care, as has happened in the UK where CCTV is now widely used and the footage is monitored independently in real time.

We have grown very accustomed to CCTV cameras being used in a wide range of settings in public places and our homes. It has evolved to enable us to access footage and recordings in real time on our phones and to store the content. We are a long way from the grainy, blurry images of early CCTV.

We routinely use CCTV to identify offenders, and it has been critical to solving some very challenging crimes, using footage from within venues, public streets and shopping centres. We also routinely use CCTV to monitor babies and security systems installed in our homes, utilising new technology to add more protection and safety to our lives. We can also use it to monitor and talk to our pets while at work. We are filmed every time we use a checkout at Woolies, Aldi, Coles or Foodland, and we are not required to consent to this; it just happens. I guess we can shop elsewhere, but it is rapidly becoming the norm.

This very simple bill makes it legal for residents, families and all their representatives to install surveillance devices in the private rooms or spaces of residents, whether it be within a residential facility or within their own home, to better protect and secure the wellbeing of our most vulnerable older and disabled South Australians. I hope that members will support it.

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

BIOSECURITY BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 August 2024.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:30): Today, I rise as the lead speaker on the Biosecurity Bill for the opposition. I indicate that I have a number of amendments, which I will move in due course, and that I have a number of questions on a series of clauses for the mover of the bill in committee stage.

A technical directions paper and a range of consultation were performed to establish a new biosecurity bill under the previous Marshall Liberal government in 2020. Feedback received was compiled into a consultation summary on the building of a new biosecurity act for South Australia. Stakeholders subsequently had the opportunity to provide further feedback based on that summary, and submissions from the initial consultations were considered when developing the draft biosecurity bill.

The draft bill was then released for public consultation over an eight-week period, from 1 August 2023, on the YourSAy website. This feedback, it is my understanding, was further considered and some updates were made before the Biosecurity Bill 2024 was introduced to this chamber by the minister.

Biosecurity is a complex and incredibly important topic. There is increasing pressure on biosecurity, as international movement of people and uncontrolled online international trade increase. An increasing appetite among consumers for knowledge of the provenance of food and wine has led to more people wanting to visit farms, orchards and vineyards and to see firsthand where their food and wine come from. Few of these customers would understand the risks that uncontrolled traffic into agricultural areas may bring and how it could result in devastation to a crop or even an entire region.

Many agricultural engineering companies operating in Europe are situated in peri-urban and semirural areas. Insects and other pests may lodge in equipment before it is packaged and dispatched to Australia. Some years ago, a shipment of agricultural processing equipment exported to Australia from Europe contained adult brown marmorated stink bug, a prolific insect pest not yet present locally. It was only the diligence of staff unpacking those shipping containers at that warehouse that led to the potential incursion being controlled.

The point I make is that these risks are real. They are ever-present and they are increasing. It is vital that biosecurity preparedness, as well as reactionary measures, are effective. Recently, members of the South Australian chicken, egg and meat industry held concerns about the outbreak of avian influenza at several interstate sites.

The concerns were mainly relating to what was seen as a low level of preparedness for an outbreak locally. An FOI revealed that there was no discoverable communication from the state's Chief Veterinary Officer about the topic in the weeks leading up to and during the interstate management of that outbreak. Similarly, the bee industry held concerns at what many saw was a low level of information about the interstate outbreak of varroa mite, including one directly over the border in Victoria where there is significant orchard product reliant on bees for pollination.

More recently, the outbreak of tomato brown rugose fruit virus has caused more concern among the affected growers north of Adelaide, and several businesses have been affected by the resulting quarantine orders that require the businesses to cease trading activity, and the destruction of those affected plants. This virus is extremely contagious and causes heavy losses in production where it is endemic overseas. This detection, obviously as we all know, was the first in Australia, and therefore the quarantine measures are vital to underpinning the security of local tomato, chilli and capsicum production.

The need for care and quarantine is not being questioned. What is under the spotlight is the government's lack of preparedness, the lack of autonomy when it comes to testing facilities, which has resulted in significant delays in testing results, the lack of transparency and communication with affected businesses, and the fact that the minister continues to refuse to do an independent inquiry into her government's response to this outbreak and biosecurity in this state.

A large business impacted by the quarantine has already announced the loss of 500 jobs, and estimates that losses will be in the vicinity of \$27 million for their company. Whilst in many cases

the destruction of crop and plants, and imposition of quarantine orders are necessary to prevent damaging outbreaks from spreading, there are significant downsides, obviously, when dealing with a biosecurity outbreak, so it is vital that everyone has confidence that these outbreaks are well-managed.

However, one grower recently publicly said that he was more scared of government regulation than the virus itself, and suggested that if such an incursion happened in the future he would think twice about reporting it. This lack of confidence in the government's ability to manage an outbreak should not be happening, and it is a sad indictment on the government and the way it has managed this so far.

I gave notice of a contingency motion to send this bill to a select committee because of the minister's refusal to commit to an independent inquiry, and indeed because of the government's refusal to commit to an independent inquiry. I did so because it was the lever I could pull to be proactive, and not just listening but responding to the hundreds if not thousands of South Australians who contact me regarding their concerns with biosecurity in this state. I acknowledge and appreciate the sentiments from industry bodies that they want to see this bill debated on the floor of parliament forthwith, given it has been four years in the making, so I have decided not to move that motion, as I respect the voice of industry bodies who speak on behalf of their members across the state.

I do need to state, however, that there is an urgent need to inquire into this government's response and the resourcing that goes into biosecurity preparedness. I would strongly encourage the minister to listen to growers and to farmers, and to individuals right across the state, and commit to an independent inquiry. If she is not forthcoming, then I will look to seek my colleagues' support in this chamber for an inquiry into this incredibly important issue in the new year, because it is incredibly important that the security of our food and fibre production is protected around the state into the future.

As we all know, the importance of biosecurity cannot be overstated. Having been a mixed-practice veterinarian in a regional community for 15 years, and having lived on a citrus orchard all of my life, I have been on the ground on a daily basis with both producers and farmers, and so I absolutely understand the importance of biosecurity. It is there to protect our \$18.5 billion primary industry sector in South Australia. This sector not only drives our state's economic engine but it also supports over half of our state's exports. I think we can all agree that the threats we face are significant and multifaceted and it is imperative that we address these with urgency and with clarity.

In speaking with industry and stakeholders, they have indicated some concerns with the proposed bill, including the ability to introduce new levies without the requirement to consult with industry stakeholders, and the additions that open the door for potential cost sharing with industry for incursions. Industries that are signatories under the Emergency Pest Plant Response Deed already have cost-sharing arrangements and there is already a considerable biosecurity cost burden on many sectors. But some have questioned how this is consistent with the government's pre-election commitment that there will be no new taxes, and there is little tolerance of any added cost or complexity in the current economic environment.

The opposition also have concerns about provisions around an employer's liability for an employee's offences. There is a desire to see provisions incorporated which place a requirement on a third party accessing primary production land to take certain steps to ensure biosecurity on primary production land is not compromised.

We are seeing and will continue to see an increase in shared land use across our state, particularly with the passing of the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill last year. It is important that with that shared land use there is a degree of responsibility on those third-party entities to ensure they minimise the biosecurity risks of the agricultural land that they access.

Primary producers often express their concern around the lack of awareness, care and accountability of third parties seeking access to their land or accessing their land under existing arrangements, and it can be a significant risk for the introduction and spread of pests, diseases and invasive species, and needs to be addressed.

I have a number of amendments to deal with some of these concerns by industry and I will be seeking the members' support on those amendments. I also have an amendment around tightening the circumstances in which section 21 of schedule 2 can be enacted after concerns were raised with the opposition around the use of this section from the Local Government Association.

I am disappointed that the government of the day did not see fit or feel compelled to deal with the ever-pressing issue of neglected or abandoned orchards. This is a significant issue right across the state and is only likely to get worse due to the current federal Labor government's push for buybacks. These abandoned orchards have the potential to present huge challenges in terms of biosecurity for this state. I think that this bill provided an excellent opportunity to address this challenge but, disappointingly, it has not been a priority for this government.

The Biosecurity Bill before us arguably provides the government with greater powers, and in doing so we need to ensure that there are checks and balances with the use of those powers. Governments should not be given excessive powers without scrutiny and without parliamentary oversight of those powers. South Australians certainly deserve accountability and transparency around any government response to outbreaks.

We need flexibility to react quickly to disease incursions through legislature; however, we also need to ensure that proper resourcing is present to enable rapid responses. We also need to ensure that governments are continuously reviewing different pest species and disease threats around the globe, continuously reviewing the latest science and continuously reviewing their preparedness and response processes to potential disease outbreaks.

I note that much of the new powers of the new act will come from regulations and possibly even policy sitting underneath those regulations. I have had concerns raised with me around these powers. I think it is incredibly important that the government consults widely with industry stakeholders and farmers alike on those regulations, and, again, it must be about having a balance between sensible changes to allow government and industry to react quickly but not granting excessive powers to the executive of the day without parliamentary oversight.

With this bill there is an opportunity to allow for flexibility in a sensible and pragmatic way to support biosecurity in our state, but we need to ensure we support our primary producers as they implement their biosecurity obligations and requirements and ensure changes are not overly onerous. At the end of the day, we need to fundamentally let our farmers farm but ensure that they can do so with the confidence that disease risk is minimised.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:45): I rise to speak to this Biosecurity Bill today on behalf of the Greens. In doing so we welcome the bill and commend the government on the amount of work that has gone into this critically important bill. The bill seeks to protect and enhance South Australia's biosecurity through the prevention, detection and control of animal and plant pathogens, pests and biosecurity matter. The breadth of the bill is nothing short of significant, as it repeals several outdated bills, such as the Dog Fence Act 1946, the Impounding Act 1920, the Livestock Act 1997 and the Plant Health Act 2009, and amends both the Fisheries Management Act 2007 and the Phylloxera and Grape Industry Act 1995.

As such, the bill is a welcome improvement on this state's current biosecurity regime. Multiple acts allow for multiple loopholes, and as such things do slip more readily through the gaps. A significant body of work has clearly gone into this bill to ensure that as many of those loopholes as possible are closed.

Environmental best practice is of critical importance as we navigate the climate crisis that puts so many species, whether plant or animal, either under stress or under threat. The climate environment crisis means that outbreaks, such as those that we see across the various biosecurity sectors, continue to increase not only in volume but also in complexity. Business as usual is unacceptable, just as it is unacceptable to think that we can simply scale up our current approaches. The CSIRO suggests that continuing along a business-as-usual trajectory could expose Australia to significant triple bottom-line risks through to 2030.

Clearly, a transformational approach is necessary, and the Greens commend the government for pushing beyond a reactive business-as-usual approach and aiming for systems

transformation. South Australia's economic wellbeing is reliant on nature. Recent work by the Australian Conservation Foundation found that approximately 50 per cent of Australia's economy, some \$896 billion of GDP, has a moderate or very high direct dependence on nature.

Whether a sector is directly impacted, such as agriculture, forestry or fisheries, or is indirectly impacted, such as shops and cafes, where people will linger longer and spend more money, or whether it is the wellbeing impacts of access to tree canopy across our suburbs and the benefits of this to the bottom line of the health budget, it is fair to say that not a single dollar across the economy is not impacted by nature, whether directly or indirectly.

The entire state is impacted by whether or not we get biosecurity right, so it is fitting that this bill brings South Australia into line with other states and jurisdictions by establishing a general biosecurity duty and, of course, it is good regulatory practice to be more outcomes focused and less prescriptive. There is a whole education piece needed around this, but that is a good thing: well-informed communities are key to spotting and responding with appropriate speed to biosecurity risks.

A recent Queensland study demonstrated that for every dollar invested in community engagement on the red imported fire ant there was a 60-fold return, measured as the savings in active surveillance from reports by community members who had simply spotted the ant when out and about and reported the sighting. This bill's current focus is on protecting South Australia from 'pests, diseases and other biosecurity matters that are economically significant for the state'. However, the Greens will contend that 'economically and environmentally significant', not 'economically significant', is our preferred outcome. If we aim only to protect that which we know to be economically significant, we miss much of what lies beneath the surface.

All of nature is interconnected. Human beings are simply one part of the incredibly diverse web of life that this planet has sustained for so many millennia. So many plants and animals have already been wiped out simply because we only focused on economics. Putting environmental significance front and centre, with economic significance, will ensure that we protect everything and do not inadvertently fail to protect crucial species whose significance—indeed, whose very existence—may as yet be unrecognised.

If we look only to the dollar, we will fail to implement the best practice that will enable us to work proactively, and we will instead respond reactively to the situation. Bear with me on this, because this is a case where the old adage about prevention being better than cure is appropriately applied. Of course, the slower we are to respond to a biosecurity threat, the costlier it will be for us to contain and eradicate it. We should therefore be ensuring a precautionary approach.

Whilst scientific evidence is of course crucial, we should also ensure that a lack of evidence does not see us fiddling while Rome burns and delaying action, which would potentially see a greater risk to biosecurity occur—risk that, as we know, impacts not only our economy but nature and biodiversity, which we need to protect for the health of both our ecosystems and, of course, the people of this state. This bill also fails to incorporate space for First Nations perspectives and knowledges.

As such, the Greens will be moving and would like to see the bill establish an expert biosecurity advisory committee to advise the minister, either on its own initiative or at the request of the minister, on matters relevant to the operation of this act. The group should include at least one environmental biosecurity expert and representation from First Nations peoples, the University of Adelaide's Environment Institute and the Conservation Council of South Australia, and I am sure the minister may have other ideas on that.

We are all very well aware of the changes brought around currently in the way that we shop—by the internet. Changes that impact our daily lives and that extend to the way in which people trade illegally in protected and/or restricted matter have seen wildlife crime become a booming business. According to recent ABC reporting of a CSIRO study, more than 800 crayfish, reptiles and birds have been seized in the past 18 months. The bill in its current form, however, fails to capture these online spaces appropriately, so the Greens will be moving an amendment to ensure that this is covered. These proposed amendments we hope will go a long way to ensuring a good bill is a better bill, and I commend those changes to the chamber.

Before we conclude the Greens contribution at the second reading, I also place on notice, for the minister to respond to in her second reading contribution, a question. It is currently unclear how this bill proposes to treat species that are also within the scope of the landscape act. If an invasive animal or plant is posing a significant biosecurity risk but is not yet declared, could there be an amendment, perhaps, to clarify that the general biosecurity duty can be applied to enforce control in that situation?

I do believe that this would be something that the minister can place on the record for us, and if there is—as some in the sector have raised with us, perhaps because this does not replace the landscape act, we just want to make sure that we are not still leaving one of those loopholes that we seek to remove here. The landscape act has its own provisions for pest animals and declared weeds given vertebrate animals and plants still clearly fall within the definition of a biosecurity matter and/or other carriers. The Greens seek to make sure that those particular species are not lost. With that, I commend the bill.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:53): I rise briefly to address the Biosecurity Bill 2024 plus the suggested amendments put forward by the opposition. Our agriculture industry remains the heartbeat of our state's economy, and amid an era of primary production being made more difficult by rising input costs and generally unfavourable conditions for business, many created by government, any measures that genuinely aim to better protect these industries are welcomed.

The consolidation of a number of existing acts to streamline regulatory framework makes sense in terms of improving consistency across sectors. I note the lengthy turnaround time in tabling this bill and consider this troubling given the pressing nature of the many current and emerging threats to South Australia's \$18.5 billion agriculture industry.

In reaching out to stakeholders about this bill, my office was informed of a perceived lack of urgency with regard to varroa mite, which impacts honey bees and the beekeeping industry but naturally has far wider implications for all horticultural and agricultural pursuits. Varroa is on South Australia's doorstep, and we were told again by those involved in the beekeeping industry that its arrival in our state is inevitable and that we should be doing more to be prepared, essentially clearing the red tape and bureaucratic decks to act immediately when it arrives.

Meanwhile, the citrus industry has been battling the impacts and fallout, including increased operating costs of South Australia's fruit fly outbreaks for several years now and we know how much taxpayer money has been invested in that program which is aimed at retaining our state's fruit fly free status.

The industry is broadly supportive of the bill, but concerns were also aired about what it believes is a lack of specific mentions of backyard and/or abandoned orchards, which are a source of fruit fly breeding. We were told that fruit fly breeding in these instances should be treated the same as potentially harmful weeds or pests like rabbits.

Much of our consultation with industry groups returned the same vibe: this bill is not perfect, but it is much better than what we have now, and it should be introduced without any further unnecessary delays and excessive toing and froing. Consultation time is over was the message.

The Liberals have today put forward some amendments to the bill. Our stakeholder engagement suggests that, while some or even all of these might be considered worthwhile, the short turnaround time on consultation may have limited the capacity of certain industry leaders to fully consider the changes, such as they are.

Livestock SA considers itself particularly impacted by this bill's rationalisation measures and is broadly supportive, though wary of the detail contained in regulations. Livestock SA and Grain Producers SA backed amendment No. 4, believing that decisions to collect additional levies may require consultation; however, with regard to amendment No. 1, Livestock SA pointed out that, on occasion, the fewer barriers between certain third-party figures realising they need immediate access to a property and actually being able to access that property the better. Time can be crucial to limiting and mitigating damage caused by certain biological threats and their spread. Like Livestock SA, Grain Producers SA was overall supportive of the bill but also cast a cautious eye towards regulation details.

Amendment No. 5 refers to the Dog Fence Board and the Dog Fence Act. This existing provision in the bill would, in the event of an emergency, give the Dog Fence Board power to make its own declarations regarding any council in South Australia. Essentially, it becomes a taxing power able to raise money from councils on behalf of the state government.

The Local Government Association of South Australia told us its preferred position would be to either adopt a more user-pays system, collecting fees from, for example, farmers living near the fence, or rather than use councils to raise funds, instead use funds collected via the state government's existing Emergency Services Levy. The hint about why this makes sense is in the title: Emergency Services Levy.

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

CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 September 2024.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:58): Today, I rise to indicate the opposition's support for the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2024, a bill introduced to refine and enhance the powers granted under the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015. This legislation, brought to the Legislative Council on 12 September 2024 by the Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC, reflects our commitment to strengthening community protections against serious offenders.

The Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015 has served as a critical tool in managing the risks posed by those convicted of serious, violent and sexual offences, as well as terror-related crimes.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I remind that interjections are out of order. However, this amendment bill aims to make essential improvements, clarifying definitions and enhancing the authority of courts and the Parole Board to enforce and modify supervision orders effectively.

The amendments proposed reflect a comprehensive approach, addressing gaps highlighted in previous legislative discussions and adapting the act to serve our communities better. The Liberal Party of South Australia value policies that improve the quality of life for the individual, family and community, and ensuring their safety is paramount to this promise. We also believe in personal responsibility. There should be fitting consequences for criminal acts. Our party room agrees that these amendments reflect these values.

Clause 3 refines several definitions providing clarity on terms such as 'detainee', 'extended supervision order' and 'home detention'. These adjustments may appear technical but they are crucial for ensuring that all relevant forms of detention, including immigration detention, are included under the act's purview.

Clause 7 introduces a vital modification to allow the issuance of interim supervision orders beyond the original expiry date if necessary. This change addresses scenarios where the high-risk offender may require continued supervision, further reducing the risk to public safety and providing legal structures for extended oversight when needed.

The bill also significantly enhances the powers of the Parole Board through clause 10 which grants the board the authority to vary the conditions of the offender's supervision order. The flexibility provided by these amendments enables the Parole Board to respond to changes in an offender's risk level and make real-time adjustments to the terms of their supervision.

The Liberal Party have asked multiple questions in this place regarding the Parole Board since coming into opposition in 2022, and we hope these amendments will abate some of these ongoing concerns. These refinements are not limited to prospective cases. Schedule 1 of this bill includes transitional provisions that allow these amendments to apply to existing supervision orders

and ongoing proceedings. This ensures continuity and brings both existing and new orders under the amended framework.

This bill also introduces part 3A to enable interagency cooperation, which allows information sharing with other jurisdictions. This is particularly vital as it empowers South Australian agencies to work with commonwealth and interstate bodies ensuring that the highest risk individuals stay caught-up due to bureaucratic barriers.

High-risk offenders often present a threat that crosses state boundaries and this bill makes it possible for relevant information to be exchanged swiftly and securely to safeguard our communities. While some argue that these changes could introduce additional complexities, it is essential to remember that protecting the public is paramount. We as a party will never waver from doing our part to protect the people of South Australia.

The bill's drafters have incorporated checks and balances, particularly in the decision-making powers granted to the Parole Board, which requires thorough reporting and notice to the Supreme Court. At the heart of this legislation is a clear message: the South Australian parliament is committed to protecting its citizens from those who pose serious risk to public safety. We are committed to providing our justice system with the tools to respond to emerging challenges, ensuring that high-risk offenders are managed, monitored and, if necessary, detained for as long as required to protect the community.

Let us keep in sight the broader significance of this bill. By enhancing the clarity and scope of the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act, we are taking a principled stand for the safety of our state. The law must be robust and adaptable and this amendment bill provides flexibility without compromising our core values of justice and fairness. This bill, and I hope it is passing today, represents a commitment to continuous improvement in our legal system, reinforcing the structures that keep our community safe and ensuring high-risk offenders are managed with the diligence and vigilance they warrant.

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

PLASTIC SHOPPING BAGS (WASTE AVOIDANCE) REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 August 2024.)

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (18:03): I rise today on behalf of the opposition to indicate that we will be supporting the Plastic Shopping Bags (Waste Avoidance) Repeal Bill 2024. This is a simple bill which seeks to repeal the Plastic Shopping Bags (Waste Avoidance) Act 2008 and the Plastic Shopping Bags (Waste Avoidance Regulations) 2022. Currently the act bans retailers from providing a customer with a lightweight checkout-style plastic bag. The regulations set out signage requirements in relation to the banning of plastic shopping bags.

The new Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) (Prohibited Plastic Products) Amendment Regulations 2024, under the Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) Act 2020, include plastic shopping bags already banned under the plastic bags act, as well as banning all plastic film bags, no matter the thickness, and plastic-laminated paper shopping bags. The new regulations broaden the scope of prohibited plastic shopping bags, and the penalties under the single-use plastics act are broader and higher than those under the plastic bags act. These regulations came into effect on Sunday 1 September 2023, which means that the plastic bags act and regulations are now redundant and hence being repealed.

I would like to take the opportunity to briefly highlight the Liberal Party's strong record in delivering practical action in this space, as it was the former Marshall Liberal government that introduced the nation-leading single-use plastic legislation. The former Liberal government saw SA become the first state in the nation to ban a range of single-use plastics, including plastic straws, cutlery and drink stirrers. The work we started has seen further plastics banned in September this year, including plastic pizza savers, cotton buds, bowls, plates and, of course, plastic bags.

The former Liberal government extended South Australia's nation-leading approach to recycling and waste management. In reflecting on this, I commend the bill.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (18:08): I rise to speak on the Plastic Shopping Bags (Waste Avoidance) Repeal Bill 2024. It is fantastic to say that, back in 2009, South Australia led the nation in the phase-out of lightweight plastic shopping bags when the plastic bag act came into effect under the former Rann Labor government.

This repeal bill aims to extend the prohibitions on single-use plastic shopping bags by banning lightweight, singlet-style plastic shopping bags that are less than 35 microns—that is right, 35 microns—in thickness. Utilising the more modern and broadly scoped Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) Act 2020, also known as the 'single-use plastics act', will strengthen our efforts—'strengthen' is a fantastic juxtaposition—to remove plastic film shopping bags of any thickness from circulation in South Australia by broadening the scope of prohibited plastic shopping bags. This will include plastic shopping bags already banned under the plastic bags act, making the plastic bags act redundant and in need of repeal.

To bring it to somewhat of a sudden close for this evening, in summary the plastic bags act bans retailers from providing a customer with a lightweight, checkout style plastic bag, which is defined as a carry bag that includes handles and comprises in whole or in part polyethylene, with a thickness of less than—that is right, you guessed it; how many microns?—35. That is right: 35 microns.

Biodegradable bags and heavyweight plastic bags are not banned under the plastic bags act. The new Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) (Prohibited Plastic Products) Amendment Regulations 2024, under the single-use plastics act, include plastic shopping bags already banned under the plastic bags act as well as banning all plastic film bags no matter the thickness and plastic laminated paper shopping bags.

The current plastic bags act includes an exemption for the Australian standard certified compostable shopping bags. This exemption has been included in the draft single-use plastic regulations as well as additional exemptions for reusable shopping bags made from plastic material such as nylon, polyester, woven polypropylene and non-woven polypropylene.

Penalties under the single-use plastics act are broader and higher than those under the plastic bags act. Under the plastic bags act the offence is limited to a retailer providing a plastic shopping bag. However, the single-use plastics act contains an offence to sell, supply or distribute. The maximum penalty under the plastic bags act for providing a plastic shopping bag is \$5,000, whereas the single-use plastics act contains a maximum penalty of \$20,000 for a manufacturer, producer, wholesaler or distributor and \$5,000 in other cases, such as for a retailer.

So what does all this mean? It means that there are going to be less plastic shopping bags at most retailers. I know, from having engaged, over the time that I have been in parliament, in a number of committees relating to waste and recycling that plastic shopping bags are something of a bugbear for many commercial arrangements. However, I have to note that, as those committees have progressed over time, we have seen most of the major retailers—certainly the major retailers—adapt quite well to the incoming plastic bag regulations as they have been brought into place.

I think what that is is a great example of the retailers—certainly the major ones—being able to achieve what it is that the government is seeking them to slowly get to. I do agree that in some ways that would be a bit too slow for what could be required as probably the intent of the initial 2009 legislation of the Rann government. However, we are slowly getting there—and it is slow, I will acknowledge that, but we are slowly getting there.

I would say as well that, in terms of practice, back in the day when we were banning single-use plastic bags in 2009—it seems like only yesterday—I was not much of a plastic bag ban fan, but I have come round. Perhaps it is age. I have come round. I have decided that the plastic bag

ban is something that I can live with, not least because paper bags have become far stronger and far more practical for what we seek to put in them.

While what we seek to put in them is certainly the next frontier, I think the plastic bags around the plastic containers which also then have bags of plastic in them is something that is in the days of our past. That will summarise what I have to say on this bill.

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

RETURN TO WORK (PRESUMPTIVE FIREFIGHTER INJURIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 October 2024.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:14): It gives me great pleasure on behalf of the Greens to rise to support this legislation, the Return to Work (Presumptive Firefighter Injuries) Amendment Bill. This bill adds, at the behest of the United Firefighters Union, an additional three cancers particularly pertaining to women firefighters. The Greens have long championed a presumptive approach when it comes to the connections between firefighters and the cancers that they contract through their work. That causal relationship, as we know, has been well established by science, and as we have more data we are able to add particular cancers to that list with the additional information that we receive.

I note that the Hon. Frank Pangallo has an additional list to add and that also comes before us with the support of the United Firefighters Union. The Greens will be supporting the Hon. Frank Pangallo's amendments, and we do so with pleasure. We note also that the Greens have consulted the CFS Volunteers Association. I am not sure that the government bothered to do that, which is a little disappointing, but it will indeed apply to them, because under the Return to Work scheme firefighters are workers.

Whether they are career or volunteer, if they contract cancers because of their work as firefighters, protecting people and place and planet, then I think they deserve to be treated with respect when it comes to workers compensation. I would hope that next time that respect is accorded to them in terms of an actual consultation before a bill like this comes before this place.

It will be no surprise to those in the sector that the Greens will support this. We have long championed this, and I do commend particularly the work of Adam Bandt, who in the House of Representatives actually initiated the first of these sorts of bills in our nation. They are very common in places like Canada and have been well established. We know that additional cancers will be added to the list as we have more data. In this case, there was a lack of women firefighters, and now we have more data about that we welcome that addition from the government. We do also strongly support the proposed amendments from the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I commend the bill.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (18:16): I rise in support of the Return to Work (Presumptive Firefighter Injuries) Amendment Bill 2024 and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. I also indicate that we will be supporting the Hon. Frank Pangallo's amendments.

The Return to Work Act 2014 provides recovery, return to work and support for workers in relation to work injuries. The purpose of the amendment bill is to address an essential matter of health, safety and equity for our firefighters, those who dedicate their lives to protecting our communities. The Return to Work (Presumptive Firefighter Injuries) Amendment Bill 2024 seeks to amend schedule 3 of the act—Injuries presumed to arise from employment as a firefighter, to include three additional cancers—cervical, ovarian and uterine cancers—as presumptive injuries for female firefighters serving in the South Australian Country Fire Service and the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.

This will mean that when a woman develops one of these cancers following their service as a firefighter for the qualifying years they do not have to spend their time, energy and money fighting for their case to be acknowledged as an acquired injury under the Return to Work Act. Instead, it is

presumed that their injury was as a result of their work, unless proven otherwise, and they can immediately begin receiving the support they deserve.

We must recognise that the nature of firefighting exposes these courageous women to a range of health risks that do not affect men. Currently, schedule 3 acknowledges several cancers as presumptive injuries, but it fails to address the specific cancers that affect women firefighters. The number of women working as firefighters has significantly increased, and no-one should have to choose not to join a workforce they are passionate about because they will not receive the same equitable compensation and support as their male counterparts.

If this bill helps just one woman in her cancer battle that was a result of exposure to carcinogens in her line of duty, it is worth our time as lawmakers to make these changes. Queensland recently made similar changes, expanding the list of cancers covered by their workers compensation scheme. These changes garnered bipartisan support, because they are rooted in evidence and are a commitment to safeguarding the health of our first responders.

We must ensure that our legislation is reflective of the need of all workers. By expanding the list of presumptive injuries, we not only support our female firefighters but also send a clear message: their health matters, their sacrifice matters, and their contribution to our communities will not be overlooked.

The Hon. Frank Pangallo's amendment seeks to reduce the qualifying period of some cancers and insert further cancers and other diseases, also in line with the Queensland act. We thank the honourable member for these additional amendments. It simply should not be the case that a firefighter goes unsupported and forced to fight this battle alone because they did not serve the qualifying period of 25 years. This is a good bill and good amendments. I hope to see it passed with the honourable member's additions. We must support our frontline workers, and I believe this bill achieves that.

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (18:20): I rise to support the Return To Work (Presumptive Firefighter Injuries) Amendment Bill. This bill reflects Labor's commitment to improving the function of our Return to Work scheme and builds upon changes that have already been introduced in this place this year. The goal of this bill is to make it easier for female firefighters to access compensation for work-related injuries.

It has been widely known for over 10 years now that firefighters suffer cancer at a higher rate than the general public. The first large-scale research of cancer and deaths in Australian firefighters in 2014 found that their cancer risk would increase in line with the number of fires attended and years of service.

The Return to Work Act lists some of the most common cancers that occur in firefighters as presumptive cancers. If a firefighter suffers from any of the cancers listed, the assumption is that the cancer was caused by their work and compensation payments are therefore available to them.

There has been a growing gender gap in cancer payment claims since women started joining the workforce in higher numbers. This is because some of the cancers suffered by women were not included in the list of presumptive cancers. The effect of this was that the burden of proof lay upon each firefighter to prove that their cancer arose out of their employment as a firefighter, which complicated, delayed and, in some cases, terminated their chances of gaining compensation.

This bill expands the list of presumptive cancers in the legislation by three, including cancers which predominantly affect women: primary site cervical cancer, primary site ovarian cancer, and primary site uterine cancer. As long as someone has worked for the necessary qualification period, if they suffer from any of these three cancers they will be assumed to have arisen from their employment.

There is still a lot that needs to be done to make the Return to Work scheme fit for purpose for firefighters. Along with cancer, PTSD and post-traumatic stress injuries are the most common injuries resulting from service as a firefighter. There is also the risk of exposure to asbestos in a building where there is a fire, and many other carcinogens.

Firefighters put their lives on the line for us and their compensation scheme needs to reflect the enormity of that risk and sacrifice. This bill is a small, but important, first step in making sure these issues are addressed. I commend the bill to the chamber.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

GREYHOUND INDUSTRY REFORM INSPECTOR BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (18:23): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Mr President, I rise today to speak to the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector Bill 2024.

I commend the Hon Katrine Hildyard MP Minister for Recreation Sport and Racing on the successful passing of this Bill through the other place.

As the Council is aware, our government acted swiftly to establish an inquiry following the emergence of disturbing footage which demanded this action.

The Independent Inquiry into the Governance of the Greyhound Racing Industry was conducted by former Victorian Police Commissioner Graham Ashton AM APM.

Mr Ashton did an excellent and thorough job and was assisted in his work by Ms Zoe Thomas who was also exemplary in the work she carried out.

The Report was publicly released on 14 December 2023. It made 86 recommendations focused on helping ensure the Greyhound Racing industry modernises its practices in line with community expectations.

The Report's recommendations included significant animal welfare, integrity and administrative reforms to be progressed by the controlling body, Greyhound Racing SA.

A key recommendation of the Report was Recommendation 57, to 'establish the role of an independent inspector for greyhound racing reform, to be known as the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector.'

The core role of the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector is to:

- Oversee the implementation of the recommendations from the Inquiry and resulting Report.

To do so, the Inspector's role is also to:

- Develop and maintain relationships with relevant parties to oversee the Review implementation.
- Establish and convene a Greyhound Racing Reform Advisory Group to provide professional advice regarding the reform progress.
- Regularly report to the Minister for Recreation, Sport, and Racing on the progress of the Review implementation; and
- Meet regularly with Greyhound Racing SA's General Manager Integrity and Welfare who is required to report to the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector on welfare matters.

Mr Sal Perna AM was appointed to the position of Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector.

Mr Perna's career spans five decades of fighting crime and corruption. He was appointed as Victoria's inaugural Racing Integrity Commissioner in 2010 and provided independent oversight of integrity of that state's multi-billion-dollar racing industry.

Mr Perna also conducted an inquiry into live baiting in greyhound racing in Victoria.

It is clear that Mr Perna, who formally commenced in the role on 8 July 2024, has already approached his remit with diligence and determination.

Mr Perna is a highly competent person.

There is currently however no legislative mechanism to compel Greyhound Racing SA to cooperate with the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector.

We want Mr Perna to be empowered to carry out his role with the access to information and premises that he needs to do so.

To help ensure that the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector can indeed have, as the recommendation states, 'unfettered access to Greyhound Racing SA systems and data', we introduce this new legislation.

Having said this, it should be noted that to date Greyhound Racing SA have been very cooperative during this process.

This Bill has been developed through targeted stakeholder consultation with a range of parties, including the:

- Attorney General's Department;
- Animal Justice Party;
- Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds;
- Department of Environment and Water (DEW);
- Greyhound Racing SA (GRSA);
- Harness Racing SA;
- Racing SA;
- Royal Society for the Protection of Cruelty Against Animals (RSPCA);
- Consumer and Business Services (CBS); and
- South Australian Police (SAPOL).

It will absolutely support the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector to oversee the recommendations and ensure government is able to determine if the greyhound racing industry has sufficiently reformed after the recommended period of two years.

Enshrining the powers of the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector in legislation will ensure compliance with requests and assurance and the ability for the Inspector to fulfil their function and duties with access to the required information needed to do so.

The provisions within the Bill clearly establish the powers of the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector, outline what is required of the Inspector and defines the independence required and functions of the role.

As well as outlining these powers in relation to the requiring of information and the entering and inspecting of premises, the bill also sets out the applicable penalties regarding non-compliance.

The Bill seeks to support the sharing of prescribed information between the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector and state authorities and defines the appointment of authorised officers for the purpose of the Bill.

The Act will be time limited legislation with expiration at the conclusion of the reform period.

The Inspector has been appointed to satisfy the Government and our community that real change is happening, and this Bill is a key step in ensuring the inspector has the powers to do so.

I progress this Bill today as a key step forward in ensuring the role can be fulfilled and in the way that the report envisioned.

Mr President, I commend the Bill to the Chamber and seek leave to insert the Explanation of Clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines key terms for the purposes of the measure.

Part 2—Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector

4—Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector

This clause provides that there will be a Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector who will be a person employed in the Public Service of the State.

5—Functions of Inspector

This clause specifies the functions of the Inspector.

6—Staff

This clause provides for staff to be assigned to the Inspector.

7—Delegation

This clause is a standard power of delegation for the Inspector and the Minister.

Part 3—Powers

8—Power to require information

This clause provides that the Inspector or an authorised officer may, by notice in writing, require the controlling authority, or an officer or employee of the controlling authority to provide (within a reasonable time specified in the notice) information or documents in their possession, or to require a person to attend at a specified time and place. Failure to comply is punishable by a maximum penalty of \$10,000.

9—Powers to enter and inspect etc

This clause sets out several powers of the Inspector or an authorised officer to enter, search and inspect premises, seize things and require persons to answer questions in the circumstances and within the limitations outlined in the clause.

10—Offence to hinder or obstruct Inspector or authorised officer

This clause makes it an offence for a person to hinder the Inspector or an authorised officer, use certain language to the Inspector or an authorised officer, refuse or fail to comply with a requirement of the Inspector or an authorised officer, or to refuse or fail to answer questions to the best of the person's knowledge, information and belief.

11—Self-incrimination

This clause provides that a person cannot refuse or fail to answer a question or produce documents as required under the measure on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate the person or make the person liable to a penalty.

If a person objects on either of the first two grounds, the fact of production of the document or the information furnished is not admissible against the person except in proceedings in respect of making a false or misleading statement.

Part 4—Information gathering

12—Sharing of information between certain persons and bodies

This clause allows the persons and bodies specified in subclause (1) to exchange certain information to each other without restriction.

13—Interaction with *Public Sector (Data Sharing) Act 2016*

This clause clarifies that the proposed Part does not affect the operation of the *Public Sector (Data Sharing) Act 2016*.

Part 5—Miscellaneous

14—Authorised officers

This clause provides for the appointment of authorised officers by the Inspector.

15—Impersonating authorised officer

This clause provides that a person who falsely represents, by words or conduct, that the person is an authorised officer is guilty of an offence for which a maximum penalty of \$5,000 applies.

16—Confidentiality

This clause provides for confidentiality of personal information, information relating to trade secrets or business processes or financial information received under the measure (except in certain specified circumstances).

17—False or misleading information

This clause provides an offence of making a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular (whether by reason of the inclusion or omission of any particular) in information provided under the measure.

18—Final report

This clause requires the Inspector to submit to the Minister a final report on the implementation of the Report recommendations by the controlling authority, and the final report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

19—Regulations

This clause is a regulation making power.

20—Expiry of Act

This clause provides that once the final report has been tabled, the Minister may fix a date for expiry of the measure by notice in the Gazette.

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

At 18:24 the council adjourned until Thursday 31 October 2024 at 14:15.