

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 9 March 2023

The **SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** took the chair at 11:00.

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: FINDON TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:01): I move:

That the 20th report of the committee, relating to the Findon Technical College, be noted.

The public works submission from the Department for Education proposes a new technical college at Findon High School. The college will form part of this government's commitment to establish five technical colleges over the next four years. The colleges will provide a pipeline of skilled workers for entry-level jobs in key industries with the greatest demand. They are designed to modernise senior secondary schools and deliver a practical-based learning program that includes technical, literacy and numeracy skills in line with industry need.

Each college will be tailored to the needs of its local industry, region and community to ensure meaningful pathways from education to work. They will cater for students from years 10 to 12, in conjunction with nearby high schools, allowing students to complete their SACE while obtaining trade qualifications. The Findon Technical College will be located on the Findon High School campus within the City of Charles Sturt. The college will be built on the school's existing sports courts with the relocation of these courts included as part of this project.

The existing front car park will be reconfigured to accommodate more vehicles and an additional car park will be developed on the school grounds. The proposed college is designed around a central learning area across two levels with connecting stairs, tiered seating and a raised roof light. The central area will offer formal and informal spaces for learning, interaction and socialisation, with connections to workshops, general learning areas and educator and support spaces.

The first floor will house early childhood education and health and social care, along with space for a future learning program. Preparation spaces and stores will be distributed throughout the building for specialised staff training, as well as informal breakout spaces. The key aims of the building are to: firstly, provide a contemporary, environmentally sustainable technical college that incorporates new technology to support vocational training; secondly, create an adaptable, innovative learning environment that is responsive to future opportunities; and, lastly, deliver a senior secondary program that includes vocational qualifications and subjects to achieve SACE in a state-of-the-art facility.

Ecologically sustainable development (ESD) strategies have been incorporated in the building design to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions. To ensure strong ESD outcomes, the department has engaged a consultant to advise on best practice and establish ESD requirements as part of the tender. Workshops will continue to be held with clients, end users and the design team to ensure that ESD initiatives are targeted in accordance with stakeholder priorities.

The anticipated enrolment for the technical college will be between 90 to 120 students for 2024 and 135 to 180 students for 2025. Construction will be delivered as a single stage for the building and associated works. Findon High School students and staff are expected to remain at the

school site for the duration of construction. Early works were scheduled to start in February of this year, at an estimated cost of up to \$35 million. The college is expected to be operational from term 1, 2024.

The project has considered the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1992, with respect to making provisions for persons with disabilities. The project will be fully certified in accordance with legislative requirements. There are no outstanding land purchase transactions or agreements beyond the formal construction contract.

The department affirms that the school principal, governing council, staff and education director have been informed of the scope of works to be completed at Findon High School and confirms that care has been taken to consult with stakeholders to ensure their questions and concerns have been addressed appropriately.

The committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Findon Technical College Project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Ms Helen Doyle, Director, Capital Projects and Technical Services, Department for Education; Mr John Harrison, Director, Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Mr Michael Lambert, Director, Brown Falconer architects. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:06): I am very pleased to make a brief contribution on the Public Works Committee's report on the proposed infrastructure at the Findon Technical College, where I understand work has now begun. I see that the technical college is effectively a significant upgrade to the facilities at Findon High School and I am certain that the Findon High School community is glad of this opportunity, in addition to the \$10 million capital works that were in planning and underway to some extent. This is now a \$35 million additional project, which will provide particularly technical college facilities in the form of buildings that are purpose-built to deliver certain vocational education training outcomes.

Its purpose, if I can sum it up, is to upgrade a school's facilities and to prioritise vocational education and training and vocational outcomes, which is certainly a purpose that the opposition has no problem with. The way that the government has talked about the technical college program, both in the election campaign and since, is where the rhetoric does not quite match up to the reality.

Technical education and vocational education are tremendously important, and I think they are understood in the community as being important priorities as well. I think that when many in the community think of technical colleges they think back to a bygone period where indeed some schools existed solely to be technical colleges. There was certainly a movement away from that approach in the 1970s and eighties and nineties. I think that we understand there was certainly a push to make sure everybody was able to conceive that they could get to a university pathway if they wanted.

In recent years, we have been struggling with the legacy of that as we also now try to educate not just students but parents as well that technical and vocational skilled pathways are tremendously important opportunities.

Indeed, one of the priorities for our government, when we were in from 2018 to 2022—I worked very closely with the member for Unley, who was the minister for skills during that period—was to ensure that students, who were not the biggest problem in terms of highlighting the importance of VET, as it was particularly their parents and the broader community, understood that eight out of the top 10 pathways in terms of the growth sector for jobs were in vocational and technical education and that in many ways it was where there would be the best job opportunities and pay opportunities. Those sectors required a skilled qualification, rather than a university degree.

The idea was that we could encourage more young people into learning and earning at the same time, so that if they were in year 12, for example, they could be completing that year 12 while at the same time completing the first year of an apprenticeship. That was an important step.

The reality around how to best deliver vocational education and training, skills qualifications, to school students, to students of school age, is more complex than the rhetoric would suggest. The rhetoric goes back many years. I think this really first came to the political fore in about 2007, give or take a year or two, when Kevin Rudd's government decided that the Trade Training Centres were to be one of the ways forward. These were centres where funds were made available by the federal government to set up improved technical facilities in state and non-government high schools around Australia. Different clusters of schools were encouraged to bid for that federal fund so that they could build some purpose-built technical facilities in their areas.

Some of those facilities that were built within a couple of years became obsolete and were no longer connected to the industries and what industry needed. I think it belied a lack of consultation and engagement with local industry on what was needed at the time. The education department has learnt from that experience over the years, no doubt. Some of those facilities still exist and have been repurposed in other ways, but we have potentially expensive pieces of kit lying dormant, as they have for many years.

The state government during the Rann and Weatherill eras had a program called Trade Schools for the Future, which operated with apprenticeship brokers. I think it was closed down in 2017 and that funding was repurposed for other tasks within the education department. Certainly, in 2018, when the Liberal government was elected, we had a program called initially Flexible Apprenticeships, and then Flexible Apprenticeships and Traineeships. It was highlighted to me as the shadow minister and then minister that that had an unfortunate acronym. Ultimately, some engagement with the industry sectors highlighted a better name for it, which remains under the new government, as I understand it, the Flexible Industry Pathways model.

I think the key insight that the Flexible Industry Pathways model had and why I think the new government has been good enough to continue that program is that we want to make sure that, firstly, flexible pathways—they might be an apprenticeship or a traineeship or, in certain sectors, another model of a pathway, bespoke for each sector—really look at the needs of industry. Having that high school qualification is very important, but ensuring that for industry and businesses to engage with the students effectively, the school needed to be designing its program around what that industry needed.

Having a one-size-fits-all approach, where the school timetable rules supreme and the student might be available to go out to work as part of their apprenticeship or their traineeship for three hours a week or potentially one day a week on a release to the business, was not something that was going to be of any real benefit to the business. You certainly would not be able to get the job readiness that a first-year or a second-year apprentice requires by having that short period of time.

The Flexible Industry Pathways model firstly designed: what does industry need, and where are the jobs going to be that will be there for these students when they finish that pathway so it can be seamless? They continue through their high schooling, they start the pathway in year 11 or 12 and they are potentially doing the majority of their week at the business or industry or potentially the whole week with just some blocks of time going back to school to complete their required SACE units. Then they can seamlessly go on to be working in that industry or continuing working in that business as a second, third or fourth-year apprentice once they have finished their year 12.

The second insight that the Flexible Industry Pathways model had, which is tremendously important, was that we want all of our schools in South Australia to be able to offer these pathways. Each one of our public high schools has signed up to one or more of the 26 Flexible Industry Pathways; some of them are offering many. I note that the member for Florey in talking about programs to be offered at the Findon Technical College highlighted early childhood education and health and social care. These are two tremendously important areas with jobs shortages and skills shortages. We need students and young people to do certificate III, certificate IV and diplomas in these industries, starting at many schools with certificate II, I imagine, as well.

The thing is that there are many high schools around South Australia that are offering these pathways as part of their approach under Flexible Industry Pathways, and this is good. Many of them were piloted in 2021, and many of them were fully rolled out in 2022. In the years ahead, I expect

schools around South Australia to continue to offer Flexible Industry Pathways in health and social care and in early childhood education.

Indeed, I think that dozens of schools, I think 20, may be offering it at the moment. I could be wrong and I am sure the minister could correct me if I am mistaken, but many schools are able to offer these pathways, and they can offer them to students from other high schools in the local area as well, and that is a great outcome. It will encourage, hopefully, hundreds if not thousands—there may already be potentially hundreds of students undertaking these. But with dozens of schools involved, with all our public high schools offering different industry pathways, we can really be put in a great position to meet the skills needs of the future.

Bringing us back to the specific pathways being offered at Findon High, there will be a \$35 million new building for those pathways to be supported in. I think that there is no problem with upgrading the school facilities. What I would hate to see—and the government, and I am sure the department, has got some people working on this—is the buildings being seen as more important than the work that is being done in these buildings and more important than the engagement with business and industry.

It is going to be very important, as these technical colleges are rolled out at very significant expense, that those five sites not be seen as the priority area over and above the need for us to give every student at every school in South Australia the opportunity to find the pathway that suits their needs. So I urge the government to keep those Flexible Industry Pathways at schools across South Australia as the priority, so that students, whether at Findon or at any of the other 130-odd public high schools, have access to great, quality pathways and skilled qualifications.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (11:16): I rise to make a few brief comments on the noting of this report. I begin by thanking the member for Florey for his words, and of course the member for Morialta as well. It was a very exciting occasion to join the Premier, along with the member for Cheltenham and also representatives of Hindmarsh builders, in this case Rowan Hindmarsh himself, and Brown Falconer, who are the architects for this project in particular and who have done some fantastic work across the education system in other projects as well.

Also, of course, perhaps most importantly, we were joined by Kathleen Hoare, who is the principal of Findon High School and a very well-regarded principal in our public education system. She is doing wonderful things at Findon High School, which, to not put too fine a point on it, I think I can fairly characterise as a school that has been underinvested in for many years. It is a school that is in a very important area of Adelaide and a school that has had a significant capacity available to it, over and above current enrolments, for a number of years as well.

We know that we need to get out of the cycle that governments of all persuasions have been stuck in, I think, in South Australia for a long time, namely, spending a lot of taxpayers' money to upgrade and expand schools that have really acute enrolment demands, rather than focusing on trying to uplift those schools in our system that have a lot of existing enrolment capacity that is not being utilised by the local community.

I think Findon is a school that has, for many years, fallen into that category, and I am pleased to see that we now have a couple of significant projects occurring there. One of those is, of course, what we are speaking about here now, the construction of a \$35 million technical college at the Findon High School site, but there is also the project that the member for Morialta alluded to, which is a \$10 million upgrade at the school through a Building Better Schools grant approved by the now Deputy Premier, the then education minister at the end of 2017.

I think exciting things are happening at Findon, and what I hope to see through the completion of these two really significant projects is an increase in the number of students locally who choose to go to Findon, which then has a couple of benefits. One, of course, is that in an ideal world everyone feels completely comfortable going to their local school, which means ease and convenience for those families, but it also then has the added benefit of taking pressure off the system more broadly for those families who would be otherwise choosing to go to a school out of their area.

I want to make a brief comment about how exciting it is to have Hindmarsh builders as part of this project. They completed the first SAHMRI build, which is a building of international renown, and an award-winning building I think as well, so it is great to have that team on board with Brown Falconer doing the work here at Findon. This is just one of five technical colleges that this government has committed to build. It was one of our key election commitments.

To remind the house of the five sites, at Mount Gambier it will be co-located with the existing UniSA and TAFE buildings. At Port Augusta, it will be built and co-located with Port Augusta Secondary School. At Tonsley, it will be at the Tonsley innovation precinct, and I was pleased to join the member for Elder and the Deputy Premier there recently to announce that we have struck an agreement, a memorandum, with Flinders University there to partner with them in what we build. The technical college that will be built at the Tonsley innovation precinct will be closer to a \$50 million build than the \$35 million build that it would otherwise be and that the other four technical colleges will be. There is also The Heights School in the north-east, but the first that will be finished and operational from the first day of term 1 next year is Findon High School, which is very exciting.

I was pleased to be there to turn the first sod and see a number of diggers and other very big construction equipment on site getting on with the job, which is great. From the moment that we announced Findon as one of the sites for the five technical colleges, the principal, Kathleen, told me that the phone was ringing hot with parents from the local area inquiring about when they could get their kids enrolled. I think it is safe to say there is going to be a lot of demand for places at this technical college and the other four as well.

What we know we need to do if we are to really make a serious dent in the skills crisis that faces Australia at the moment is we need to do things differently. Part of the Malinauskas government's approach to that is the building of these five technical colleges to give students the opportunity to come into the college at year 10 and complete their SACE whilst also getting certificate IIs and certificate IIIs.

In the case of Findon, I think the most exciting part of the project so far is an agreement that we are at least very close to reaching with BAE Systems, who are a very important employer in South Australia, where a certain number of apprenticeships will be put aside by BAE for those coming through the advanced manufacturing stream at Findon and then going straight from high school into a job. That pathway can be seen by the young student and their broader family really from year 7 and 8. They can see the opportunity to move from school to the tech college in year 10 and then, if they enter the advanced manufacturing stream, which is one of the three things being offered by Findon, hopefully straight into an apprenticeship with BAE Systems.

I think it provides not only a certainty for that student and their family in terms of a job that will come at the end of their studies—which of course has to be our goal—but it also provides some much-needed assurity to employers, particularly in those areas where we know not only do we have skill shortages now but there is going to be increased demand given the projects that are coming online in South Australia.

There are some really exciting ones that will not come as a surprise to anyone in this chamber around defence projects and submarine builds but also our commitment to universal preschool for three year olds, which will mean we need to increase our workforce in early childhood education and care, which is one of the other three specialisations at Findon. Then there is the work that this government is doing to rebuild our health system, which brings me to the third specialisation at Findon, which is broadly around health, a number of health streams.

It has come on the back of an enormous amount of consultation that has been done by the team in the education department. I want to make special mention today, in the time I have remaining, of Clare Feszczak, who is the executive director in this area. She has done an incredible job, along with the assistant minister in this area, the member for King. I think 500 businesses and industries were consulted and engaged with right across the state before decisions were made around what the courses and streams offered at Findon and the other four technical colleges will actually be.

We have done that work. The member for Morialta referred to the importance of doing that, and I wholeheartedly agree with him, but I can reassure the house that that work has already been done. It is that work that has informed what we are offering at Findon. I think the member for Morialta

referred to technical colleges, or trade schools, of days gone by, and of course that will evoke for many people images of the traditional tech colleges.

I went to school at one of those that had the big old trade wing, that had metalwork, woodwork and automotive, but these need to be more flexible in terms of making sure that the pathways they offer are up to date for the modern South Australian economy. We also have to make sure that what we create here is a model which is nimble and flexible enough.

That is what Clare Feszczak and her team have done, but in the future if the skills needs of the state change, which of course they will over time, then the flexibility is there in the model to change from potentially these streams to something else, if that is what the state needs. I think probably part of the downfall of the old model was that it was very rigid in how it operated. I want to commend all those involved. It is very exciting. I look forward to being on my feet in this place over the next year or so to give more updates on this project.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:26): I rise to make a contribution on the Findon trade school as well and in doing so reflect on the success of doing something different, which is what the Marshall government did in the four years when we turned the training system around in South Australia. Just for some background, when we came to office in 2018 South Australia had the worst-performing commencements of apprenticeships and traineeships in Australia. As a matter of fact, there was a 66 per cent decline in the number of commencements of apprenticeships and traineeships in the six-year period from 2012.

By the time the Marshall government left office, there was a 34 per cent increase to 30 June 2021, the largest increase in the nation. We went from being the worst-performing state when it came to commencements of apprenticeships and traineeships to the best-performing state by a very large number. When we came to office, there were about 15,000 apprentices in training in South Australia. When we left office, there were 31,675—the latest figures that I have available here—who were training in South Australia.

So we were doing something different; we were doing something very different. We were engaging employers in the apprenticeship system once again. We did that because we were investing in people. We were not investing in bricks and mortar. Employers had bricks and mortar. They had factories and buildings that they were operating their businesses from. We actually recognised that the biggest barrier for skills growth here in South Australia was the on-the-job training.

Anybody will tell you that vocational education is based around a combination of classroom training, which is a very small part of training in most certificate III qualifications, which is what the vast majority of apprenticeships are based on, and it is the implementation of that off-the-job training in the workplace that delivers the outcome, delivers the skills that industry needs. Of course, the minister was right when he said that industries are changing and we need a flexible system. That is exactly what we had with our Skilling South Australia program. It was a very flexible system where we were supporting apprentices in the workplace as well as in the registered training organisation in which they were working.

Amounts of around about \$10,000 were offered to employers to help them to remove barriers to taking on apprentices and to bring in enablers to support their staff, particularly those skilled people who were spending their time working with apprentices and trainees and passing on their skills in that area. This was identified as being a major cost, a major disincentive, particularly in the very early days of an apprenticeship—that first year, that first six months of a traineeship.

On top of supporting those apprentices and their employers through the Skilling South Australia program and that support that we provided for the early years in particular, we also expanded our use of the pre-apprenticeship program. That expansion was criticised by those opposite because they said they were not real apprenticeships and they were not real traineeships, but they all led to apprenticeships and traineeships. There were employers lining up to take those apprentices and trainees on once they got through that process.

It was not just accredited training that they would do in those pre-apprenticeships. As a matter of fact, there was very little apprenticeship training. It was the sort of life skills that had been

lost in a generation that people of my generation, for example, would have picked up working part-time, or even playing as children. We know that tying down a load, parking a vehicle, and even sweeping the floor are the sorts of things that many people would have learnt just in growing up. But of course, it is many of the skills that they call 'soft skills' that we are focused on. For example, digging a ditch that is for a particular length, a particular width and a particular depth is a skill that many employers value, particularly in the plumbing and electrical trades. Pre-apprenticeship programs were set up to do that.

They were run by industry-based RTOs, supported by industry, and then those apprentices were employed by industry. The figures speak for themselves: from the worst performing state in the country—only 15,000 apprentices and trainees in training—to a 34 per cent growth to June 2021 to over 31½ thousand apprentices and trainees. It was the largest in the nation. Of course, we did not stop there.

We were very much engaged in the school system with our World of Work program, a program that we borrowed from the United Kingdom, where we designed a program that enabled students to be exposed to the workplace from grade 7. How often do you come across a year 11 or 12 student who is studying particular subjects but still does not know what they want to do? The World of Work program was designed to help students understand what opportunities were there for them, matching their natural skills and their interests with where they will be able to make a good living in a skilled area with those skills.

We expanded the school-based apprenticeship program. We had big growth in school-based apprenticeships. We did that again through our Skilling South Australia program, but also because we enabled apprentices to work up to four days a week in the workplace—not at school but in the workplace so they were being paid. This is a significant difference between the Labor Party's policy, what they are implementing in their trade school policy, and what we were able to achieve. Without spending millions of dollars on buildings, by using existing infrastructure and investing in people rather than in bricks and mortar, we were actually able to deliver a massive growth in apprenticeships and traineeships by working in partnership with industry.

Of course, it was not just traditional industries. Yes, we had, I think, close to double the number of apprentices in the construction sector in that time. We also brought in new apprenticeships in the ICT sector, in cybersecurity, a growing sector. When we came to office we were shocked to learn that the previous government had suspended the traineeship program in the public sector—no traineeships or apprenticeships in the public sector, and we brought that in.

That was an extraordinary capitulation to the public sector unions who demanded that government offer permanency to these apprentices and trainees. It simply does not happen in any apprenticeship or traineeship system anywhere. A traineeship is a contract and then there is an opportunity to apply for a job with that trainee employer or with another employer with the skills that you have learnt.

Of course, the Labor government's response to that was to no longer take on apprentices or trainees because they did not want to be tied to the obligation, like any other employer. They did not want to be tied to the obligation of having to put people on in a training situation in a permanent public sector position. But we changed all of that. We got around that enterprise bargaining agreement by using group training organisations to bring those people into the sector, and we are expanding the skill sector in the public sector, and the private sector is also picking up those people that the public sector trained in those new areas.

So it is an exciting time because of the work that was done by the Marshall government. Even those who are learning skills in child care and aged care are now being paid to do that, something that they had to do in their own time previously, and that is a legacy that I am certainly very proud of.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:36): I just want to take this opportunity to thank those who have contributed to the debate. The member for Morialta and the minister were kind enough to give us their views about this particular project, and it is also always pleasing to be taken on a trip down memory lane by the member for Unley, so thank you very much for his contribution as well.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MAJORS ROAD INTERSECTION UPGRADE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:37): I move:

That the 25th report of the committee, entitled Majors Road Intersection Upgrade, be noted.

The public works submission from the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) proposes to construct a new interchange for the Southern Expressway at Majors Road and install new traffic signals at the junction of Majors Road and Adams Road. Situated west of Main South Road and east of Ocean Boulevard and Lonsdale Road, the Southern Expressway is a major high-speed traffic route linking the outer southern suburbs with the southern metropolitan areas of our city; however, there is currently no public vehicle access to the Southern Expressway at Majors Road.

This has been a recurring issue for local residents, particularly since 2001, after traffic volumes grew significantly with the completion of the first stage of the Southern Expressway. New on-off ramps on the Southern Expressway at Majors Road have therefore been identified as a priority upgrade. These proposed works are expected to generate economic opportunities by connecting the expanding industrial, commercial and residential growth areas in the south.

As part of the upgrade, modifications to the existing Majors Road bridge are necessary. To improve safety and increase network efficiency for vehicles accessing the Sam Willoughby International BMX facility and the Southern Soccer Facility, the construction of a new signalised junction at Majors Road and Adams Road is also proposed. The existing veloway adjacent to the Southern Expressway at Majors Road will be reconfigured and new pedestrian and cycling facilities will be installed on Majors Road to provide connectivity.

The proposed scope of works includes new on-off ramps to the Southern Expressway for access to and from the CBD and the north-south corridor, new on-off ramps to the Southern Expressway for access to and from the southern suburbs and the north-south corridor and Fleurieu Peninsula, and a widening of the Majors Road bridge to accommodate six lanes including two through lanes and a dedicated right-turn lane onto the Southern Expressway.

Emergency services will be provided direct access to the new interchange. In addition, the new design incorporates pedestrian and cycling connections to provide safer access to Glenthorne National Park, O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park and the Sam Willoughby International BMX Facility.

Key outcomes of this project include improved road safety, enhanced local access, reduced travel times, improved route reliability, increased network resilience, and realisation of investment benefits. The Australian and South Australian governments have jointly committed \$120 million towards the design and construction of an interchange for the Southern Expressway, with funding split fifty-fifty.

Money from this government was committed as part of the 2022-23 state budget. Construction is scheduled to commence in mid-2023 and end in late 2025. Planning, design and investigations are already in progress. Ongoing costs for the maintenance of the proposed upgrade will be sourced from the department's annual operating budget.

The delivery of the upgrade will be undertaken through separate planning, design and construct contracts by contractors appointed through a competitive tender process. The project management will be undertaken by DIT in accordance with its program and program management guidelines and contract management procedures. External specialist recourses may be engaged, if required.

An environment and heritage impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the department's Environment and Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines. The assessment identified aspects that will require investigation and assessment during the design and construction phase, as well as additional environmental approvals.

A vegetation survey of the project area was undertaken by a qualified consultant. The presence of threatened ecological communities or species of conservation significance was noted in the vicinity of the project; however, the project is unlikely to require referral under the Environment

Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. An ecologically sustainable development report has been prepared by the department, outlining the ecologically sustainable development (ESD) objectives and principles for the project. DIT has current endorsement of its ESD system from the Department for Environment and Water.

DIT prepared a community and stakeholder engagement plan that provides an overview of the actions needed to ensure all stakeholders, including local residents, property owners and businesses, are adequately engaged. DIT began community consultation in August 2022, resulting in the release of a preferred concept design and a summary of feedback by the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport in October 2022. Further community consultation was then initiated with a close date of 2 December 2022. DIT affirms that communication will continue throughout the works to ensure that stakeholders are kept informed and issues are identified early and managed appropriately.

The committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Majors Road interchange upgrade. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were the member for Davenport; Mr Andrew Excell, Executive Director, Transport Planning and Program Development, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Mr Michael Rander, Delivery Manager, Department for Infrastructure and Transport. I would like to thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Black for the written statements they submitted to the committee.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:42): I am pleased to make comment on this Public Works Committee report. I am a huge advocate for the Majors Road interchange project, an election commitment of the Malinauskas government that will deliver a wide range of benefits to southern suburbs commuters, national park users, pedestrians, cyclists and the local community.

It is very pleasing to see the Albanese Labor government and the Malinauskas state government partnering on this important project and getting to work so quickly. I welcome the proposed improvements to access our beautiful Glenthorne National Park and recreation facilities, the improvement to traffic movements and the construction jobs this project will support during its construction.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, who have done an incredible job with the community engagement on this project. It has been an excellent process. They reached a large part of the community and received significant responses and support for the project. Demonstrating strong community support, we saw 65 per cent of the 745 survey responses positive and in support of the project.

Earlier, there had been some concerns shared about potential impact to Glenthorne National Park, noting previous Liberal government designs that showed a considerable impact. The Liberals' 2019 plan proposed to impact a minimum of 13,000 square metres of Glenthorne National Park, including 8,000 square metres of established vegetation and significant trees.

Our beautiful parks are something that I am keen to see preserved and protected. I am a keen supporter of the environment and will never waver on this topic. That is why I am pleased to see that the Department for Infrastructure and Transport has pursued a design that has minimal impact on the park and that ensures there is no impact on significant vegetation.

I am also pleased to see that engagement by the current government, with community groups and associations, has resolved all concerns regarding any impact on community facilities. While the former Liberal government's designs would have had impacts on these facilities, community representations and concerns have been listened to, and the current design has no negative impact for users.

I can confirm that, contrary to the deliberate efforts to share false information via glossy materials in the letterboxes of the Black electorate, there will be no impact to the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park mountain bike trails, no impact to the Sam Willoughby International BMX Facility,

no impact to the Southern Soccer Facility, no impact to Glenthorne Farm and very minimal impact to the Glenthorne National Park.

Pleasingly, the new design incorporates new bike connections to the national park, making it even easier and safer to journey to the park by bike. This is an excellent example of government getting community engagement right. We shared information with the community, we listened to their ideas and their concerns, we addressed those ideas and concerns and now we have a well-supported positive solution for our community. It is yet another demonstration of the Albanese and Malinauskas governments working together to get on with the job of delivering the infrastructure South Australians need and deserve.

This project will deliver lasting road infrastructure improvements, while providing critical local jobs, with approximately 245 full-time equivalent jobs to be supported each year over the construction period. We know more work on the books is always welcome news for our local construction businesses, and so I was particularly thrilled to see the South Australian Aboriginal business, RAW SA, already engaged on this region-shaping project. They have been contracted to construct project site facilities adjacent to the Riding for the Disabled Association SA site, as well as continue site investigation works to help us to better understand the underground services and inform the project's detailed design.

Just last week I met with Riding for the Disabled, and they were particularly excited to share that they have been able to negotiate with the department and the contractor to accommodate the site buildings at their site in exchange for being able to retain the hard base of that building once the works are complete so that they are able to build a future nursery on that site. They are excited about those opportunities and the many more opportunities that this project will bring to the O'Halloran Hill precinct.

The site investigation works for this great project are underway now, with the construction of site facilities set to commence in the coming weeks. We anticipate the procurement of the interchange's design and construction contract to be completed in mid-2023, with major work expected to start late this year and project completion by the end of 2025. Key design features will include:

- new on/off ramps in both directions;
- widening of the Majors Road bridge to accommodate two through lanes and a dedicated right-turn lane onto the Southern Expressway in both directions;
- a signalised intersection to improve access to Majors Road from Adams Road;
- a new dedicated bike lane on the northern side of Majors Road and a new shared-use path on the southern side of Majors Road; and
- new and upgraded traffic signals, road lighting and drainage.

The community and I are extremely thankful that the current government has addressed the significant deficiencies in the former Liberal government's plan and we look forward to continued updates on this exciting project. Thank you to the Public Works Committee for their thorough consideration of this project and, importantly, for giving it the green light.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (11:48): I want to make a brief contribution on this really important project to upgrade and provide improved access to the Southern Expressway via the Majors Road intersection. In 2014, I was elected to this place and, very early in the doorknocking of the then Fisher community in O'Halloran Hill, the difficulties that this group of people had accessing the Southern Expressway, and how they really desperately wanted to be able to use what was going to become a really important piece of infrastructure in the north-south journey, were highlighted to me.

I set about starting to have those conversations with our then Labor government. This has been an ongoing conversation through our community and the desired outcome, it seems, is now going to be achieved. I am really pleased to see that.

I am not in the habit of wasting my time looking through the social media of any other party or the opposition, as such. However, people did raise with me that back in 2018, just before the state election, the then member for Black and now Leader of the Opposition had posted a video on Facebook prioritising this particular project as the number one priority. I have the post printed here in front of me, which is still there, including a video, saying:

ACCESS @ MAJORS!

For far too long, the Southern Expressway has by-passed our community and I want that to change!

Delivering an on/off ramp at Majors Road is my number one priority and this will mean:

- access to the expressway for Hallett Cove, Sheidow Park, Trott Park and O'Halloran Hill;
- quicker access to the city and the Fleurieu;
- improving traffic flow and reducing pressure on South Road and other roads.

I am 100% focused on delivering this project with design works budgeted for early in the term of a new Liberal government.

Well, the member for Black as a minister in the previous cabinet spent the next four years, sadly, having to retreat from that commitment for whatever the reasons might have been. But I know that the community is now very excited that our state Labor government and the federal Labor government have been able to navigate this impending catastrophe that is now articulated by the member for Black around environmental and access concerns and carving out unnecessary components, according to him, of the national park.

I am very pleased that the grown-ups have actually worked out a way to do this so that we get great access to Glenthorne Farm and we get access to Sam Willoughby's BMX track if and when it opens. I am not sure it is open yet, again, after the catastrophe that was the burns that slid down and looked more like blankets than racetrack after the rains that came on the day of the opening. That was all a bit embarrassing. Hopefully, now we will see access, improved traffic flow, both south and north, and for those who live in my 'hood there will be better access to the national park—Ityamaitpinna Yarta is the traditional name—the BMX track and the southern soccer facility.

I know that residents of my old Fisher haunt—now ably looked after by my friend the member for Davenport—will be very pleased with the commitment; a real commitment that stacks up, a real commitment that is delivering for the south.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:53): I rise to speak about the Majors Road interchange upgrade report. Obviously the member for Schubert and myself carefully researched this very matter and we did of course submit our own minority report. I would like to touch on a few of these issues that we have arrived at.

Obviously we are concerned about the committee's decision to support a proposed project for purposes that we say will result in fact in little to no gain for the community, but also come at enormous cost. During the committee stage we were able to delve a little bit deeper into the economic cost-benefit analysis. Certainly we had serious questions surrounding the lack of rigorous economic analysis applied to this proposed project.

We know that the former government obviously did conduct a body of work, and the economic benefit was not totally justified. The only thing that changed after the election was, of course, the government and, as well as that, a new minister and a new CEO, and we have seen a change, if you like, in direction. Whilst that is the prerogative of the new government, the economics remain the same. In fact, *ceteris paribus*, the costs have actually increased. When that is the case, I cannot understand how the economic benefit increases; if anything, it only decreases.

There is also in the community a substantial group of people who are not in favour and see this as quite unfavourable, and that there will also be unintended consequences if it proceeds, including impacts to Glenthorne National Park, as we have heard. There was extensive community consultation conducted by government and opposition late in 2022, and we have seen a significant proportion of the community that remains unconvinced about the value, but also the benefits of the project, with 35 per cent of respondents indicating that their sentiment towards the project is either negative or very negative.

I did also point out that in the analysis commissioned by the former government in 2020, it found that the proposed on/off ramp at Majors Road would result in no, or questionably any, road safety benefits, would significantly increase traffic volumes and also have some restriction of access to the Glenthorne precinct. That particular cost-benefit ratio deemed the expenditure unjustifiable. I asked questions in the committee about this and there were various explanations given about why, for example, the discount rate had changed. That seems to be a little bit inconsistent, sir, but that could be a debate for another day. I do not want to talk to you about net present values and discount rates as it might put you to sleep, sir, even being the good, astute Speaker that you are.

Despite reference by the transport minister to there being a positive benefit cost ratio, we do not think that that has been adequately substantiated. I also asked questions about wider economic benefit, so there is not just the net present value you have to look at, but you also have to look at the wider economic benefit. When you look at that on balance, we find it incredible that the government would propose a \$120 million investment—in reality, of course, it is going to be more than a \$120 million investment of taxpayer funding—when we say that there are countless other competing demands.

At the end of the day, there are infinite wants and limited resources, and we have to use those resources to get the best bang for buck possible. We find it incredible that the government would have proposed an over \$120 million investment of taxpayer funding when there are countless competing demands, including, for example, to complete the north-south corridor, and a third arrester bed on the South Eastern Freeway.

Look at the lives lost on our roads at the moment. We have had an horrendous start here in South Australia. We do not want to politicise road safety—we do not; however, what is happening at the moment is just not good enough, and we say that there are far more substantial higher priorities to which this government should be allocating resources.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:57): I would like to thank those who have contributed to the debate, the member for Davenport and the minister, and I would also like to thank the member for Hartley for his contribution in outlining the opposition's reason for opposing this particular project. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the member for Schubert and the member for Hartley for the contributions they made to the committee's consideration of this particular project.

Motion carried.

Bills

FIRST NATIONS VOICE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 March 2023.)

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:58): I rise today to lend my support to the First Nations Voice Bill. I want to commend my good friend, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher, in another place for the amazing work that he has done.

I think when people look back at the history of South Australia and the work that the Parliament of South Australia has done over the years, Kyam Maher's name will be held up as one of the great champions of change in South Australia. As an Aboriginal man he has led the consultation, the discussions and the drive for us to reach a point where we can give Aboriginal people a voice in South Australia, a voice to the parliament, a voice to government, that will be heard and acted upon.

Kyam Maher did extraordinary work where other attempts had failed over the years to bring in the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill when we were in opposition. Leadership on important issues like this, leadership on emotive issues like these, takes great strength, takes great courage and it takes a stamina that few of us have. I look at all of my parliamentary colleagues: they all, on both sides, have heavy workloads, but when I look at Kyam Maher's work that he does in this parliament and on behalf of communities right around South Australia, I think he is an extraordinary man who has done

an extraordinary job. We appreciate what he is doing now, but I think history will judge Kyam as one of the great leaders in South Australia's history.

Six years ago now the Uluru Statement from the Heart was delivered after widespread consultation and discussion. It is a very short statement but one filled with emotion, with a structure, a plan, for all Australians to walk with Aboriginal people, our First Nations people, in a way of improving the nation that we live in, a nation that cannot stand by for another year, another decade, and allow what has happened over the past 200 years since European settlement occurred to keep on going.

There needs to be change. We have tried things over recent decades, all aimed at improving things for our First Nations people in Australia, and still to our great shame as Australians we have a huge segment of our population, a really important segment of our population—those First Nations people—who die younger than the rest of the Australian community, are incarcerated at rates much higher than other Australians, are in juvenile detention centres and have worse health standards than the Australian average.

This is not something that goes unnoticed around the world. As Australians we like to take pride in being Aussies, the people who give everyone a fair go, the nation that is for everyone, yet when you go overseas and talk to people who have an interest in what is happening globally, they ask the question, which is a very difficult question to answer: why do we treat our First Nations people so poorly? This first struck me in the mid-1990s when I lived in Switzerland and made friends with people in Italy, Germany and right throughout Europe, and many of those people kept bringing up this issue. It followed the time of Hawke and Keating, who had done so much, and I would explain that to people, and they would still go, 'Yeah, but the problems haven't been fixed and the world is watching.'

It is to our shame as Australians that we have not done better over the years in looking after them. Some of the things we have tried to do to help have actually created the reverse impact. It has often been people in this place, with very few connections to Aboriginal people, who have been making decisions on behalf of these people about what their life should be, about what their conditions should be, without truly listening to the voices of those people who are most concerned.

I think when the First Nations people, who have been treated as poorly as they have for a couple of hundred years, come together and write a very articulate Statement from the Heart in 2017 and ask us to join them on the walk into the future, a walk that has First Nations people and all Australians walking as one, that is a very generous thing for them to do, to extend that offer to us.

Really, six years later, the fact that we have not given that voice at the federal level—and I am really hopeful that that happens later this year—is pretty sad, given the incarceration rates, the poor health sustained by Aboriginal people, all of these things that have not improved. The problems are still there and action needs to be taken.

We have a mandate to do that here in South Australia because we took this to the election last year, in March 2022. Kyam Maher, as our then shadow Aboriginal affairs spokesperson, and our then opposition leader, now Premier, Peter Malinauskas, took this to the election. So the South Australian people were left with no doubt whatsoever that if we were to win the election, we would be bringing this into parliament and hopefully bringing it into law, and that is to give the First Nations people in South Australia a voice, a voice that will be listened to.

Over the past almost year since we have been in government, discussions have been happening right throughout the state. I want to thank all of those people who were involved in those discussions to work out the importance of the Voice and how that would work and who would be a part of it. For people to say that there has not been enough consultation: there has been a lot of consultation.

On the day that this bill was introduced into the upper house, we had Aboriginal leaders from around the state in here at Parliament House, and you could see the joy on their faces and the tears rolling down their cheeks—and, I must admit, I had tears rolling down my own cheeks—at what was a pivotal moment in South Australia's history. These people have been fighting forever to have their voices heard, and here, finally, people in this place had invited them in to see the introduction of that

bill. I am hoping that in a few Sundays' time, we will have people from across the entire South Australian community come here to bear witness to this Voice actually being enacted and taken over to Government House to receive the assent from the Governor.

We all have our own personal stories about what has influenced us in life and what has helped inform us on various aspects of our lives. I can only speak from my own personal experiences about the context that First Nations people have played in my life. I am almost ashamed to say that I have had very little interaction with Aboriginal people. I grew up on a dairy farm in the South-East where we had one Italian family, the Prosperi-Porta family, who had about five kids, and that was about as culturally different as anything we had in our small dairy farming community.

The multiculturalism down there was Irish, Scottish, Welsh and English. The Boandik people had been pretty much wiped out by those early settlers. I trace my own family back to the *Buffalo* with my great-great-great-grandfather, James Harvey, coming out on the *Buffalo* as a 19 year old. He built the first wagon wheels in the new colony. He had land at Glenelg that he swapped because he wanted to find gold at Prospect Hill. He moved to Prospect Hill. I do not think he found any gold. He had 16 kids with his wife and farmed. They would walk down the hill to McLaren Flat and pick grapes in those early days of the colony. That was on my dad's side.

On my mum's side, my great-grandfather lost his dad as a seven year old and his mum remarried a Hogan. He was a Kennedy, but his mum remarried a fellow called Hogan and they migrated from Tipperary to the South-East and had land just out of Mount Gambier. In their writings, they wrote about the challenges of clearing the land of vegetation, kangaroos and natives. We know there were massacres right through those early colonial years in South Australia and we cannot shy away from that, just like civilisations around the world cannot shy away from bad things that happened in their communities. We can ask forgiveness and we can say sorry, but we cannot shy away from those things.

We also cannot let this imbalance in our society, where we share this beautiful country with the oldest continually living civilisation that goes back at least 60,000 years, continue for another day, another week, another month or another year, let alone for another decade or another century. We have to own up to the fact that things are out of whack here and that we have one part of our community that is terribly overrepresented in all the worst statistics that are possible and underrepresented in the places where we should be having more First Nations people. We should be celebrating them.

I want to read a few lines from the Uluru Statement from the Heart. As I said, I think it is a very generous document. It is a document that asks all of us to walk together, but it comes from the First Nations' perspective. It says:

Proportionally, we are the most incarcerated people on the planet. We are not an innately criminal people. Our children are [alienated] from their families at unprecedented rates. This cannot be because we have no love for them. And our youth languish in detention in obscene numbers. They should be our hope for the future.

I think all Australians should share that sentiment and allow the people who have written this Statement from the Heart and all those who they represent to flourish. It goes on:

These dimensions of our crisis tell plainly the structural nature of our problem. This is the torment of our powerlessness.

We seek constitutional reforms to empower our people and take a rightful place in our own country.

It is a pretty good point. It is their country that they have called home for 60,000 years. They are just asking for a voice in their country. It continues:

When we have power over our destiny our children will flourish. They will walk in two worlds and their culture will be a gift to their country.

We call for the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the Constitution.

Obviously, that is what has to happen at the federal level. Here, we have one less barrier: we do not have to have the referendum, but we do have to have a majority in both houses to get this up. It continues:

Makarrata is the culmination of our agenda: the coming together after a struggle. It captures our aspirations for a fair and truthful relationship with the people of Australia and a better future for our children based on justice and self-determination.

It is asking for fairness in a nation where we always believe in everyone getting a fair go. I find it hard, having read that statement many times over the past six years, to find anything really controversial in there, anything that we would not necessarily agree with. I have been buoyed by the fact that so many people in my community, so many South Australians, are actually taking the attitude of, 'Why wasn't this done a lot earlier? Why would we stand in the way of listening to First Nations people and actually doing what they want for their people and for our country?' I commend everyone for pulling together the Uluru Statement from the Heart. I think it is a lesson in concise communication and something where the point is so clearly and well made.

I mentioned before the fact that for a lot of Australians we have had very few interactions with Aboriginal people. Growing up in the South-East, the first Aboriginal people I saw were brought to our school from the APY lands, because our principal had been working up in Ernabella. His name was David Tassell. He brought these Aboriginal people down and they taught us songs. They taught us how to play the didgeridoo, and they taught us how to play the sticks. My sisters and I still remember the songs and the rhythms and the wonderful sense of enlightenment that we got as six, seven, eight-year-old kids from that trip organised by David Tassell.

But I did not see Aboriginal people in our community. I remember being about 10, looking along the pew at church and seeing a young Aboriginal kid there, who may have been adopted or something like that, but that was it. Throughout my life, at school, in the workplace, the first colleague that I have worked with who is a First Nations person is Kyam Maher.

When he went off to the APY lands to do business a few years ago, it all happened pretty quickly for us. Obviously, he knew that something was happening. He was going to get the call when the time was right, and then he was gone. I was talking to Uncle Moogy, to all the Aboriginal leaders that we now know and work so closely with, and every time I would see one of them I would be going, 'Is Kyam going to be alright?' They would say, 'He will come back, and he can't tell you what happened when he did business.' This is a big part of his life, and I felt bad that I had so little understanding of what Aboriginal culture is all about.

As I said at the outset, of all the people in this place, I have the most admiration for Kyam Maher and for everything that he goes through. He has added layers that none of us ever have to deal with. We all have busy workloads, but Kyam has this sense of duty that is palpable, that you can sense coming out of him, this sense of duty for his people, to lead them to a better future: a future where we have a lower incarceration rate, where we have health results and health standards that are the same for First Nations people as they are for the rest of the Australian population.

When we go overseas and when we welcome visitors to our country, I think we should be in a much better place, a place where we can be proud about where we are headed and where we are in terms of the way we treat First Nations Australians. I have not always been able to say that I am proud of that, for many of the things that are historic but also for some of the things that are reasonably recent. As legislators in this place, it is beholden on all of us to listen to the community and do the work that they want done to make South Australia a fairer place and a better place for all South Australians.

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (12:19): I stand in this place as the member for Flinders, which is a diverse electorate that is physically very distant from this place and one that has Aboriginal communities across its lands, including some very remote ones. Upon reflecting on some of the contributions to this bill, can I note that I am not aiming to be politically adversarial on this item. I want to be matter-of-fact about my opinion that this is poor legislation that will not deliver real, positive outcomes for my community. From my perspective, positive outcomes for our Aboriginal population should be the most important aim with Indigenous policies.

This issue really is above politics. Whatever party you are representing, you have a genuine interest in seeing improvement in this area. It is something that governments have struggled with on both sides for many years, at both the state and the federal level. I think the Australian public has a

right to be disappointed in the progress of improvement and the significant gaps in practical outcomes between our Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations.

Some of the examples of these have been articulated already through some of the contributions. One of these is education outcomes: giving our young Aboriginal kids opportunities to achieve better social, economic and wellbeing outcomes through education. I see it from examples across schools across Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast. Another is health outcomes: the life expectancy gaps are unacceptable and deeply upsetting, and health outcomes play a significant part in that. I see that playing out in my electorate as well, with the Aboriginal health services doing good work amongst the population.

Regarding incarceration rates, as has been mentioned, the terrible fact is that our Aboriginal population are over-represented in detention. The supports for our young people, in particular, to help them navigate life to avoid such situations are so important. Once again, I see that clearly within my electorate. I can understand why the government may want to make a significant change, with the deficiencies that are happening currently, but I do not believe this bill will achieve anything practical for my Indigenous community.

The First Nations Voice Bill 2023, which we are debating, seeks to establish an elected body of Indigenous South Australian representatives, known colloquially as the State Voice to Parliament. This Voice will formally interact with our parliament and state government, including receiving notification of the introduction of every bill to state parliament and being given the opportunity to address either chamber, although not both, with regard to any given bill.

The Voice will be required to deliver an annual report and to address members at a joint sitting of state parliament each year, and to ensure that the issues raised therein are considered. A response to the report must be provided by the minister, including detail as to whether any action has been or will be taken. Required meetings will take place between both the Voice and the cabinet, with briefings held for the Voice by chief executives of every government department at least twice yearly, where any matter of interest can be discussed. As stated by the Attorney-General in the other place, this direct access to government will provide Indigenous people with the ability to influence decision-making at the highest possible level in South Australia.

I am sure there are the best intentions around the development of this bill from those who might see the challenges that are faced by the Aboriginal community and seek to provide a solution. As I said, I am not being adversarial. This is an admirable thing and it is what is expected of us by those from our communities who have elected us.

There is no doubt that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people face very serious challenges that cannot be ignored, and I do not believe they have been. I was interested to read some of the data from the Australian Productivity Commission's series of reports entitled Indigenous Expenditure Report, with reports delivered in 2010, 2012, 2014 and 2017. These reports highlight to me that indeed our decision-makers at the political level have been investing significant expenditure into the challenges. The 2017 report, in particular, which is the most recent one that is publicly available, states about expenditure estimates in 2015-16 that:

The total direct expenditure on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians was estimated to be \$33.4 billion.

To quote again:

On average, direct expenditure per Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australian (\$44 886) is around twice the direct expenditure per non-Indigenous Australian (\$22 356).

It is entirely reasonable, I think, to say that all sides of politics have taken this issue very seriously over many years, and have made repeated, ongoing and genuine efforts via policy positions, very substantial funding allocations, and other practical steps to address Aboriginal disadvantage in South Australia and, more broadly, across our nation.

The success of these measures is able to be debated, obviously, but what cannot be are the genuine focus on and the attempts to address Aboriginal disadvantage that they represent. The myriad organisations, both government and non-government, that are responsible in this area reflect

this, and there is no greater example than that within my electorate covering Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast.

The question is then: what can be done better? The perspective put from the government is that the Voice, as it is has been called, will do this. Anyone who has watched Indigenous policies throughout the decades would know that the concept of an overarching body which can speak for Indigenous Australians is not a new one. It has been tried a number of times and, unfortunately, it has failed a number of times.

When I talk to my Indigenous friends and constituents, I get asked, 'How will this be different?' How can one small group of people somehow speak on behalf of Indigenous peoples and communities from across our vast state? Even in my electorate, the diversity of views and perspectives vary so much between the Barnjarla, the Wirangu, the Nauo, the Mirning, and the same with peoples across the state. I worry that the structure which is put together within this legislation actually creates more division than it fixes. It can potentially widen the gap between those that have and those that have not.

Our system of government is built on equality of representation. As a democracy, any citizen can put up their hand to be elected to represent their community within parliament, and it truly is a privilege to do so. We all have the opportunity for this equal voice within our society, and those who are elected have the immense responsibility to be representing all their constituents the best they can.

This change, I believe, set out within this legislation, adds inequality and disruption. I believe that all people are created equal, and should be treated as such, and it is our responsibility as elected officials to create a society where equality of opportunity is something we should absolutely strive for. I know there is genuine emotion and care, which has been put into this process, but I believe this legislation is fundamentally flawed and, although well intended, will not deliver the positive outcomes for my community that such a piece of legislation should. Although it is not something I do lightly, I will not be supporting the bill.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (12:27): It gives me great pleasure to rise to make a contribution on the First Nations Voice Bill. I think the Premier has articulated the prospect of this bill passing both houses of parliament really well in saying that this is a really significant milestone for the South Australian parliament and for the governance of our state. It is a remarkable change that this bill will see in terms of how our parliament and our community engages with First Nations people and, I think, one which not only makes sense but you could comfortably say is also long overdue.

We have all separately in our own ways come to arrive at views about how well our community provides for First Nations people, and we have heard many contributions so far on how perhaps over-represented First Nations people may be in our criminal justice system, how poorly served they seem to be through our structures and services with regard to the health system and comparative health outcomes, life expectancy outcomes, and their capacity to achieve economic and social opportunity.

This is not something that is new or newly recognised. This is something that we have been aware of and struggling with and trying different ways of tackling for decades. While, yes, there have been some pleasing examples and areas of progress, I do not think anyone can credibly say that progress has been swift or timely or significant enough to ensure that First Nations Australians are getting equal access and equal opportunity to economic and social participation in our community.

All of us should consider that situation as completely unacceptable—completely unacceptable. It seems to me that, perhaps in a similar vein to how the member for Mawson reflected on this in his own experience, I consider this bill and I make my comments on this bill from a position where I have not had the benefit of extensive and longstanding interactions with First Nations Australians or Aboriginal South Australians throughout the course of my life. It has principally only been through my roles in government previously and also now as a member of parliament that I have had the fortune of those experiences.

Through that relatively and comparatively brief experience compared to some of my colleagues in this place on all sides of the chamber, even though I have had that comparatively limited engagement, it is absolutely and abundantly clear to me that the current arrangement by which we hear First Nations Australians, that we give Aboriginal South Australians the opportunity to engage with us, to engage with our parliament and to strive for improvements generally in their lives, is not working well. It is not working well, and the outcomes speak for themselves.

If you cast your mind back through the decades, there seems to be the same situation, albeit in different contexts, which arises from time to time, where there seems to be a sudden recognition of the plight and the social and economic disadvantage of First Nations Australians, or particular communities within a state or within the nation, that draws the attention of the public and of the media. There is a flurry of media reporting, a flurry of public interest and an urgency for decision-makers to do something about this situation. There are announcements of action, there are commitments of new resources, and the attention inevitably ebbs away, and the media and public focus move on.

It happens time and time again. Even in recent memory, even in the last 20 years, we have seen that with the previous Howard government's intervention. We saw a different approach here under the previous Rann government of a much greater involvement and investment in resources in the APY lands to combat some of the plights of the communities there and some of the social dysfunction and dislocation that was occurring there—the poor health outcomes, the poor opportunities for economic participation—and this seems to happen cyclically. Even in recent weeks, we have seen the plight of communities around Alice Springs reach national attention and the urgency for the Northern Territory and the commonwealth governments to step in and do something there. These problems seem persistently unresolved.

We had the effort from the previous Rudd commonwealth government to really promote the Closing the Gap initiative, where not only would there be additional resources provided across a range of different service delivery areas, but importantly there would be a focus on collecting data and reporting on outcomes for First Nations Australians across a whole range of areas, across a whole range of different areas of government service delivery, for example. That, I think, was approximately 15 years ago—I think in 2008 the effort was really made and the agreements reached between state and territory governments with the commonwealth for not only the additional resources and the framework but the reporting against it. That continues today.

There may well have been pockets of progress over the last 15 years. I do not mean to decry all of the efforts that have been made under that particular initiative since then, because extraordinary effort and extraordinary resources have been put in, but I do not think we can credibly say that we have significantly and demonstrably improved overall those economic and social outcomes for the recipients of that effort.

I think part of the problem is a dislocation between what the actual experience of First Nations Australians is and the considerations and the decisions that get made by people in positions of decision-making authority, whether it is members of parliament considering and passing legislation or whether it is governments of the day and ministers in positions considering submissions and funding requests for additional initiatives and so on. With that in mind, I think that providing a further but much better opportunity for direct engagement with the South Australian parliament for Aboriginal South Australians makes absolute sense.

For many people in the broader community who perhaps have not had the opportunity to see the bill or have it explained to them as to what the process will be of establishing the framework by which Aboriginal South Australians will be able to elect their regional Voices and how the statewide Voice will be able to engage with the state parliament, I can understand why in some areas of the community there is some trepidation that some people may be seen to get particular access to the parliament that other people may not. But I do not think that that is a fair way of representing what we are considering here.

Think of the counterfactual. Think of the benefits of particular cohorts of our society that have enjoyed unfettered access to the parliament and all of the benefits that have come with it. While it is gradually changing—for example, I think the former Deputy Premier referred to a particular cohort of the community or a particular demographic as another 'old stale male', which used to almost

exclusively populate the benches in this place up until recent times—I do worry that there is a persistent mindset in some areas of the community who think that there is one group of South Australians who are going to gain further and better access to the parliament than other groups, and that just simply is not the case. That just simply is not the case.

There has also been a concern that there will be a third chamber of the parliament, that there will be another decision point that motions and bills will have to pass through in order to be formally approved. That is also absolutely not the case. Indeed, I think many members have made the contribution that they have had constituents come up to them, raising issues or concerns with the proposed Voice to the South Australian parliament and, on having a better understanding of how it is going to work, those constituents feel a bit more comfortable with it.

But I am concerned that we still have the opposition that, at this point, remains opposed to this bill. Of course, we should all arrive at our conclusions based on the information that we have and what we think is in the best interests of the parliament. But I do remain concerned that, to me at least, there does not seem to be a well-articulated motivation for opposing this bill because to oppose the bill accepts the status quo, and to accept the status quo means to accept the decades of failure that we persist with in trying to provide equal social and economic opportunity here in South Australia for Aboriginal Australians, and that to me is completely unacceptable.

Should the legislation be passed, I know that when in the future I stand before this place as Treasurer and hand down a budget, I will be for the first time under this regime subject to the views of the Voice's representatives in this place, and that will be an additional level of scrutiny. I assume that at times that is going to be uncomfortable. I assume that it will be challenging. 'Why has the government not invested more resources into this particular area?' 'Why has the government taken this particular approach with this particular initiative?' 'Did you consider how it may affect the people that I represent?' These, for example, may be some of the representations that are made.

While it may feel uncomfortable for, if not me, then a future treasurer from either major party in South Australia, that scrutiny should be welcome because I think when we are put in these positions of taking significant decisions then we should be cognisant of how different groups in the community are going to be affected by those decisions. We should be prepared to explain or to justify the decisions that we take and to be cognisant of the impacts that our decisions are expected to have out in the community.

We have done that as a parliament. Indeed, I am looking across at fellow members on both sides of the chamber, even in the last session of the parliament where we considered a number of really significant, weighty matters of conscience where I am sure we had all been separately, individually, collared by our constituents saying, 'Why on earth did you decide that? Why on earth did you vote in that particular way?' We should welcome that scrutiny.

But it is not just about scrutiny of the decisions that we make. The regime is not just commentary on a bill which has already had its drafting instructions approved by cabinet, which has already been drafted by parliamentary counsel and all but finalised for consideration in this place and presented here. It is also the engagement with executive government, with chief executives and ministers outside of the parliament, which I think is also important and should be welcomed. Before we get to the point of bringing a bill into this place, I really do think that having the opportunity to engage with a Voice and their representatives about what is being done, or what is not being done, or what is being proposed to be done, will better inform us, and hopefully that will mean better decisions.

I do encourage, particularly those opposite who are opposed to this bill, to quite genuinely and seriously reflect on what the parliament will be missing out on, and what they potentially in the future as key decision-makers will be missing out on, in the absence of this Voice. If the view is that we as a parliament do not need to hear the representations that the Voice is going to make, or that they do not need the engagement with First Nations Australians that the Voice as constituted in this bill is going to provide us, then I simply do not agree with that view, and I simply do not agree with the basis of the view that we have already got enough, that there is nothing or there is only little to be gained by further engagement or further constructive dialogue with the Voice. I just do not accept that at all.

I have heard some of the contributions made by members opposite about, again, their concerns that they feel that this gives a prioritised opportunity for engagement with the parliament or an exclusive opportunity for engagement with the parliament that others do not have. Again, I would encourage them to reflect on whether that is merely a red herring or a strawman argument, which has been put up by people who are really just fundamentally against, perhaps for their own reasons, wanting to improve the lot of First Nations Australians.

As I was at pains to articulate earlier, I really do think once people understand how this works they will see that this is not some unreasonable or exclusive leg-up or access to key decision-makers that other members of the community do not have.

I would like to finish on this note: without wanting to start a party political rumination on the difference between our two major parties, my understanding of the Liberal Party is that it is based in the values of small 'l' liberalism and freedom of the individual. To the extent, in general terms, that they pursue that as a basis for their ideology, I understand where that comes from and I understand what motivates it.

I do worry, though, that at times on different issues of policy, it can run the risk of manifesting itself as a reflection on their own individual opportunity, thinking that things have worked out alright for them and that if things could work out okay for them, despite their upbringing, despite whatever hardships or grievances they may have had in their own backgrounds, it then informs the view, 'Well, I've done alright, given the cards that I was dealt. What's your excuse?' or 'What's their excuse?' It gets used as a basis for justifying a decision not to make the additional effort, not to provide additional initiatives or resources in order to address long overdue social and economic disadvantage.

I look across the chamber and I see many who are genuinely motivated to leave the South Australian community in a far better place than when they first came into this place, taking the decisions that are necessary to improve the lot of all South Australians. This is genuinely one of those opportunities. I really do hope that those opposite, when they are thinking about whether they support this bill or not, reflect on: are they going to be better off or are they going to be at a loss, depending on the passage of this bill? I know that First Nations Australians, and Aboriginal South Australians in particular, are going to be much better off with the passage of this bill.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:47): I also rise to express my very strong support for this bill. In doing so, like many others, I want to acknowledge the work over many years of Kyam Maher. The effort that he has gone to to bring this to the parliament has been something that has been outstanding to see. He will be recognised for the efforts he has made.

In those efforts, he has been supported by a lot of other people. The work that Dale Agius has done as the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement has been exemplary. The work around consultation, the work around listening to communities, the work around going back to communities to verify what he has heard and the iterative fair process that was entered into—Dale deserves a lot of credit for that process, as does Roger Thomas, whose longstanding advocacy for the Aboriginal people of this state is commendable. Indeed, he was engaged to start, if you like, a process of looking at the Voice in this state, so he needs to be recognised as well.

The people who need full recognition are often the people who do not get it. All those people throughout our state who took part in the process offered up their suggestions, answered their questions, provided their input, provided their general knowledge and provided their local knowledge when it came to shaping the bill that is before the house. This has been an effort that has taken time, and it was important that it did take time, in terms of the consultation process and the eventual build-up that was arrived at, having that out there for further comment.

Everyone is not always going to be happy. There will be some people in the Aboriginal community who will have criticism and might not even support having a Voice at all. Certainly the impression in communities I move in is that there is strong support for this direction.

It is interesting to reflect back upon history. I was not born in this country. I came out to what was a booming industrial community at the time, and my dad made an explicit decision not to go to South Africa because of the explicit racism that was at the fore in that country. In fact, it was deeply part of the whole governance structure in that nation as expressed through apartheid. Indeed, we did

drop off in South Africa on the way out to Australia and I was given my first lesson about racism and how he, as a Glaswegian with a strong commitment to an egalitarian ethos, found it abhorrent.

It was interesting coming to Australia. We came after the 1967 referendum. I would have to say that during all my schooling, Aboriginal people were hardly mentioned. It is worth reflecting on the 1967 referendum because it was one of those important steps, as a result of campaigning by activists and others over the years, that overwhelmingly the Australian people supported that referendum. Over 90 per cent of the vote said, yes, Aboriginal people should count. Ultimately, Aboriginal people got the vote.

It is interesting to reflect that prior to that, Aboriginal people did not count in the Census. They were virtually part of the flora and fauna, if you like. They did not count, they did not have the vote and they were not counted as citizens of this country. The people who have lived here for 60,000 years were treated in a manner that was absolutely appalling.

The impact of those years does cascade down through the generations: the structural problems and the issues around colonial conquest—all those things in one form or another are still with us today. It has been a long struggle to attempt to improve, often slowly improve: sometimes two steps forward and one step back. To move forward at times has been very frustrating, especially when we continue to look at all the gaps that exist. It is interesting the word 'gap' is used because, as some people have said, when it comes to some of the measures comparing the Aboriginal population of Australia to the general European descendants and others in this country, there is not a gap in places: on some measures it remains an absolute chasm.

As I said, when I came to Australia we knew hardly anything about Aboriginal people. I can only recall one reference in the classes that I attended in late primary and high school in Australia to an Aboriginal person and that person, whatever his name was, was referred to as Jackey Jackey, someone who accompanied an explorer who found whatever area that he was exploring. That was the nature of the educational instruction that a lot of people, especially older people, received in Australia when it came to Aboriginal history. Of course there would never be any mention of the initial contact and what flowed on from there. That did not come to the fore until many years later.

The other big decision that was made in the High Court was the Murray Islands decision, what became known as the Mabo decision, Mabo v Queensland. The Queensland government never over many, many years covered itself in glory when it came to its treatment of Aboriginal people, but that decision was an incredibly powerful one.

It was that decision that overturned the legal fiction, the actual legal reality when you go back, of terra nullius: that this was an empty continent. Of course it was not, given it was inhabited by the people that had the oldest continuous culture in the world. In that finding, it said that the people of the Murray Islands:

...are entitled as against the whole world to possession, occupation, use and enjoyment of [most] of the lands of the Murray Islands.

That was an incredibly important decision. Indeed, there was the decision and then the whole legislative push around the native title and the controversy. Once again, elements in this nation—you could say it is all part of democratic debate—organisations, individuals and some political parties did not cover themselves in glory. They argued that native title would cause the sky to come crashing down.

I went to some of those meetings in the lead-up to the enactment of the legislation and some of the vitriol coming from some of the pastoralists was absolutely disgraceful. The mining industry back then did not cover itself in glory, either, arguing that it was going to be an absolute disaster, but it did not turn out that way. With this debate now—not so much here in South Australia but the national debate—we have elements of this sneaking in, in addition to some really crass political opportunism.

When I was growing up in Whyalla I hardly knew any Aboriginal people. Once I got into my twenties and thirties that changed somewhat, but when you look back on those years, in the Whyalla community the Barngarla people who lived there were very small in number and this was a massive immigrant community.

I can only recall one Aboriginal woman who I went to high school with and that was Ann Croft, who went on to become a nurse. Tragically, her life was cut short due to a car accident. There was a young man, an Aboriginal man, who was famous in Whyalla and respected in Whyalla. In some ways, he epitomises the story of some of our Aboriginal people when it comes to lives tragically cut short. It is one thing to die in an accident, but with Buddy Newchurch, he was a 16 year old when he was spotted playing soccer by one of the spotters from Chelsea in the UK—not my team—but an incredibly notable team nonetheless. He was spotted; he was a left-footed midfielder and a brilliant player.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Before the member waxes further lyrical about the Chelsea Football Club, do you seek leave to continue your remarks?

Mr HUGHES: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

South Australian Multicultural Charter

Ministerial Statement

MULTICULTURAL CHARTER

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:00): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It was a great honour today for the Premier and I to launch the South Australian Multicultural Charter, and to table this important document both here and in the other place.

The South Australian Multicultural Act 2021 was enacted on 2 December 2021. The centrepiece of this legislation is the South Australian Multicultural Charter which contains guiding principles that will help guide the future of multicultural policy in our state. The charter also includes provisions recognising Aboriginal peoples and their role in the diversity of South Australia.

An extensive consultation process was undertaken as part of the formation of the Multicultural Charter, including multicultural community organisations, South Australian government agencies, local government, universities, businesses and industry bodies. The charter recognises both the achievements and challenges of the generations that came before us and who, with new and emerging communities, continue to shape our state's identity. It acknowledges that our cultural diversity is a strength.

The six principles within the charter speak to equal access to opportunities, services and the ability to thrive. They speak to having the right to freedom from discrimination into a dialogue that encourages a free and respectful exchange of knowledge and an understanding of cultural, linguistic, racial and religious diversity.

South Australian government agencies are required to have regard to and seek to give effect to the charter in carrying out their functions and exercising their powers. It is anticipated that the charter's principles will provide guidance for agencies in the design and delivery of culturally and linguistically appropriate services. Practically, the Multicultural Charter will also help organisations promote understanding and respect through increased cultural awareness, and support the implementation of diversity and inclusion strategies.

The next stage of activating the Multicultural Charter is the development of the South Australian Ambassador Program, which will engage businesses and government agencies to actively consider the charter's principles. A pilot program for the Ambassador Program will be launched in the coming months, and I look forward to updating the house regarding its progress.

I acknowledge and thank the many members of the Charter Working Group who have contributed to the development of the charter. I would like to thank all members of the South Australian parliament for the bipartisan support of this project which has progressed during both the former and current governments. The Multicultural Charter is for all South Australians, and I look forward to working with you all to promote and support the charter principles in everything we do.

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:03): I bring up the second report of the committee, entitled Riverland Fact Finding Visit, 7 to 9 November 2022.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call questions without notice, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Tony and Darren Robinson of the *Leader* newspaper in the Barossa Valley, guests of the member for Schubert. I am also aware, being a strong supporter of country newspapers, that of course they won best newspaper at the recent Country Press SA Awards—not to diminish in any way the *Courier* newspaper, which is very strong in my community.

Question Time

AUKUS SUBMARINES

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received assurances from the Prime Minister that at least eight AUKUS submarines will be built at Osborne? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 26 September last year, the Premier was asked on ABC radio whether Australia would buy submarines off the shelf from the USA and then that the ones after that will be built in South Australia. The Premier responded, and I quote:

I don't think there is any possibility this will occur...the Labor Party went to the May federal election committing to building new nuclear submarines in Adelaide ASAP...as quickly as possible.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:05): I do thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question because this is probably one of the most important projects and topics of discussion that I think we will see in South Australia in decades. The short answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question is: yes, absolutely, I have sought assurances from the Prime Minister of Australia regarding the building of AUKUS submarines here in Adelaide. That's the short, without equivocation, answer.

In respect to the response from the Prime Minister: yes, he has given me assurances that the federal government is committed to building AUKUS submarines here in Australia. I can elaborate with a little bit more detail on the commitments that I have received from the current federal government. I am in receipt of no information that suggests for one moment that the federal government is not committed to building nuclear submarines here ASAP.

I don't mind saying in this forum that I will be completely astounded and totally blindsided if the commonwealth has a departure from that policy. Should they depart from that policy, which I don't believe they will, not for a moment, but should they depart from that policy, then I will be rather forthright in my advocacy on behalf of South Australia, if that occurs.

I am not too fussed about whether there is a federal Coalition government or a federal Labor government in charge in Canberra; building nuclear submarines here in South Australia is the right thing to do, not just for South Australia but for our nation's security. It is a policy that I wholeheartedly support, as I would expect members opposite would wholeheartedly support. We will make sure that we do everything we can to lock that in.

Having said that, I don't think South Australians have any reason for any apprehension that the commonwealth won't deliver on its commitment to building nuclear submarines here in Adelaide ASAP. Naturally, the Leader of the Opposition's question arises at a time that we are seeing media speculation over the course of the last few hours about the prospect of what the commonwealth is doing to plug the capability gap. This is something that is well documented. There is a capability gap from when the Collins class submarine will no longer be able to meet the requirements of the Australian Navy versus when the new AUKUS submarines will start coming off the production line here at Osborne. There is a gap that needs to be filled.

I think it would be irresponsible for anybody, not the least of which the Premier of the state, to not acknowledge that that is a gap that is worthy of being addressed, particularly in the context of the geopolitical uncertainty that now exists, not just globally but right here within our region.

As I made clear in a speech I gave a couple of weeks ago at the Building a Bigger, Better South Australia forum, hosted by the Adelaide *Advertiser*, I think that as a state it's important that we focus on what matters most to the future of our state when it comes to the AUKUS arrangement. That is to say, we shouldn't be preoccupied about what the commonwealth decides to do to plug the capability gap, although that is of interest. What really matters is what the commonwealth is doing in terms of real action to deliver us the submarine production line here in South Australia.

We know that there is no example anywhere in the world of a nuclear submarine production line commencing the delivery of submarines and then stopping. Once these production lines start, they do not stop, which is why the nuclear submarine proposition is a more enticing one than a conventionally powered submarine proposition. We want that work here in Adelaide, we are ready to deliver that work here in Adelaide, and it's our firm expectation that the commonwealth honour its promise.

AUKUS SUBMARINES

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My supplementary is to the Premier. When will construction start at Osborne? Is it the Premier's understanding that we will still have eight submarines built in South Australia?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:09): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. Yes, we would want to see construction start at Osborne ASAP. We will await the details that are important out of the AUKUS announcement that we understand the Prime Minister will make in the not-too-distant future, and we will keenly observe the details of that announcement, particularly around construction time lines.

In respect of the number of submarines that the Leader of the Opposition refers to in the question that he asks, I think the point here is consistent with what I said in my earlier answer: what matters here is that this production line starts, because once it starts, there is no evidence of them ever stopping.

My view—my hope and expectation—is that we get nuclear submarines produced here in Adelaide as quickly as possible. Certainly, we would like to see construction of the yard down at Osborne to build those submarines commence sooner rather than later, and that will be a key detail that I am awaiting to hear from the Prime Minister.

But in terms of the number of submarines that get produced, what matters is the first one, because once the first one is delivered, we will know that the commonwealth is on track to do that forever more, because, like I said, there is not a single example anywhere in the world of a nuclear submarine production line starting and ever stopping. Let's make sure that happens and then we can have confidence there will be work for literally thousands of South Australians for decades to come.

AUKUS SUBMARINES

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:11): My question is to the Minister for Defence and Space Industries. What work is the minister undertaking to prepare the Osborne precinct for AUKUS?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:11): I thank the shadow minister for his question. The state government, through Defence SA, the department for industries and skills and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, is actively engaged with the commonwealth on the most important element of ensuring this work occurs at Osborne in the future, and that is workforce development.

There is nothing more critical to the state's policy interests than working with the commonwealth on workforce development, which is why, going right back to the Jobs and Skills Summit hosted by the Prime Minister last year, we went over there with a very specific, finite proposition that the state government co-chair a task force around developing a workforce strategy exclusively for naval shipbuilding in South Australia into the future. That task force is now underway. It is being led out of DPC in conjunction with DIS to do that enterprise.

I am not seeking to make a partisan point, but what we have seen is various iterations of policy efforts around workforce development for the naval shipbuilding program that haven't been able to realise the ambitions associated with them. Given the AUKUS announcement, now is more than an opportune time—in fact, it is a critical time—to actually develop a comprehensive strategy that isn't just the state government doing it or the commonwealth government doing it unilaterally but, rather, together in conjunction with industry to make sure we've got workforce development activities, training and skills activities, happening in a coordinated way that actually delivers to industry what they require to complete this work at pace. That isn't just in respect of the submarines but also in respect of the frigates as well.

One of the programs that is already in action is that at the beginning of this week—it feels like an eternity ago—on Monday morning, the education minister and I, along with the member for Cheltenham, were at Findon High School, turning the first sod on the brand-new technical college being built at the school. At that school, there is a partnership between Findon High and BAE on advanced manufacturing. I would like to thank and acknowledge BAE for engaging with the state government on realising the opportunity that Findon High School presents as a strategic location to help contribute to that workforce effort.

In answer to the member for Morphett's question, the principal focus from the state government's perspective, between the Deputy Premier's department and mine, is to make sure we are doing that workforce development exercise to set ourselves up for the future. There will be (and I am conscious of the time) other works that will need to be undertaken collaboratively between the state government and the commonwealth, particularly around infrastructure at Osborne. That work on preparedness is in train too, but much of that will be informed out of the outcome of the Prime Minister's decision, which we hope is sooner rather than later.

AUKUS SUBMARINES

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:15): Supplementary: you spoke of the workforce and skills task force. When will the recommendations of that be made public?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:15): The government has, at the moment, a time line in place of that program being completed around October. We haven't got a specific date and we haven't made an absolute commitment, but October is the date that we are working towards, and it is my expectation, once that work is complete, that it is made publicly available.

EYRE PENINSULA DESALINATION PLANT

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:15): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. When did the minister accept SA Water's recommendation to locate a desalination plant at Billy Lights Point on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate,

Environment and Water (14:16): The decision was announced publicly today, after going through the appropriate processes within government to ensure that there was whole-of-government support for the selection of that location. Just to be clear, the decision is that, of the various sites that have been looked at, Billy Lights Point is the preferred site to build this desalination plant, for numerous reasons, including sensible use of public money and also having appropriately addressed the scientific questions of the potential impact of that location in the salty water that will be produced by the desalination plant.

The stage of the process that we are now at is that work will advance on that site in order to develop the final business case for final approval, as well as for going through development processes. So this is well down the track now but not at the final point of approval.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary from the member for Flinders.

EYRE PENINSULA DESALINATION PLANT

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:17): In regard to the answer, can the minister assure the house that locating a desalination plant at Billy Lights Point on Eyre Peninsula will not have negative outcomes for the aquaculture sector in the Port Lincoln bay area? Has she received any feedback about the proposal from this sector?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:17): SARDI has undertaken a report, which is publicly available now, that has examined the impact, both simply of the salinity from the desalination plant into the water but also the question of whether there is an impact of any of the sprat being sucked into the desalination plant. Both of those aspects are being examined.

The SARDI report is satisfied that the amount of increase in salination is within the current variability in that area, so it doesn't take the water to being saltier than one would expect in the variability in that area. It also has said that there would be a minute amount of the material being sucked in. Something like 0.1 per cent, I think—but I will double-check the figure—might come close.

On that basis, I feel that SARDI has done a good job. That has been looked at by the site selection committee that was established by the previous government, and that report is now publicly available. On that basis, the next stage is able to be gone into, which is to properly build a detailed business plan for putting the desalination plant there.

As the member will be very aware, and I believe he has made reference to it publicly already today, the overwhelming need is to make sure that Port Lincoln and Eyre Peninsula have water security. You can't have a major part of South Australia and a very significant town in South Australia at risk of not having fresh water in 2025. That is unthinkable. So we need to keep making progress here. We need to keep moving in order to be certain that we are able to deliver the water security needs, also paying attention to not spending excessive dollars that are unnecessary to spend, and also that we have paid due attention to the scientific advice on the potential impact.

ADELAIDE HILLS AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house on the Malinauskas Labor government's commitments to support residents of the Adelaide Hills needing emergency health care?

The SPEAKER: An excellent question.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:19): I thank the member for Playford and note his interest, as a former resident of Mount Barker. It probably goes without saying that I think you, sir, have the most interest in this house in the outcomes of services in the Mount Barker region. Therefore, sir, it was fantastic to join you on the weekend at Mount Barker to announce some very significant developments in terms of delivery of ambulance services for the Adelaide Hills.

As you know (and have been involved in petitioning for additional ambulance services in the Hills for a very long time), it has been, I believe, since 1992 that there has only been one ambulance

24/7 crew on the road in the Mount Barker region over that time, and yet we have seen the population of Mount Barker go up and up and up since that time. Very clearly, we listened to the community, listened to the calls from the local member of parliament, as opposed to the previous government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am listening closely to the answer.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The member for Dunstan, who was leading that (who, of course, isn't here again today, but I note his communications director is) didn't take action on this front. He ignored those calls from the community. We are now reversing that. I know you are delighted, sir, that we now have that additional 24/7 crew that's about to hit the road in the Adelaide Hills. That means that people in the Hills, that growing population, now have additional support from the SA Ambulance Service when and where they need it.

It was fantastic that we both met Harry and Maddie, who are some of our new paramedics who are joining the service. This was part of our commitment for 350 extra ambos across the state, 12 of whom are starting in that new Mount Barker crew. But of course, that's not all, because we also made the announcement of the new location of the new Mount Barker ambulance station. The ambulance station at the moment is far too small, far too constrained and doesn't have room to grow in the future. That's why we have selected the new site which, again, has been talked about for a number of years with no action taken.

This is the site where it's going to be located, near the Bald Hills interchange. There is very easy access to the freeway—excellent work done by the previous Treasurer and infrastructure minister to get that interchange up and running. To now have that new ambulance station there will give easy access for many locations across the Hills. We will be able to build that with capacity for the Ambulance Service to grow into the future, because we know that the population in Mount Barker is going to go up and up and up. To have the ability for us to be able to put additional crews as they are needed in Mount Barker is essential.

Work will be starting later this year on that site. We will have that open in 2025. You will be glad to know, sir, that there is an additional regional transport crew that will start next year in the Mount Barker region as well. This is a very substantial uplift in terms of the service offering for the Adelaide Hills but, of course, we need to make sure that we have the hospital capacity for that as well. This coincides with our very significant investment to triple the number of beds at the Mount Barker hospital to make sure that people are not only getting that emergency response when they need it but also can get the hospital care as an important follow-up. All of this is important for your constituents, sir, the broader Adelaide Hills, to be able to get the services when and where they need them.

EYRE PENINSULA DESALINATION PLANT

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:23): My question is again to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Has the minister made any direct personal representations to the federal Labor government regarding the funding of the desalination plant on Eyre Peninsula and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:24): What we did in seeking to address fairly what the site selection committee intended, which was to have a serious look at an alternative site to Billy Lights Point, was say that we would support a process of inquiring of the federal government if there might be some funding available to bridge the gap.

Of course, the federal government itself would need to be satisfied that it was necessary to have a more expensive plant than the one which has always been used as the base case, being Billy Lights Point. What we did, therefore, was to send someone from the Department for Environment and Water, from the water section, along with the chair of the site selection committee, Peter Treloar, to go—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am trying to be as factual and helpful as I can be, sir—to Canberra—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe! Member for Light!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe! The Deputy Premier has the call. Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —to go to Canberra to meet with the people who are responsible for the National Water Initiative and to seek to understand where there might be some funding available. What they were informed was that there is a process that can be gone through but it requires a fully-costed business case prior to their consideration and it would then go into a budget round.

It was, therefore, already impossible for this year's federal budget to be able to submit on a case for a site which didn't have a fully costed, fully detailed business case. What it had was a reasonable estimation undertaken by SA Water as part of their diligent proving up or testing out of the various alternative sites.

That means that had we elected to put the project on pause in order to enable the business case to be developed to a point that would be required by Canberra, we would be waiting for more than a year to discover whether there might be some funding available. In any case, that funding would be no more than 50 per cent of the amount that we were seeking. They would only do it in partnership.

That presented an immediate problem. Even if one thought they might provide half of the approximately \$150 million, and even if it might be that we thought it was reasonable to spend the other half on it, given that there is no evidence that the relocation away from Billy Lights Point was necessary, then we would be waiting at least a year to find out and then we are a year closer to Port Lincoln not having secure water.

It seemed that not only from the very great doubt that one would have to have about whether that would be acceptable by Canberra and acceptable from the South Australian public's perspective also in spending so much additional money, the fact that we simply can't afford to wait any longer, having waited already a significant period of time to allow the site selection committee to undertake its work, that was no longer an option that could be explored. And, as I say, nor was it necessary given that we have had the SARDI advice about the security of using Billy Lights Point.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of students from Adelaide Botanic High School, who are well known to the member for Adelaide. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

NATIVE VEGETATION

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Has an order been issued to the landowner of 104 Mount Lofty Summit Road to refrain from conducting illegal vegetation clearances and, if so, what action has the minister taken to ensure that this notice has been enforced? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: In response to a question on notice dated 2 November 2022, the minister advised that clearance of native vegetation at 104 Mount Lofty Summit Road was excessive by up to half a hectare beyond the approval issued by the Native Vegetation Council. Since then, an

adjacent landowner has informed the opposition that the clearance is ongoing and causing further destruction to native vegetation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:28): I do recall the matter that the leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has the call. Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. I do recall the issue that the leader has raised but, given that we are talking about sensitive matters in terms of issuing orders, I will seek advice and bring back an answer.

NATIVE VEGETATION

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My supplementary is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Has the minister had discussions with either the Chair of the Native Vegetation Council or the Adelaide Hills Council in relation to this matter?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:29): While I have had discussions with both of those, I have not had discussions specifically about this matter.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Heysen, I remind members that reflections on members' land-clearing practices are well and truly out of order. Member for Heysen.

CHILD PROTECTION CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Was the Child Protection Case Management System unavailable last week and, if so, can the minister outline for how long, how many staff could not access the system and the actions the minister is taking in response?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:30): I thank the member for the question. What I can say is that users of the Connected Client Case Management System (C3MS) in Child Protection has experienced some functionality issues. I have been advised that the department is working really hard with the external vendor on the issues and that remedial action has been undertaken to improve system performance, including memory upgrades, server checks and data migrations.

I can also say that the department has really strong business continuity processes in place to work around any disruptions to the system and that important and new information is recorded in really secure ways. I take this opportunity to thank the incredibly dedicated Department for Child Protection staff who are working really hard, as they always do, to ensure that records are up to date, and also to ensure that the safety of children and young people remains a priority.

What I can also say is that our government is developing a very detailed business case for an improved case management system for Child Protection. That work is progressing as it should be. What I can also say is that, sadly, those opposite, despite being highly attuned to these issues, highly aware of these issues—in fact, despite those opposite actually speaking in this house about those issues with the system—unfortunately no work on a business case was undertaken, no work to begin to remedy those issues was undertaken—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: In contrast—

The Hon. B.I. Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Wright!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —I am getting—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —on with the job, as is the department. We are getting on with the job—

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —of developing that business case for system improvement, and that development is progressing really well. Obviously, we need that to be a very deep look at the system. That work is continuing and we will continue to progress it, as we should.

AUTISM STRATEGY

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. How has the community responded to the public consultation on the state's first Autism Strategy?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:33): I thank the member for Waite for her question, and interest and support for autistic members of our community. I will emphasise that I will be using identity-first language in my answer and acknowledge that some people prefer person-first language, those who prefer identity first and there are others who use both terms interchangeably.

The Malinauskas Labor government is committed to making South Australia a leader on autism inclusion. Autism is a condition that affects social interaction, communication and behaviour. It's the largest primary disability group in the NDIS. Despite its prevalence, people with autism often face a lack of understanding and acceptance in the community. They can experience discrimination, exclusion and isolation. This is not only unfair but can have serious consequences for mental health and wellbeing.

We went to the 2022 election with a clear message to the autistic community: that we see you and we will walk with you as we navigate these challenges together. Our commitments included:

- a \$28.8 million investment in autism inclusion teachers in public primary schools;
- increasing staff in preschools with qualifications in autism;
- exploring more early intervention in children's centres;
- developing a state autism strategy;
- requiring government agencies to sign up to an autism charter; and
- investing \$50 million for speech pathologists, occupational therapists, psychologists and counsellors in public schools.

Last August, we appointed the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC as the nation's first—and, as Emily's children proudly exclaim, the galaxy's first—Assistant Minister for Autism. Within our many election commitments, I am responsible for developing a state autism strategy, alongside our State Disability Inclusion Plan. I am thrilled to have the assistant minister helping in this work. I offer my sincere thanks to Assistant Minister Bourke and her team for their tremendous effort in organising more than 20 community forums across the state.

While we know they are doing their jobs, I also offer thanks to Katherine, Ksharmra and Melissa and the entire DHS social inclusion team for their very hard work. Their level of commitment, compassion and care makes me very proud of our public servants and the important work that they do.

To ensure the community was involved in developing this strategy, the Department of Human Services assembled a group of 19 autistic adults to develop the Autism Strategy Discussion Paper. This paper was the basis for 12 weeks of public consultation. I am delighted to report, although I am not sure the public servants are so thrilled, we received more than 1,000 submissions. We were also overwhelmed by the community's response to the expression of interest for the Autism Strategy Advisory Committee.

I have been deeply moved by the passion, energy and thought that has been shared with us by the autistic community throughout consultations. I can assure the house and the autistic community that we are listening to the experiences and voices of those who understand the challenges faced, who know how we can solve that together.

In another nation first, the Malinauskas government is creating the Office for Autism and that will be held within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, a central agency. It will collaborate with government agencies, private industry and community to drive change in our society. Most significantly, autistic people will be at the heart of the office. Recruitment is now underway to fill senior positions with autistic people. I look forward to updating the house as we work together on the strategy.

AUTISM STRATEGY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): Supplementary, sir, in relation to the minister's answer: is the government going to be maintaining, reducing or increasing funding to Autism SA for their diagnostic testing program through the Department of Human Services, and will that program be continued?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:37): Thanks very much for the supplementary. In fact, I understand Assistant Minister Bourke has been asked very similar questions in relation to this in the other house. Last year, I ensured that there was continuing funding during this year for Autism SA to deliver on this diagnostic funding; \$310,000, exclusive of GST, was provided in the financial year of 2021-22. We replicated that in the current financial year. I am advised that Autism SA has provided correspondence to the assistant minister and there has been no cut to any funding currently to Autism SA, and we will take any—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: I'll finish. I'll finish. Yes, I got your whole question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: We will be using the current process to assess and evaluate what is required.

CHILD PROTECTION CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Were any vulnerable children unaccounted for during the recent outage failure of the case management system, and did any serious or critical incidents occur during that time?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of Government Business on a point of order, which I am bound to hear under 134 before turning to the minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 97: the question involved argument and debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen, addressing me on the same point of order.

Mr TEAGUE: I just highlight the context in which the question was raised. It wasn't a supplementary but it has followed on from an answer that has been given in the course of question time.

The SPEAKER: Well, that may be, but I think the pragmatic way to resolve the matter is to allow the member for Heysen to recast the question.

Mr TEAGUE: In case the Child Protection Case Management System was unavailable last week, during that time were any vulnerable children—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order from the member for West Torrens—I anticipate 97.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, 97; and Erskine May, hypothetical question, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The shadow minister is asking 'if' an event occurred and did something else subsequently happen.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is Erskine May. He might have used it once or twice.

The SPEAKER: I would be—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley! I would be inclined to uphold the point of order, but I am going to give the member for Heysen one final opportunity to recast the question. 'In case' certainly invites speculation, and if it is the case that it is hypothetical because, for instance, certain circumstances are to be speculated on or hypothesised on then, of course, it is the invitation to do so. So, it does seem to me to be a question that is likely to be problematic, cast in the terms that it has been. Member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Was the Child Protection Case Management System unavailable last week and, if so, were any vulnerable children unaccounted for during that time, and did any serious or critical incidents occur during that time?

The SPEAKER: That question is just within the standing orders, although it is possible to argue that it is multiple questions in one; nevertheless, I am going to allow it.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:40): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and thank you again to the member for his question. As I said in my earlier answer, the department, rightly, has really strong business continuity processes in place to work around any disruptions that occur to the system, and information is recorded in secure ways in those circumstances.

I am going to take this opportunity again to offer my wholehearted thanks to the incredible Department for Child Protection workers who work every day with really complex and challenging issues that, unfortunately, children and young people in our community experience. They do work incredibly hard. They go into these roles because of their commitment to children and young people and trying to make a difference and trying to improve their lives and offer them support and care where needed. So I do thank them, and I also thank them for their work to ensure that any records are up to date.

The safety of children and young people, of course, remains a priority, and I understand that the department is working really closely with local officers to ensure that those incredible child protection workers are able to discharge their responsibilities for keeping children and young people safe. On this topic, I will say again that we are developing a comprehensive business case in relation to C3MS. I must say that I was really disappointed to find that, despite the previous government knowing about these issues for the entirety—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. There is a point of order. Member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: repetition and debate.

The SPEAKER: I will keep that point of order well in mind and listen closely. Minister.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Just in terms of the need that has been raised to make sure that system issues with C3MS are addressed, I will reiterate again that we rightly are getting on with the job of developing that business case for improvements to the case management system. That work is progressing well. I do wish that it had been started when the previous government was made aware of it but, unfortunately, it wasn't a priority for them—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —but we certainly will make it a priority—

The SPEAKER: Minister, I'm going to turn to the member for Heysen.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —because it is incredibly important—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: —that we do make it a priority.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you will be seated. Member for Heysen on a point of order.

Mr TEAGUE: Standing order 98A prohibits debate. It has continued. It has persisted. The question in the end was quite straightforward as to time frames and response.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Frome is warned. There is some context of course that is permissible, and that context can come not only at the start of the answer but also towards the middle or the end. I am not certain that necessarily the fact that the same material is revisited is in and of itself a transgression of standing order 98(1), but nevertheless—member for Hartley.

FOOTY EXPRESS

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister assure the house that there will be no change to the funding allocation by the state government given to the Footy Express during this term of government?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:44): There is only one party that attempted to do what the shadow minister is accusing me of and that is those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe! Member for Newland!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When you look back on the official record, *The Advertiser*—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's fine by me. When you look back, it was of blessed memory, former transport minister Stephan Knoll—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order, Leader of Government Business, from the member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: Point of order: for debate. This has nothing to do with the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is some merit in the point of order that is raised with me. I have the point of order. I will listen closely. In the meantime, the member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would have thought after the appalling week the member has had, given his football club lost 7-0 to Liverpool—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that he would have learned his lesson.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Schubert! The Premier is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's important to note that, first and foremost, earlier this year in February, both clubs announced that they would be freezing their ticket prices. The shadow minister was peddling a story that ticket prices could increase by up to \$35 a game, I think it was, despite having read in *The Advertiser* that ticket prices had been frozen. The only people who ever attempted to remove the government subsidy on Footy Express were members opposite.

Our contribution has been reinstated and increased across the forward estimates. We are continuing to invest in Footy Express. We are continuing to make sure that Footy Express is a viable option. Unfortunately, what the shadow minister has failed to understand is that since coming to office, since March of last year, there have been a number of events that have received free public transport to Adelaide Oval—

The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —including, obviously, the AFL 2022 season; during the Gawler line closure; ANZAC Day; we have given seniors free travel; the Illuminate Festival had free travel; rugby union at Adelaide Oval had free travel; the SANFL grand final had free travel; the City to Bay had free travel; the proclamation of His Majesty The King, King Charles III, King of Australia, the lord and sovereign of the member for Black—free public transport; the day of mourning for Her Majesty The Queen; the AFL Women's Showdown; the ICC T20 cricket; the Christmas Pageant got free public transport. Importantly, the Guns N' Roses concert had free public transport—that was an important event. VALO 500 had free public transport—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elder! Member for Newland!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —as will—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the Footy Express.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on two warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will just remind members of an article in the paper on Friday the 9th 2018, during the dark four years of the previous government—dark, dark times for members on this side and for some members opposite as well, from what I remember, given the number of phone calls I was receiving late at night. They were dark, dark days indeed. The former transport minister, of blessed memory, was attempting to make—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You don't know who he is? You have never heard of him?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hurtle Vale! Member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: it's clearly debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have the standing order. There is some force in the submission made to me. I guide the minister to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Fair enough, sir; I see you have applied the mercy rule. I will stop. Under Labor, the Footy Express is here to stay. Only one party tried to cut bus stops and bus services; another party is undoing privatisation and restoring community confidence in public transport.

ENERGY CONCESSIONS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Have electricity bills for 60,000 South Australian concession holders increased? If so, does the minister accept responsibility for this? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hurtle Vale is on two warnings.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: Sixty thousand South Australians who benefit from the South Australian Concessions Energy Discount Offer were told last week that their discount would be cut from 21 per cent to just 17 per cent, the lowest on record.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:50): What the shadow minister is not saying is that those same people are also getting a discount on their gas bills for the first time—conveniently forgotten, conveniently ignored.

Of course, what he is also ignoring is what the commonwealth government have said in the most recent federal budget about their offer to Australians. As part of this national energy crisis that we are all facing across the country, the commonwealth government is using every tool in its arsenal to attempt to do its very best to lower power prices for South Australians, indeed all Australians.

The unfortunate reality for the member opposite is that, while to compare and contrast is appropriate, for every single year that they were in office, from 2018 to 2022, power prices were higher during that period than they were under the previous Weatherill government, despite having made a promise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —to reduce power prices by \$301. They weren't even close to getting to that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They weren't even close to those decreases.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is on three warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are waiting on the Australian Energy Regulator to release its default market offer. We have seen projections from the most recent federal budget, where the federal Treasurer announced that wholesale power prices in Australia could increase by as much

as 50 per cent due to the war in Ukraine and the crunch on commodity prices that fuel our electricity generation across the nation.

Coal prices have increased dramatically, gas prices have increased dramatically, but the commonwealth government has acted, and remembering that the federal Treasury were predicting a 50 per cent increase in wholesale power prices, which would be potentially a 100 per cent increase in retail prices. We will see very, very soon what that default market has and what it is in South Australia compared to other jurisdictions.

What the state government has negotiated with Origin is these very concession cardholders that the member says he cares so deeply about are also getting for the first time a concession on their gas bills, on their heating bills. Gas has gone up more than any other commodity. It has gone up dramatically. We have seen prices on the wholesale market, before the government's cap of \$12 a gigajoule, reaching up to \$46 a gigajoule. The impact on families trying to heat their homes during winter would have been dramatic. This government has acted to now offer a concession on gas prices for those most vulnerable people to make sure they can heat their homes, and the member decries it. He should be celebrating it.

Mr PATTERSON: Point of order, sir: I ask that he withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order from the member for Morphett. I'm going to give the member for West Torrens the opportunity to resolve the matter immediately.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As a gentleman, I withdraw the accusation of my good friend the shadow minister for energy.

The SPEAKER: Very well; the matter is resolved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders is called to order. Member for Hammond, your contribution is not required.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I also apologise because I know how fragile he is, and I wish to offer that apology.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am pleased that the South Australian government has done its very best to negotiate with this private operator to not only for the first time get a concession on gas but also get a concession on energy prices. We will wait and see what a default market offer is for all South Australians, to see whether or not those massive price increases that members opposite have said are a reality and what commentators are saying could be very, very large—hopefully, the commonwealth government's interventions have had an impact. We will see what that impact is, but we hope it is dramatic. We are supporting them in their efforts to make sure that they can keep power prices lower.

ENERGY CONCESSIONS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Did the minister find out from Origin Energy about the change to the energy concession? If so, when, and what action has she taken?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:54): We go through a process, the same process that members opposite went through.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. We went through the entire process, and of course the process is a detailed one. Both my agency and the minister's agency worked together on this, along with the Department of Treasury and Finance. We worked well with all our procurement processes. What we were able to negotiate for the first time was an additional concession—an

additional concession—which, taken in and of itself, is actually larger than the concession when combined with what was received last financial year. So it's actually more. When you add the gas concession and the electricity concession and you combine them, households are actually better off this financial year, in terms of the discount they received, than they were last year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, no.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on a final warning. The member for Unley is warned. Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Members are attempting to put words into my mouth.

An honourable member: They're bullying.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, they are bullying me, Mr Speaker, and you know how sensitive I am to bullying.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am very fragile as well. It's important to note that what we are seeing here is that the entire country is facing stress when it comes to power prices. South Australia is not alone here. This is a national energy crisis. There is a war in Ukraine. What we are seeing is energy being weaponised in Western Europe. We have seen dramatic interventions in Western Europe, which is creating a massive demand on gas, so much so that the commonwealth government, for the first time in its history, I understand, has put in price controls—price controls—on the sale of domestic gas in Australia. That is unprecedented outside of wartime. It is unprecedented.

What we are seeing now, with our \$12 cap, which should have an impact, we are also seeing a cap on coal prices. Hopefully, that has an impact. Thankfully for South Australians, because of the work that this government and previous Labor governments have done, we have a dramatic penetration of renewable energy in this state, helping to keep power prices lower, especially for companies that can buy off the spot market, like small business and like large industrial users. They are able to capitalise on our penetration of wind and solar and opportunistically buy power prices on the market at spot price, relatively cheaper than their interstate competitors. That is a good thing.

Of course, residential customers who are locked into fixed prices throughout the year are the ones who are most vulnerable, which is why there were so many interventions and which is why this government acted to make sure that we could spread that concession to more than one energy source, especially leading into winter. So now we are seeing these concession cardholders getting additional concessions, and that concession will go a long way to helping.

It doesn't mean the problem is fixed. It doesn't mean people are going to be celebrating the fact that their power prices may go up, or that their gas prices may go up. But they are going up for reasons they can see every single night on the television news. The world is in turmoil. We are seeing, being played out geopolitically, the use of energy as a political weapon in Western Europe, and that has consequences for us here at home. So we are seeing these interventions to try to lower prices.

We went through a process, the government was informed, and that was made public. We went through the normal processes that we always go through when we do any procurement. There's nothing out of the ordinary here whatsoever, other than that there is now an additional concession being offered to concession cardholders, which I think is something we should celebrate.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles has been waiting patiently.

RESOURCES SECTOR

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:59): I certainly have. My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the trade performance of South Australia's resources sector? I would appreciate it if he made no mention of Liverpool and Man United.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:59): Yes, 7-0 is a humiliating loss. I don't want to have to put the member through any more of that than he has to, other than to say I don't think anyone since 1932 has seen a team capitulate so appallingly to another side—other than, perhaps, at the 2022 election.

South Australian copper products are once again at the top spot for South Australian exports of goods to overseas markets. Stats from the ABS have copper product exports reaching \$2.44 billion in January of this calendar year. That is an astonishing figure that marks a rise of almost 65 per cent over the previous 12 months, and 11 months of consecutive improvement for copper export figures since March 2022. That is a remarkable number.

What we perhaps see is a correlation of improved overseas trade performances with the confidence being restored to an industry on 19 March of last year, and that the South Australian government is wholeheartedly supportive of our resources industry here in South Australia. The state's resources inventory of critical minerals is increasingly in demand to support the global transition to a decarbonised future. Copper is the key to that decarbonised future.

Australia is home to the second-largest reserve of copper resources in the world, and South Australia hosts the majority share: an incredible 69 per cent of Australia's copper resource is here in this state. Wind turbines, electric vehicles, power cables, energy-efficient generators, motors, transformers and renewable energy production systems all rely on copper. Copper production in Olympic Dam, Carrapateena and Prominent Hill and exports continue to underpin the resource sector as a major pillar of the state's economy.

Much of our copper resource is not yet developed, which presents opportunity. But first, it is crucial that we debunk the myth that suggests that more renewables will mean the end of mining. The transition to renewable energy does not mean an end to mining; it means more mining. We need more critical minerals, more rare earths. We need to get these resources to be used to decarbonise our future. Our resource inventory gives us the opportunity to add complexity to South Australia's economy and, through our growing exports, assist other countries in their transition to low-carbon economies to meet their Paris treaty obligations.

It's not just copper—other critical minerals present fantastic opportunities, such as graphite, which is a key component in battery systems, both domestic and grid scale. Capitalising on opportunities for critical minerals in the emerging battery supply chain and other emerging supply chains will require investment in extracting the mineral deposits we have already identified, and also additional investment in exploration to target those critical minerals still to be discovered across our vast landscape. That's why it's important that we see investment grow. It's encouraging that we are already seeing breaking records: 2022 saw South Australia's highest expenditure on mineral exploration in the past decade, reaching \$165.4 million.

The growth we're already seeing includes advanced-stage copper exploration and programs for other critical minerals, including rare earth elements, graphite, iron ore and zircon, across the state. I think we all look forward to our resource exports growing and seeing South Australia capitalise on the decarbonisation program around the world, and us becoming the centre of not just renewable energy but the resources that help in that decarbonisation.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPICE CARE

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the government fund the Mount Gambier In Home Hospice Care service? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: At the end of this month funding provided to this service will cease, which will mark the end of a free service run by volunteers who support people with a life-limiting diagnosis and who choose to die at home.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:04): I thank the member for Frome for her question. It's a very important area in terms of palliative care across the

state. I'm aware of the particular non-government organisation of which the member speaks. I understand there have been discussions with the Limestone Coast Local Health Network who, under the Health Care Act, have governance responsibilities for service delivery in the Limestone Coast.

The advice I have from them from their discussions is that they are investing in their own services, and in fact we as the state government have increased the provision of palliative care services right across country South Australia. We are adding 10 additional palliative care nurses right across the state and putting all those resources into country palliative care, because we recognise that there is a growing and unmet need in regional South Australia for people to access palliative care services, compared to what city counterparts can offer. Those 10 additional nurses will significantly improve the ability for people right across country South Australia to receive palliative care.

In addition, it is also timely to note what we have just announced today. I have asked the Health Performance Council, an independent body that has oversight over the health system and is, unfortunately, a body that the previous government wanted to abolish but luckily didn't, wasn't successful in their attempt to do that, to undertake a review of palliative care services across the state. I would like to thank the member for Light who was instrumental in pushing for this inquiry to take place. They will be reporting next year on a series of recommendations. I think we all understand the importance of palliative care to make sure that it's high-quality palliative care, that it's accessible for people across the state, it's contemporary and able to keep pace with the growing demand for those services.

Grievance Debate

EYRE PENINSULA DESALINATION PLANT

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:06): Well, today we had an announcement from the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water on a subject that my electorate has been watching for a long time, a desalination plant for Eyre Peninsula. The announcement was that this SA government had disappointingly decided to disregard the perspective of the EP Desal Site Selection Committee and their preferred location at Sleaford West and instead forge ahead with the location at Billy Lights Point at Port Lincoln.

Now, there is a long history on this subject and one which my community knows very well. They have been advocating for years for a desal plant with concerns about the longevity of the underground water aquifers that supply the peninsula, specifically the Uley South Basin, with the latest advice being that that supply is at risk of being too diminished by the end of 2025. The previous Liberal government had been the first in that time to make any indication on advancing the project, with a \$99 million announcement during the previous term.

As the project advanced, SA Water came up with a recommendation on their preference for a location at Billy Lights Point, which, for those who know, is in the middle of the bay area at Port Lincoln, around the meeting point of Proper Bay and Boston Bay.

Port Lincoln is known as the seafood capital of the state, with fishing and aquaculture being a significant component of the local and state economy. Many of these aquaculture industries are based within this bay area, notably tuna, kingfish and mussels. The locals know the fine balance that these industries must make with their interactions with the local marine environment, as they rely on this for their clean, green produce for which they are renowned.

With this in mind, the community and industries at the time came out strongly opposing SA Water's proposal and in response to this, the former minister put in place a site selection committee, made up of community leaders, fishing and aquaculture industries and local government, tasked with putting the work together to put forward an alternative.

I must commend this committee for its work, chaired by Peter Treloar. They were thorough, thoughtful, evidence-based, collaborative and consultative. After much deliberation and evidence-gathering they made a recommendation of their preferred site at Sleaford West.

I know that the committee considered all different aspects: environmental impact, economic impact, cost and constructability. They got expert advice, scientific advice—they were thorough—

but, disappointingly, that has been ignored. Now the community once again is faced with the potential of a desalination plant within the bay area of Port Lincoln at Billy Lights Point.

What will be the impact on our fishing and aquaculture industries? The minister says she has a report that found that it can be built without negatively impacting the local marine environment, with oceanographic modelling showing that once the plant is operational, long-term salinity levels in the bay will remain within natural background levels.

Does she have confidence in this? Will she financially guarantee those aquaculture and fishing businesses in the bay, which could be at risk if that modelling proves to be inaccurate? Does it take into account plumes of saltwater moving through the levels of water? Will there be an impact on the natural movement of mussel spat—or 'sprat', as the minister said—which happens in the area, which is relied on by mussel producers? Will there be risks of areas of high nutrient levels, which could potentially impact the tuna or kingfish industries? Is the science clear enough? Or is the decision purely one about capital costs without taking into account long-term financial risks? Did the minister herself personally approach the federal Labor counterpart about opportunities for co-funding? Seemingly not. These are all questions that my community and businesses are asking and this is why they preferred a site at Sleaford West, where there is direct access to high-energy water.

As I said, this has been a disappointing outcome for those who have been directly involved or those who could be directly impacted. To add to a level of dithering the minister stated, 'The final decision on the plant by will'—it doesn't make sense in itself—'be informed by a separate business case being prepared by Infrastructure SA into the Northern Water Supply Project.' That just means the uncertainty around the project continues. It is added to by this layer. Even if it is possibly delivered, the Northern Water Supply Project is many years away and hundreds of kilometres away, not connected by existing pipework at all. Surely the minister would know this, surely her department would know this, so why are they trying to confound the community by adding this? What is her motivation? It is not good enough, it is lazy process, the perspective of my community has been put aside—and that is incredibly disappointing.

GILES ELECTORATE

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:11): I rise today to talk about a number of issues of concern in my electorate, one of which I wanted to raise on the last day of sitting but, alas, I did not get a grievance spot. It is an issue of serious concern to the communities of Coober Pedy, Roxby Downs and its neighbour, Andamooka, that is, the total loss of banking services in the Far North of our state. Westpac have closed in Coober Pedy. Coober Pedy is a unique community. It is the opal capital of the world. It is a community where some people deal with a lot of cash, but other people do not have access to IT technology. They do not understand it.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: Yes. That's partly because the age profile of the Coober Pedy community is a lot higher than the age profile here in the state as a whole. It is a combination of age, and it is also a combination of Aboriginal people who often need that face-to-face contact at banks because of issues to do with establishing identity, and they do develop personal relationships. They are known.

Westpac did not have a full banking service up there, in terms of hours, but it did send their people up there to work at the branch that they had. Now they are closing it in a way that all banks say: 'People can access their phones now, they can do this, they can do that.' But in a place like Coober Pedy that is somewhat different. Given the closure in Roxby Downs, that means the closest bank is in Port Augusta or in Alice Springs. We are talking about hundreds and hundreds of kilometres away. Westpac last year made a profit of \$5.65 billion, and that came on top of a 17 per cent or a 19 per cent decline in their operating costs.

When we go further south to Roxby Downs the NAB are closing their branch there. A lot of people in Roxby do have access to technology. It is a younger community. And cheek by jowl with the community of Roxby Downs is the community of Andamooka with, once again, a very old age profile, and people do not have access to IT in general and, at times, the reliability of that access—because Telstra, I think it was last year, was out for several days, so access can also be an issue.

When it comes to National Australia Bank, they made a profit last year of \$6.81 billion which represents an 11.5 per cent increase on the year before. These banks are making huge profits but they no longer have a sense of community service. They are there to make a profit, and there is nothing wrong with a reasonable profit, but these are huge profits. We do need to do something about this.

As to the state government, in terms of the banks, our leverage is somewhat limited. There is a commonwealth inquiry going on at the moment and we will feed into that commonwealth inquiry. But something does need to be done in a legislative manner at a federal level to ensure that an essential service like banking and people in regional communities, especially the smaller communities, are not disadvantaged.

Some form of community service obligation should be imposed. If they are pulling out of these communities, maybe look at imposing a levy and pump that levy into enhancing what can be delivered at the post offices that we have spread throughout Australia. They are still publicly owned. It is still a publicly owned essential service that does now provide banking services, somewhat limited in comparison to a full branch. Maybe we should look at enhancing their capacity to deliver banking services based on a levy from these highly profitable banks. That is one way to go.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:16): Business class trips, social media hits and VIP lists: that seems to be the priority of this government at the moment. I rise today to reflect on the treatment of the South Australian economy under this Labor government.

Here in South Australia we must be prepared and we have to react appropriately to the economic challenges that we are facing today such as the cost-of-living crisis that is being felt by many families right across the state. We saw in recent times that, according to our 2022-23 budget, South Australia has a net debt of around \$19 billion and, according to the 2021-22 estimated result, a net operating balance that continues to be concerning.

No-one could have anticipated the COVID-19 pandemic, let alone the economic ravages it would bring, but South Australia pulled through. We pulled through thanks largely to the people of South Australia but also to the economic management of the former Liberal government. Everybody wanted to be in South Australia for many reasons but above all for our deeply enviable economic position. Those opposite have tried their absolute hardest to tear down the former Liberal government and its policies but nothing that this Labor government says or does can ever smother the achievements of the former state Liberal government, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic.

South Australia was once upon a time the fastest growing economy in the nation, not that long ago, where we saw record investment in infrastructure and strong support for hospitality and tourism and also a reversal of the brain drain. What we also saw before the state election were unfunded spending promises by the now Labor government that, quite frankly, tripled the state Liberal government's own promises—an over \$3 billion spending spree with a fanciful range of promises, most notably around the concept that they would fix the ramping crisis, a vision that this government a year in has still failed to realise.

What we have seen is a state Labor government awkwardly stumbling its way through its first term of government, tripping over one coffee table after the next coffee table. What did the Labor government promise about hydrogen? They promised that it would bring jobs, clean energy and capital to South Australia. Mr Speaker, we know that the cost of living is biting hard on South Australian families; I am sure they are coming to your electorate office, they are coming to my electorate office as well.

This government's solution is a \$600 million hydrogen facility, a hydrogen facility that the Premier has already admitted may not actually save South Australian families a single dollar on their electricity bills. Is that not what it is about at the end of the day? Are we not supposed to help people with their energy bills? A hydrogen facility that this government alleges will cost around \$600 million—but of course that figure remains highly questionable, and we are facing labour shortages, inflation going through the roof and a skyrocketing cost of materials, yet the people of South Australia are expected to believe this static price tag of around \$600 million.

If we know one thing from this government it is that price tags are pure fiction, as is evidenced with the over \$5 billion blowout of the north-south corridor. This project is such a state Labor classic: overreaching, overspent, overpromised. Do not just take our word for it. We saw recently the South Australian Productivity Commission's inquiry into SA renewable energy competitiveness add some context. For example, finding 31 of the report asserts that:

South Australia's poor budgetary position... constrains the extent to which the State Government can support the development of a local green Hydrogen sector.

It goes on to call into question the very financial viability of this hydrogen plant. Finding 25 states:

An export-scale green hydrogen plant would increase GSP by \$1.9 billion and create an additional 4,900 jobs, conditional on market prices for hydrogen being high enough to make its production financially viable.

Conditional—and it is a very big 'conditional.' This is a microcosm for state Labor's economic promises, a manifesto of thought bubbles, the success of which is entirely conditional upon favourable economic winds—but economic winds, as we know, are unfavourable.

We have challenges coming. We are facing post-COVID economic challenges that this government would not and did not account for—economic challenges such as rate rises. It struck me as unusual that during a period in which South Australians have been put under immense pressure, we saw the Minister for Trade and Investment, through his department, spend thousands of taxpayer dollars on an ad in Monday's AFR boasting that South Australia's wages are lower than the national average.

I seem to remember a time when the Labor Party actually stood for wage growth and they actually stood for workers, but not now. What we are seeing are business class trips to Europe with departmental CEOs, things like \$900 per night. It is absolutely out of control. The chains of habit are too light to be felt until they are too heavy to be broken. But this government needs to get its priorities in order and break the cycle of tragically mismanaged South Australian economies under state Labor governments.

HOLI FESTIVAL

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:21): The electorate of Torrens has a significant multicultural community and, as the member for Torrens, I am delighted to often be invited to join in the celebrations of these communities. Recently, one of my residents opened up a new restaurant on North East Road, Chennai Palace, a sister restaurant to Chennai Palace on Stephen Terrace, Walkerville. I would just like to congratulate Poongadi and Vasunth on their new business, and wish them every success going forward.

This time of year many members of the South Australian Indian and Nepalese community celebrate the Holi Festival, also fondly known as the Festival of Colours. Over the years, I have attended many Holi Festivals. I recall the first one where I was covered in colour from head to toe. Nobody had given me a tip about what to wear to that particular one, and I have photos as testament to that experience, and in the next few days my clothes remained soaking in Napisan to try to remove the colour. The powder is made from cornflour and it originally started off with one colour, red, but it has now progressed during Holi Festivals to be multicolours.

It is important to learn from experience—and I certainly learnt from my first Holi Festival—so now each year when I attend the festivals, I wear white which makes it so much easier to remove the colour that the revellers take so much pleasure in sharing with us. Last weekend, dressed in white, I had the pleasure of attending the Holi Festival Adelaide 2023, organised by Adelaide Nepal Inc. Hundreds of people attended throughout the day and not even the intermittent rain and wind—of which there was much—could keep away our Nepalese community. The day was enjoyed by young and old with Nepalese food on offer, along with traditional dance, music and song, as well as on-stage entertainers and, of course, lots of colour.

In India, the Holi Festival is celebrated on the last full moon in the lunar month of fargoon. Originally celebrated mainly in North India, today it is celebrated internationally by many members of the Indian and Nepalese community. This ancient tradition marks the end of winter and it honours the triumph of love over hate. Celebrants light bonfires and throw colourful powder called goal, they

eat sweets and dance to traditional music. At night, ground nuts and popcorn are offered to the bonfire. It is a really special occasion for a newborn and also for newlyweds.

From the very young to the very old, this celebration carries over two days. It begins with the bonfire and then on the following day with the colour and water balloons. It is celebrated as a public holiday in India. I know our South Australian Indians miss the time that they celebrate Holi. The festival has a cultural significance among Hindu traditions of the Indian subcontinent. It is the festive day to end and rid oneself of past errors, to end conflicts, a day to forgive and to forget, to renew broken relationships and to pay or forgive debts.

It also marks the start of spring, an occasion for people to enjoy the changing seasons and to make new friends. It is a playful cultural event and an excuse to throw coloured water at friends or strangers in jest. Celebrated at the end of winter, on the last full moon day of the Hindu luni-solar calendar month marking the spring, makes the date vary with the lunar cycle, so in some years it falls in March and in others it falls in February.

Historically, Holi has been commemorated to celebrate agriculture, good spring harvests and also the fertile lands. Hindus believe it is a time of enjoying spring's abundant colours and, of course, saying farewell to winter. I am looking forward to this Saturday 11 March, attending Holi on the Beach on the Semaphore foreshore, where from experience I know there will be colour, music, dancing and Indian food stalls. Based on recent festivals, it will be widely attended by the Indian, Nepalese and wider South Australian community that has embraced this fun-filled festival, with larger attendances each year.

This is the seventh festival organised by the Indian Australian Arts and Cultural Association, who state it is the festival that helps bring society together. Significantly for Holi, one is not to get angry or offended, so for those planning to attend the Holi on the Beach Festival at Semaphore foreshore this weekend, be prepared: wear white (it is easier to clean), and be prepared to be covered in colour, to have fun dancing the afternoon away to Indian Bollywood music and enjoy the curries and mouth-watering desserts and all that go with them.

ELDERLY CITIZENS

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:27): Today, I rise to speak about an important but sometimes forgotten or looked-over group of people, and that is our ageing and elderly population. Ageing is a triumph of modern medicine, and for the first time in human history in both the developed and developing world people are living longer lives. This is particularly relevant to us in SA, as we have seen the highest proportion of older people on mainland Australia living in this state.

I see this as a great opportunity. It must mean that we are more experienced, it must mean that we are more mature, and, if we are living longer, then it must mean we are healthier too. Ageing should not imply a withdrawal from society but in fact quite the opposite. Older people are vital community members as carers and neighbours, as consumers, as volunteers and, indeed, as workers.

More than ever before, our seniors are indispensable as citizens, consumers, carers, volunteers and members of our community. In my own electorate of Frome, so much of the history of our region and our current way of life could not continue without the work of our older community members, and I thank them for it. From leadership in progress associations, agricultural shows, to community outreach programs like volunteer drivers for the unwell, we are tremendously fortunate.

For our older population, this time of life should afford men and women who have worked hard all their life the chance to enjoy their freedom and their families, for those who can. It should afford them the opportunity to be comfortable in their own home—whatever that may look like—to be free from worry and free from attack from the government, from their children, sadly, and from carers or strangers.

The majority of over 65s live independently at home, with only one in four people aged 85 and over living in aged-care accommodation in South Australia. But it is incredibly confronting to read this week, following the release of new data by Adelaide researchers, that in Australia the suicide rate among men aged 85 and older is three times that observed in the general population.

Researchers for the first time are looking at the number of people aged over 65 who are ending their own lives before accessing aged-care services. In a largely overlooked statistic, older adults record the highest age-specific suicide rate of any age group in most countries. The research showed that fewer than 20 per cent of the older people who died by suicide received any Medicare-subsidised mental health service in the year before their death. Effectively preventing suicide in older adults does require multicomponent interventions that target social isolation, clinical symptoms, access to lethal methods, stigmatising help-seeking and access to those important services.

It is also important to acknowledge while discussing ageing the disparity between ageing in metropolitan areas versus regional South Australia. All members representing regional areas in this place would be acutely aware of the challenges our communities face to sustain facilities for people to age well locally and to recruit allied health works. All levels of government play a role in bridging this gap and supporting individuals to age well in the regions.

So I extend my thanks to a number of organisations that continue to advocate and provide support to our ageing South Australians: Council on the Ageing SA, Aged Rights Advocacy Service and ARIIA (Aged Care Research & Industry Innovation Australia), funded by the former Coalition for \$30 million in research. I note the amalgamation of aged care homes in Hamley Bridge and Balaklava in my electorate and the fabulous work by volunteers in the Mid North Community Passenger Network. Uniting Communities, AnglicareSA, Centacare, Carers SA, Multicultural Aged Care, Dementia Australia and the South Australian Retirement Villages Residents' Association all contribute to providing essential services.

While the statistics for some of our elderly population does look grim, I do want to celebrate the opportunities we all have to age well because we live in South Australia. Once we turn 50 years of age, we become seniors. I am not there yet, but lots of concessions are unlocked at that time, and people should make the most of it. This cohort are still at work. They are still fit. They are just hitting their stride in their careers. At a time when we are experiencing a national workforce shortage, I am paying close attention to comments coming out of National Seniors Australia, where current taxation barriers are preventing older Australians from returning to work lest they lose their pension. I want to recognise our older and ageing community and tell them to keep going and keep volunteering.

ENDOMETRIOSIS

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:32): March is a busy month for women. Yesterday it was International Women's Day, but it is becoming clear that the whole week could be renamed 'The Festival of Women' because, let's face it, we deserve it. Every day, women continue to face challenges, facing inequality and facing some who choose to continue to hold us back, but we are strong, we are resilient and we are not going away.

We do, however, have something all of our own that no man can have, and that is a uterus—bear with me. Whilst it homes our unborn babies and keeps them safe, it also reminds us of its existence every month for much of our lives. For some women, they have no issues at all, but for one in nine women, they suffer from the debilitating illness known affectionately as endo.

But there is nothing soft and squishy about endometriosis. I have spoken about it before here, but I will keep speaking about it, keep raising awareness about it, and I stand here right now experiencing the symptoms, so I can. Endometriosis is a common disease where tissue similar to the lining of the womb grows outside it, in other parts of the body.

According to Endometriosis Australia, more than 830,000—that is more than 11 per cent of Australian women, girls and those who are gender diverse—suffer from the disease at some point in their life, and it often starts in teenagers. It doesn't discriminate. As a young person, I never had any symptoms. It was not until I had my baby—and I do not blame him—that I got it, but for others they have symptoms all the way until they have a baby, and then they have nothing. It impacts more people than heart disease in the same age bracket.

In 2021, more women had endometriosis than there are Australians living with asthma. For the same age bracket, the number is more than double than for those living with diabetes. Yet more people know about heart disease, diabetes and asthma than about endometriosis. Just to put things in perspective, it takes six years to finally diagnose endometriosis, on average, so it is likely that that

number is even higher. So if you notice a woman not looking her normal chipper self, it could be because she is in extreme pain, managing with painkillers or natural remedies, as there is no cure or real treatment.

Work is being done, and I thank Endometriosis Australia and, locally, the Robinson Research Institute and the many other researchers who make this disease a priority. I congratulate the Albanese government, specifically Ged Kearney, who is working hard by providing almost \$700,000 to fund new research investigating the impact of endometriosis on fertility.

Previously, Nicolle Flint and the then federal government—yes, they did do something worthwhile—brought in the National Action Plan for Endometriosis in July 2018: \$87.19 million was committed for awareness and education, clinical management and care, and research. It has taken a long time for this disease to be recognised, and I am hopeful that girls starting out will benefit from these investments and will not have to suffer in silence like the rest of us.

March is endo month, and the campaign is called March into Yellow—hence my blazer. It is a fun and easy way to open up a conversation about the disease and an opportunity for our community to show support. Today alone, I have had at least five people comment on my blazer, which has allowed me to then discuss the reason for wearing it. The more we can talk about endometriosis, the more people will know about it, and hopefully the work will be done to help my sisters and me.

So in this week, where we think about equality and equity, I thank the minister for sport—I am glad you are here—for drawing my attention to the difference yesterday. Equality is about having access to the same opportunities, but equity is being provided with the necessary tools, specific to the person, to be equal.

I hope that employers across the country think about how they can better support women to be their best. Last night, I joined members of the Finance Sector Union, my old employer and my old union when I worked in banking. They were discussing the impact that menopause and menstruation can have on employees and how best to introduce a framework to support workers in finance. The Finance Sector Union has been working hard to negotiate with employers for specific leave to help women who do suffer in silence.

Some years ago, when I was working from home, the national secretary rang me up—I may have been resting on the couch in extreme pain—and I said to her, 'I'm really sorry; I'm having time out' and she was shocked that I had continued to work and said that she wanted to bring in menstruation leave for all our members. I am glad to say that they are having success. I encourage employers to think about how they can better support their women, as endometriosis impacts productivity, and helping women will help their business.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:37): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 21 March 2023 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

COURTS ADMINISTRATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 February 2023.)

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:38): When I last was on my feet talking about the Courts Administration (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, I was talking about the Statutory Authorities Review

Committee and its report and the fact that it contains three recommendations. One was in relation to allowing the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment to monitor and report on the observance of public sector principles and the code of conduct by the Courts Administration Authority.

Secondly, I was addressing the incredible work that our Sheriff's Officers do and that recommendation No. 5 (the second one to be adopted under that review report) is prescribing additional information to be included in the Courts Admin annual report, including a report from the Sheriff on the operations of the Sheriff and the security officers. I was remarking upon the particularly excellent work of the former member for Frome, the now member for Stuart, in raising the issues that Sheriff's Officers were facing and, for some time, were trying to get attention and remedy to the problems that they were facing in their workplace.

This recommendation goes directly to that, in that it provides a reporting mechanism for the Sheriff to be reporting to the parliament, and obviously to the public at large, about what is happening in the Sheriff's department, which was not provided for previously. I think that is an excellent move to provide some additional accountability and provision for Sheriff's Officers, who do such difficult work in our court system, to be able to have their voices heard, and for us as a parliament and the public to be able to have some scrutiny over what is going on.

Obviously, that is particularly important seeing as there are a number of measures that have come from the issues that the Sheriff's Officers have been raising. We will obviously want to take a look at the Sheriff's Officer cultural change plan as a parliament and make sure that what was outlined to be implemented there is actually being delivered. That looks at five key pillars: leadership and governance; communication; workforce capacity, which is a critical one; a capable workforce; and safety and wellbeing, which was central to the complaints that Sheriff's Officers were raising in relation to their own workplace in previous years.

I am glad to see that there is now that reporting mechanism, that that will be coming to us as parliament in the form of the annual report. I am sure that the greater public, especially through the media, will be scrutinising that report—I know I always did when I was a journalist. I used to take particular care looking at the Courts Administration Authority annual report every time it came down.

Recommendation 6, which is actually the third of the review's recommendations to be adopted and given effect in this piece of legislation, talks about the provision of the appointment of two additional non-judicial members of the State Courts Administration Council who can bring expertise in human resources and also finance or administration to the council.

Once again, to my mind that really goes to those issues that Sheriff's Officers have raised in the past. I think it really did highlight the need for some expertise, or additional expertise, around human resources management and also, of course, the finance and administration experience that is always welcome when we are looking at the running of something that is so significant, but also such a user of taxpayers' money, and that is our court system.

The provision of those two additional non-judicial members will provide some external advice to the council—some non-lawyer advice, some non-judicial officer advice—and, I think, make decision-making easier and strengthen the decision-making that is being made by the State Courts Administration Council. Together, those three recommendations—4, 5 and 6—that are being adopted in this legislation will enhance oversight and reporting requirements and, as I said, enhance the quality of decision-making from that organisation.

There were some other Statutory Authority Review Committee recommendations that were not adopted by the previous government, or did not require legislative amendment, so those are not given force in this amendment bill that is before us now.

There are some changes as well between the bill that was previously before this house in 2021 and now what we find ourselves with, the 2022 version. They are not huge changes but they are worth noting. The 2021 version of the bill provided for up to two non-judicial members to be appointed, whereas this bill requires two non-judicial members to be appointed. As I said, they will be drawn from the human resources management, finance or administration backgrounds. That is a good move, because obviously it does not give the council an option.

It expresses the will of this parliament, I believe, in saying, 'We want to have those two extra people. We want to have those people with that additional experience,' rather than providing it open to the council whether or not they wish to appoint them. I think that is an expression of this parliament saying that we want to have a more diverse expertise on that council, that we do not think that you can just have people all from the same line of work—that is, with judicial or legal experience—and that we want to see some more diverse experience there to strengthen the decision-making that is coming forward.

The house may also be aware that the government has tabled some additional amendments. Those are on file and we will be moving those. They concern the make-up of the Courts Administration Council to facilitate the participation of the Judge of the Youth Court, the State Coroner and the Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court (ERD Court).

I note that the shadow minister had filed amendments that were similar in nature in terms of inserting an additional paragraph that included the Judge of the Youth Court. I will leave it to him to explain his amendment, but my appreciation is that he is seeking to further the bill in that direction. These amendments incorporate that and go a little bit further in terms of adding the Judge of the Youth Court, also the State Coroner and the Senior Judge of the ERD Court. Those amendments are on file now.

There are some minor differences between the bill and the 2021 version of the bill relating to the appointment of deputies for the new non-judicial members and also to clarify quorum and decision-making requirements and those are consequential on the change of the composition of the council, as I have discussed.

The bill also differs from the 2021 version by removing a requirement included in the 2021 bill for the Coroner to provide a report to the administrator about the operation of the Coroners Court for inclusion in the courts admin annual report. That is, previously there was to be a section for the Coroner in the courts admin report. That is not in existence in this 2022 version because section 39 of the Coroners Act already requires the State Coroner to report on both the administration of the Coroners Court and also the provision of Coroner's services more generally.

It is the view of the drafters of this bill, and indeed the government, that it would simply be doubling up to have it in two annual reports. There will still, of course, be a requirement for the State Coroner to include that information in his or her annual report, which is tabled in parliament.

I have to say I used to pore over that Coroner's annual report. There was usually quite a lot of information in there that was of newsworthy substance. The Coroners Court, I think, is actually one of our most fascinating courts. It really gets to the why and it gets to accountability and for the purposes of government, I really think it is a court that government departments and ministers often pay particular heed to because there can be recommendations coming out of those court cases, sadly enough, that show us the way on how we can improve legislation or policy to make sure that tragic circumstances either do not happen or the risk of them happening is lessened.

That is a particularly pertinent court for this place and one that I, as a journalist, always really enjoyed covering because of the depth of information that the Coroner and counsel assisting would get into and the ability to really analyse what had happened in a particular tragic situation and how that might be avoided in future.

It is quite different from the rest of the court system, which is really about who did what when and penalising wrongdoers. The Coroners Court is really about finding out how something happened and how we might avoid it in future, which I think is incredibly important. The Coroners Court provides a critical role in some quite shocking and sad cases that we see from time to time in our community.

Critically, this change does not actually stop the administrator from including general information about the Coroners Court in the overall CAA annual report, so reference can still be made. It just means that there is not a requirement and we will not, hopefully, see so much doubling up.

Those are all the remarks I really wanted to make aside from mentioning that I am particularly pleased at the appointment recently of two fine women taking up positions as magistrates who have Aboriginal backgrounds. I think that will be quite an inspiration to Aboriginal people who are coming

through studying law or who are lawyers at the moment. I would like to take the opportunity to commend the Attorney-General on those very important and influential appointments.

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:49): Today, I rise in support of the Courts Administration (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. I am glad to be supporting it today, as I do believe in a strong justice system, and very much appreciate the way that amendments like these can have a real impact on the day-to-day workings of those within courts administration.

The Courts Administration Authority is constituted by the Courts Administration Act and is independent of the legislative and executive arms of government. It is a means, of course, for the judiciary to control the provision of the administrative facilities and services required by the South Australian courts. The Courts Administration Authority is governed by the State Courts Administration Council, and the State Courts Administrator is the council's chief executive officer.

The purpose of this bill is to implement three recommendations of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee and clarify the appointment process for the State Courts Administrator. The three recommendations are:

- recommendation 4: repeal section 21B(4b) of the Courts Administration Act to allow the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment to monitor and report on the observance of public sector principles and code of conduct by the Courts Administration Authority;
- recommendation 5: prescribe additional information, to be included in the Courts Administration Authority's annual report, including a report from the Sheriff on the operations of the Sheriff and the security officers.

This recommendation is particularly important and provides lived experience and real perspective from the operation of the Sheriff and those security officers involved in the administration of justice. Very much like the member for Badcoe, I have seen the work of the Courts Administration Authority firsthand. I became incredibly fond of and often reliant on the Sheriff's Officers at the Courts Administration Authority, and I was particularly saddened to hear of the plight of those officers in the course of their regular work.

Everyone does deserve to be safe at work. That is actually the premise upon which many of us end up in this place in the first place, that being the defence of people in their working lives. I also commend the member for Stuart for his work particularly in this space.

I interned at the Magistrates Court for some months as well as many law firms during the course of my law degree and would like to particularly acknowledge the role of Sheriff's Officers in our justice system and the fundamental yet often under-recognised role that they play in the sound administration of our courts, and in justice overall. The third recommendation is:

- recommendation 6: provide for the appointment of two additional non-judicial members of the State Courts Administration Council who can bring expertise in human resources, finance, administration or the like to the council.

I do think as well that this is a particularly important addition as it broadens the experience and expertise of those on the State Courts Administration Council outside of solely judicial experience. We do know that a number of people have a role to play in strengthening our justice system, and it is not just those with judicial experience—even perhaps a court reporter, such as the member for Badcoe, could provide assistance in some way to that system. I do believe that it is everyone's responsibility to assist, no matter your profession, in the further development and strengthening of our courts and justice system.

It is important to note that this component of the bill does differ from the previous 2021 bill slightly because the 2021 version of the bill provided for up to two non-judicial members to be appointed, whereas this bill requires two non-judicial members to be appointed to ensure a diversity of experience in the make-up of the council. There are also differences within the bill relating to the appointment of deputies for the non-judicial members, and to clarify the quorum and decision-making requirements of the council. I think that all these things are incredibly important, particularly for the day-to-day administration of those processes, and also to specify in real terms what is required by those bodies at any given time.

These recommendations are very important and will enhance the oversight reporting requirements and decision-making of these bodies, which are incredibly important in the administration of justice across our state. There were other recommendations made by the Statutory Authorities Review Committee but they were either not accepted by the previous government, or indeed our government, or did not require legislative amendment.

I would like to acknowledge, despite not being included in the bill, the work that goes into making those recommendations. There is a lot of work that goes into recommending in situations like these but also a breadth of experience that comes out of those recommendations to better the lives of those working within the justice system.

The government will also be moving additional amendments concerning the make-up of the council to facilitate the participation of the Judge of the Youth Court, as well as the State Coroner and the Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court.

This bill also differs from the 2021 version of the bill by removing a requirement included in the 2021 bill for the Coroner to provide a report to the administrator about the operation of the Coroners Court for inclusion in the annual report. The State Coroner does already have a requirement to provide an annual report, pursuant to section 39 of the Coroners Act, which is provided directly to the Attorney-General. This assists in relieving that double up in terms of the process.

I am very happy to be supporting this bill today, as I do believe it has a real practical effect on the workings of the Courts Administration Authority. I would again like to acknowledge the work that goes into administering our courts across South Australia, particularly at the ground level, to assist with the judicial process. I am happy to commend the bill.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:56): I simply close the debate by thanking all those who have participated in this chamber and the other place in bringing this legislation to us.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 1 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 2, after line 14 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1)]—Insert:

- (ca) the Judge of the Youth Court, appointed by the Governor in accordance with subsection (1aa); and
- (cb) the State Coroner, appointed by the Governor in accordance with subsection (1aa); and
- (cc) the Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court, appointed by the Governor in accordance with subsection (1aa); and

Mr TEAGUE: I will take this chance to address that. Amendment No. 1, standing in the name of the Deputy Premier, was filed on 17 February this year. I note that I first became aware of that in the course of debate, I think in the course of the contribution of the member for Gibson on 23 February this year. Responding as it does to the amendment that I filed on 16 November last year, I had raised it with the Attorney's office around that time, around November last year, and I thought that I had received a kind of interesting 'not the government's view at this time'. I am glad, albeit in circumstances of somewhat surprise, to see that that bore a bit more fruit than I was anticipating in November.

In case the Deputy Premier has not taken the opportunity to, I thought I would read the rationale of the government in relation to the amendment. Let's be clear, it is an amendment to

provide for the judge of the Youth Court, the State Coroner and the Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court to be also part of the composition of the State Courts Administration Council.

I am glad that that has inspired a broader view about those heads of jurisdiction, and I note that that has then been couched in terms of an expression of interest by each of them, and then tenure only so far as the extent of each individual. That is interesting, but I do not propose to cavil with what has been described as the feedback of the State Courts Administrator on the advice of the council. I am glad that the council is apparently fully apprised of and engaged with what that will look like.

I have an undated memo that is subsequent to the timing that I have just described, and follows on from my request for context in terms of the government now moving the amendment. That provides as follows:

The Government has filed amendments in the name of the Deputy Premier to the Courts Administration (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill.

The amendments provide for the appointment of the Judge of the Youth Court, State Coroner, and Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court to be appointed as members of the State Courts Administration Council.

The amendments provide that the judge of the Youth Court, State Coroner, and Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court can be appointed to the Council by the Governor upon their written request to be appointed, and with the concurrence of the Chief Justice. The appointments are not 'automatic' in the same way as the existing Council appointments.

The appointment is limited by the tenure of the relevant judicial officer—meaning that on resignation/retirement/other change from the role, their successor will not be automatically appointed but will again have the option to seek appointment should they choose to do so.

There are consequential amendments to the quorum and decision making provisions which have the effect that the amendments do not change the quorum or decision requirements.

This suite of amendments arose in the context of seeking the views of the Council via the State Courts Administrator, on the amendments proposed by the Shadow Attorney-General. The State Courts Administrator advised that the Council and heads of jurisdiction did not support that amendment, and instead sought the amendment which has now been filed by the Government.

The Council and heads of jurisdiction were subsequently provided with a copy of the draft amendment via the State Courts Administrator, to ensure it was in keeping with their request. The Administrator subsequently advised that the Council did not have any comment on the draft amendment.

End of advice. In those circumstances I take it that there was acquiescence if not embrace of the amendment in those terms. So, in the circumstances, I welcome the amendment, support the amendment and will, in due course, not proceed with the amendment in my name subsequently.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Although that was not framed particularly as questions, I think nonetheless a general question has been raised in the sense of: how has this come to be that these amendments have been filed? So, in that case, I would like to take the opportunity to give some of that context, although much of the context that the honourable member has given is absolutely accurate. That is not to suggest that any of it was inaccurate, but just for the full picture.

So, I will explain that this amendment amends subclause 3(1) of the bill to insert new subparagraphs (ca), (cb) and (cc) to provide for the appointment of the Judge of the Youth Court, State Coroner and Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court as members of the State Courts Administration Council in accordance with the proposed new subsection 3(1aa).

This amendment was requested by the council and relevant heads of jurisdiction by the State Courts Administrator as a result of consultation on the Teague amendment—so, indeed, the sequence of events described by the honourable member is absolutely accurate. The government is acceding to this request by moving this amendment and those related to and consequential upon it, which are all of the subsequent amendments standing in my name.

The State Courts Administrator has advised that it is the view of the council and relevant heads of jurisdiction that it would be beneficial for there to be capacity for the Judge of the Youth

Court, State Coroner and Senior Judge of the ERD Court to be represented on the council so that they can appropriately participate in the decision-making of the council that affects their courts, should they wish to do so.

The government has been advised that it is their preference for these appointments to be made only upon request of the relevant judicial officer; that is, these appointments will not be automatic in the same way that the Chief Justice, Chief Judge and Chief Magistrate are legislated as members of the council. This appointment mechanism has been specifically requested by the council and heads of jurisdiction via the State Courts Administrator.

The council and heads of jurisdiction have advised via the State Courts Administrator that in their opinion the amendments will have the benefits of ensuring a mechanism by which the heads of jurisdiction can seek to be appointed to the council in the event that they feel that the council is not properly considering issues relevant to their jurisdiction, and providing additional accountability mechanism between council and the heads of jurisdiction.

With those words, I appreciate the opportunity to clarify the rationale and who has had input into that, and appreciate the indication from the honourable member that other amendments will not be proceeded with.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 2 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 2, after line 18 [clause 3(1)]—Insert:

- (1aa) A person appointed to an office referred to in subsection (1)(ca), (cb) or (cc) may only be appointed as a member of the Council—
- (a) on the written request of the person; and
 - (b) with the concurrence of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Amendment No 3 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 3, after line 14 [clause 3(1)]—Insert:

- (1ca) The office of a member of the Council appointed under subsection (1)(ca),(cb) or (cc) becomes vacant if the member—
- (a) ceases to be the Judge of the Youth Court, State Coroner or Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court (as the case requires); or
 - (b) is removed from office by the Governor at the request of the Chief Justice; or
 - (c) resigns by written notice to the Governor.

These amendments are consequential upon the matter we just discussed.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 4 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 4, line 17 [clause 4(2)]—Delete 'section 7(1)(d)' and substitute 'section 7(1)(ca), (cb), (cc) or (d)'

Amendment No 5 [DeputyPremier-1]—

Page 4, line 20 [clause 4(3)]—Delete 'section 7(1)(d)' and substitute 'section 7(1)(ca), (cb), (cc) or (d)'

These amendments are consequential on previous decisions.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 9), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Mr ODENWALDER: Once again, I reluctantly draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

*Parliamentary Committees***STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:12): I move:

That the report of the committee be adopted.

I am really pleased to move that the house implement the recommendations of the report of the House of Assembly Standing Orders Committee on changes to standing orders, implementation that is really important to progress. I understand that there are four main areas of change to the standing orders recommended by the Standing Orders Committee. They are to ensure all language is gender neutral, except for reference to Chairman of Committees; make permanent the sessional orders around maternity leave and the bringing of infants into the chamber; remove redundant standing orders; and allow electronic attendance at committee meetings in certain circumstances.

I am advised that the last major review of the House of Assembly standing orders was undertaken in 1989 by the Standing Orders Committee. This was of course many years ago at a time before any of us were elected to represent our communities, at a time when many of us were engaged in quite different pursuits and at a time when some amongst us had not yet entered this world.

The world and a range of social norms and community expectations have rightly significantly changed during the past 34 years. Whilst it is so important that we strongly protect a range of important parliamentary rules and traditions, it is crucial also that from time to time the standing orders and sessional orders be updated to reflect the current operations of the parliament, the composition of our members and the social norms and community expectations of our time.

Members here would remember that, only last year, the government advocated for changes to the standing orders to ensure an ongoing inclusion of an Acknowledgement of Country at the start of our proceedings. This was rightly adopted by the house, and this important, respectful acknowledgement of Kurna people and their relationship with this land on which we meet is undertaken each day.

The committee has recommended the use of gender-neutral terms in the standing orders in most instances, except where there is conflict with the Constitution Act of 1934. As I mentioned, I understand this refers to the proposed continued use of the terminology 'Chairman of Committees' in the standing orders as it is referenced in the Constitution Act.

On this side of the house, we now proudly have a majority of women in this place. In making the change before us, recommended by the Standing Orders Committee, we acknowledge this progress and we respect that women in their numbers are now taking their rightful place in this house. Gender equality in decision-making makes for better decisions, decisions that are much more reflective of community expectations. Our parliament should be an exemplar of equal representation. It should be representative of the diversity of our community, and our standing orders should reflect that there are men and women in this place.

My heart swells with pride when I see the numbers of extraordinary women who have joined us in this house—women who do make our parliament a better, a stronger and a wiser place. We

can assume that there are roughly equal numbers of women and men of merit in our community. When gender equality is not represented in our parliament, we have to take positive action to smash through any barriers that prohibit women from taking their rightful place in this house. I am so proud that the Labor Party has taken that positive action. We can all be proud that those women who fought collectively, tirelessly and fiercely 129 years ago to successfully ensure that South Australian women could vote and stand for parliament would utterly approve of that action and would utterly approve of our actions today.

This government is profoundly committed to creating a state in which your gender has no bearing on the opportunities available to you. We want to be a state that is renowned for equal opportunity for girls and women, that empowers women and girls to live their best possible lives and that realises the benefits for all that an equal future creates.

This wonderful increase in gender representation here in our parliament is one of the strongest signals we can send to the community about the importance of gender equality and diversity in decision-making, and we hope to encourage even more women to stand for public office. Every member should absolutely be reflected in the language used in this place. That is the right thing.

The committee has also recommended that sessional orders for maternity leave and bringing infants onto the floor of this place be formalised within the standing orders. These sessional orders were adopted by the house in March 2021 and were re-adopted with the commencement of this Fifty-Fifth Parliament. Today we ensure they are enshrined in our standing orders. This important step speaks to this place being one of welcome and inclusion and one that recognises the diversity of families, and the members who are part of those families, in this place.

I understand the committee have recommended adoption of changes to allow for the publication of public evidence to select committees prior to the release of the final report. Currently, standing orders are required to be suspended to allow for publication of evidence prior to a final report. The committee have also recommended changes to notices of questions and answers to questions to align with morning sittings of the house, in particular, to allow notice of questions and answers to the current practice of 12 noon on a sitting day rather than two or 2½ hours prior to the commencement of proceedings of the house.

In addition, I understand the Standing Orders Committee has made recommendations to allow for any select committee to meet remotely via electronic means. This will mean that select committees can meet remotely in certain circumstances, much like standing committees were provided for in response to COVID-19. Finally, I understand the Standing Orders Committee has recommended redundant standing orders that refer to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which has been superseded by the Legislative Review Committee.

In closing, I thank members of the Standing Orders Committee during the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, as I understand much of the work of this report was completed by the committee during this time. I also thank the current members of the Standing Orders Committee for their really important work. I thank the Hon. Dan Cregan (the Speaker and Chair of the committee), the member for Giles, the member for Schubert, the member for Elizabeth and the member for Unley.

I again commend the Standing Orders Committee and absolutely welcome the adoption of the report's recommendations—recommendations that uphold our traditions and speak to progress in our community and in our parliament.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (16:21): I am pleased to rise to support the motion. I will not go through all of the detail that the minister has just gone through but, rather, the purpose and the need for rejuvenation of the standing orders. If we look around us in this place, we will see echoes of the 1300s, even—in the very early days that the common people shared an audience with the King and those who had property and money in the UK, which of course was the beginning of the Westminster system.

As that Westminster system grew, we saw the formalisation of meetings; rather than being ad hoc when it suited the King they became scheduled, and then, of course, we saw them in chambers such as this. In those chambers, we are reminded by some of the things that we see here

today how violent those chambers could have been in those early days. Remember, it was the House of Commons and consequently it was the common man as opposed to those who used to be in a decision-making process: those who had influence, those who had a connection to royalty, those who had some title or land. Predominantly, those early debates were about taxes and, for example, how to fund the wars that England was engaged in.

That aside, as the common man entered the parliament, often there were arguments or debates that could not necessarily be articulated well enough just with the debate. Consequently, men were wearing their swords and they drew their swords, and often that could lead to a violent confrontation in the chamber. A blood line was introduced and a rule was brought in that you could not speak unless you were standing behind that blood line. The blood line was designed to be two sword lengths apart so that those swords could not connect.

If you look at parliament today, we are the only parliament in Australia, as far as I am aware, that still symbolises the blood line, but every parliament in Australia still has elements of that positioning rule that was put in place to manage members of parliament. That is that it is out of order, against standing orders, to actually speak from anywhere other than our allocated seat. That is a more sophisticated version, if you like, of the blood line. So I am out of order if I speak from the member from Morphett's seat or if I speak walking around the gallery and quite rightly the Chair at that time, whether it be the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, would be within their rights to pull me up and tell me that I was breaching the standing orders.

With that in mind, that is where we are today with the updating of the standing orders from 1989, the last time they were done. It is an evolving process. As the minister said, it is important that we continue to understand and recognise our history: where it started, where we are now and how we got here because we have moved into a very civilised way of having debate. It is the rules in this place, the standing orders, that enable us to have that debate in a civilised manner and ensure that everybody has the opportunity to be heard and consequently then represent their constituents, the people they are elected to represent in this place.

In closing, I support the first report of the House of Assembly Standing Orders Committee, the changes to standing orders, for the very reasons that I share with the minister and my colleagues on that committee.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (16:26): I, too, rise to speak to the consideration of the Standing Orders Committee First Report helping to identify moving forward how we can be more reflective of our state's modern and changing community, which our parliament represents. I am very supportive of ways to ensure that language within our standing orders is gender neutral to encourage this parliament to be a more supportive and inviting environment and to be an environment that is as efficient as it can possibly be.

Creating a more family-friendly chamber will send a clear message to our community that this is not just a place for the blokes. It will make stepping into this place less of a daunting ask for women and, as such, it will help to further boost women's representation in our parliament, particularly mums with young families or women who want to have a family down the track, who also want to stand up and make a change for the better by pursuing a life in politics. A family-friendly parliament tells them that they, too, can represent their community here and that having kids should not, nor should it ever, be to the detriment of their position in this place.

We should always have in our mind how we can further improve the decisions made in this parliament. One way that we can do this is by ensuring that this parliament is reflective of the diversity found within our community that we seek to represent. Be it the diversity of gender, culture or disability, the strength of decisions made here are only improved when we are reflective of the communities that we represent.

I believe that as our parliament develops to reflect the diverse community that lies beyond this chamber, this parliament will be an even more productive, thoughtful and effective parliament, one that the community will have greater trust in. When there is a diversity of voices in this room, each sharing their own unique perspectives, it allows for ideas to be shared which may have otherwise been neglected to be considered.

The resulting debate that comes from that and the decisions that make their way out of this place are therefore all improved. It does not just lead to better decisions being made, it also better reflects the demands of our community and we in turn receive greater levels of trust in the decisions we make here in this chamber, boosting the integrity of our democratic processes.

We know that where we have greater participation of women in the workforce, positive impacts flow on from this, both to productivity and workplace cultures. At the end of the day, we know that a more diverse parliament is something the electorate wants to see more of.

We know very well what happened at recent elections, where voters turned out to support more women in parliament, both here at a state level and also on a federal parliament level. This is evident in the seats won by this side of the house and across our federal parliament, where we have seen a record number of women take up seats across the country.

I understand that it has been the practice of the Legislative Assembly of the ACT for many years now to allow members to breastfeed on the floor under standing order 210, with this not being tied to a member being required to attend during a division. In 2018, women were permitted to breastfeed in the Queensland parliament and last year members in WA's Legislative Assembly were also permitted to breastfeed on the floor of parliament.

A baby should not be a stranger in this place. They should not be blocked from being with their mum at such a crucial point in their life, and we do not need to stand in the way of a mum trying to do their job whilst also fulfilling caring duties to their child because of an outdated way on how we view a workplace should operate—an outdated, patriarchal view of how a workplace should operate that is so old it may even pre-date a woman's ability to even stand in this place as a member.

Many reports in recent times have detailed the important work that is required to make our workplace safer. This is one of the glaringly obvious ways our parliament can be brought into the present day. We can start today to ensure a more family-friendly workplace that we can continue to work on improving, and we can take that first step by amending the standing orders to make permanent the ability for members to bring their infants onto the floor of parliament.

As the report from the House of Assembly Standing Orders Committee details, making this change permanent will align the house with contemporary social values, allowing for the full participation in proceedings by all members of the house. Still, though, there is much work to be done to ensure an even friendlier work environment here in parliament that deserves further attention as we move forward.

I am acutely aware that language matters and of the positive influence that gender-neutral language can have in a workplace, and we have a responsibility to lead by example. It is no secret that this workplace and environment is male dominated, and it has been for some time. But as this place becomes more diverse, change is stirred, making it that more appealing for the next person to consider putting their hand up to represent their community.

As a result of its history, the language used in this place does not always reflect the gender and sexual diversity outside this chamber, outside the doors of this parliament and found in our community. It also does not promote a great feeling of inspiration when reading through these documents feeling, instead, that many of these positions are written in such a way that precludes half of our community because so many roles are highlighted to be 'his'. It will not always be 'His Excellency', and not all chairmen are men, so why do we persist in propping up these naming conventions when options like 'chair' are more than fine?

In some areas it does go both ways. For example, removing gendered references to the sovereign or governor—including 'Her Majesty', 'The Queen' and 'His Excellency'—to 'sovereign' are also sensible amendments to make. It will help to show that gender is not portrayed as a prerequisite for the role. It is also important to note that these changes are in accordance with the guidelines for accessible and inclusive content for gender and sexual diversity, as set out in the Australian government's Style Manual.

Other amendments to the standing orders will provide greater clarity for members and staff. Firstly, clarity on the deadline for questions on notice, which I understand has not been amended since the introduction of morning sittings in 2007, has caused some confusion. Questions and

answers are currently accepted until 12 noon on a sitting day, and the committee has recommended amending these standing orders to reflect current practice.

Inconsistencies between the powers of select committees established by the house and standing committees established by the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 have also been addressed by the committee—namely, standing order No. 339. There is a provision for the ability for committees to meet remotely in certain circumstances, as we have all come to embrace, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. It is another change that brings our parliament into line with the rest of working Australia. It has been a game changer, and it has played a huge role in allowing governments to continue progressing with business during difficult times, and I have no doubt it will continue to support the effective delivery of this parliament's functions and responsibilities.

I am absolutely open to ways that we can make our parliament as accessible as possible. I want a parliament that inspires all in our community, a parliament that reflects our modern society and make-up of our great state and I believe that these changes in this report are good measures to get the ball rolling.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (16:34): I, too, rise to speak on the Standing Orders Committee First Report. As the member for King was saying, words matter. I think we saw this last year when I was proud to join with students in my local community at Prospect Primary to change the parliament forever by renaming the Strangers Gallery in this chamber to the Public Gallery, something that the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC in the other place was also able to do recently on her side of the house.

The reason this happened is because the students came to us and said why do we have a parliament, our parliament, that is not necessarily inclusive? Why are they the strangers when this is their house and that we work for them? It was something I was incredibly proud to be a part of to rename the Strangers Gallery to the Public Gallery, because as I said words matter.

If we are to lead by example, if we are to be the place where we create the laws by which South Australians are governed, our workplace should really reflect what is expected of us in society. That is why I rise to support the recommendations of this report.

In 1989, the Standing Orders Committee undertook a complete review of the standing orders to ensure that they were 'meaningful and appropriate for the conduct of the house's business and expressed in plain language'. As part of that review, the house directed that the standing orders be expressed in gender-neutral terms. Thirty-three years later, acknowledging that social norms as to what constitutes gender-neutral terminology has changed in that time, the current committee undertook another review.

The committee's detailed examination has recommended several changes to the standing orders' terminology, that all references to 'he', 'she', 'him', 'her' and gender references to the Sovereign or Governor, including 'Her Majesty', 'The Queen' and 'His Excellency', be removed and replaced with 'they' or 'their' or 'the Governor' or 'Sovereigns'; that terminology of 'Chairman' for select and estimates committees be replaced by the word 'Chair'; however, the terminology of 'Chairman of Committees' will remain to ensure consistency with the Constitution Act 1934.

It is surprising in this day and age that, given we are in 2023, we did still have the terminology of 'Chairman', particularly given that for the first time following the state election women make up the majority of this chamber, which is quite—

Ms Stinson: On this side. Only on this side.

Ms HOOD: Yes, on this side—which is quite remarkable. I know my colleagues in the chamber will agree that when we do parliament tours we always are really proud to talk about how we were such a progressive state in being the first to offer women the right to vote and run for parliament, but when you actually then add up the decades that it took to not just elect the first woman in Joyce Steele followed by Molly Byrne but then how it took us until 2022 to reach majority on this side is quite remarkable.

As part of the review, the committee has identified other anomalies and has taken the opportunity to recommend changes there. They recommend that sessional orders adopted by the house in 2021, which provided an automatic entitlement to maternity leave for members and for

members to bring their infants on the floor of the chamber, be made permanent. Again, given that a few of us here are mothers to very young children, this is something I very much welcome and would love to see perhaps in the future a few little babies in the chamber.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms HOOD: Not you? You're out? Further, the report recommends allowing electronic attendance of select committee hearings in certain circumstances. Again, given the events over the last few years with the COVID-19 pandemic, it is wonderful that this place is headed into the 21st century in allowing those flexible workplace arrangements.

The committee also recommends that joint standing orders 19 to 31 pertaining to the joint standing committee on subordinate legislation are no longer valid as the joint standing committee has been superseded by the Legislative Review Committee.

I am very proud to be part of a parliament that is focused on making our office a more inclusive and flexible workplace for everyone. I would like to thank the members of the committee for their recommendations, including the Chair of the committee, the Speaker, the member for Kavel, Dan Cregan; the member for Giles; the member for Elizabeth; the member for Schubert; and the member for Unley. I welcome the swift adoption of the report's recommendations.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (16:39): I rise to support this First Report of the Standing Orders Committee. I note that while my title may change due to this—I will no longer be the 'Chairman' of the ERDC or the 'Chairman' of the select committee into access to UTI treatment—yours will stay the same, sir. You will continue to be the Chairman of Committees and that is obviously because your title is the one that is in our constitution.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What can I say?

Ms STINSON: What can you say, indeed. Note to self, and for all of us here in this parliament: the next time we change the constitution that will be a task for us, to complete that last little change of language to ensure that we have the 'Chair' of committees. I am not sure there has been a female chairman of committees—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, there have been.

Ms STINSON: Sorry?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There was.

Ms STINSON: There was? There you go; I am reliably informed that there was.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We had a Speaker and Deputy Speaker respectively.

Ms STINSON: Excellent. Hopefully we will update the language for the next woman who comes along and occupies that role. In the meantime, I am pleased that we are changing the language that applies to the rest of the Chairs in this place, so that we will be known as 'Chair'. It is probably worth noting, though, that for quite some time I think people in this place have been referring to those positions as 'Chair' rather than 'Chairman.' I did not even realise that it was 'Chairman' of several different committees until reading this report.

Really, I think this brings into line what our practice has been in this place for some time now, to refer to each other as 'Chair' regardless of gender, but it is good to have that formalised. As other speakers have said, it certainly reflects how important language is, how that language is changing, and the fact that these particular standing orders have not been reviewed for something like 34 years. Quite a lot has changed in 34 years, so it is nice to see that we are now making those updates to the rules that govern us in this place.

The other change that is recommended by this report—there were two others that I wanted to make particular note of. We are, of course, making permanent the sessional orders around maternity leave and bringing infants into the chamber. There are members of parliament who have little ones at the moment on each side—maybe not infants—but we may well see with such a young parliament in so many respects, children in future, little infants, and they will of course be able to

accompany their mothers in here—or fathers, for that matter, because we are gender neutral now, aren't we? I think that is a great thing.

It is quite surprising that we find ourselves in this situation. Quite a few parliaments around Australia updated their rules quite some time ago, including the federal parliament. Although we have had this change in our sessional orders since about 2021, I think, now this is formally coming into our rules, which is an excellent thing, although a bit surprising. I think we are on the tail end of updating our rules there.

That is, of course, a welcome thing, and we should ensure that this is a welcoming place for women at all stages of their life, but also maybe as importantly or possibly more importantly, we should make sure that men feel that they can engage in caring responsibilities as part of their work, and that that is encouraged in this place as well. I personally would love to see that scenario in future if it arises. I think men should be encouraged to take on those caring responsibilities, just as much as women should feel comfortable in doing that in our workplace as well.

Really, if we are not giving that example here in this place then what does that mean for the example that we are setting to the rest of our community? I think that these measures are really a sign of the times and bring us up to community expectations, but also are in themselves a good example to our wider community about how we see things as parliamentarians and as a parliament itself, and the expectations, I suppose, that we have of how we deal with gender and equality in wider South Australia.

Lastly, I want to note the very practical improvement of allowing electronic attendance at committee meetings under certain circumstances. This particularly applies to select committees, to allow them to meet remotely via electronic means. As I mentioned, as the Chair of the select committee into access to UTI treatment, that will certainly be something that will assist my committee in doing our work.

Unfortunately, we still do have COVID in our community, but on top of that there are of course valid reasons from time to time, including caring responsibilities, that sometimes mean that we would like to be able to conduct our committee work remotely using the modern technologies that we have. That is a great advancement, as is formalising it. I would just like to congratulate those who have been involved with this report. These are very necessary and helpful changes that I think will ensure this place runs much better.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (16:45): I move:

That the alterations to the standing orders and joint standing orders as adopted by this house be laid before the Governor by the Speaker for approval pursuant to section 55 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

Bills

FIRST NATIONS VOICE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:46): I will continue from where I finished off. I was talking about a young man by the name of Buddy Newchurch, an Aboriginal from Whyalla, an incredibly talented soccer player, a left-footed midfielder who was spotted by a talent scout from Chelsea. The community raised money for him to go over to Chelsea as a 16 year old to go through the trials and the training to see whether he reached their standard. He was there for three months, the weather was terrible, and he was lonely. As you can imagine, the standards are incredibly high. He was a talented soccer player, but probably did not quite make it.

He came back to Whyalla—and this is one of the reasons I am raising this story in the context of this debate—and within 10 years, this talented, well-liked young man was dead. He was murdered outside the Westland Hotel. He was bashed to death. The people who committed this heinous act

were never caught. Indeed, to this day—and this is dating back to probably 1982—there is still a \$200,000 reward for anybody with any information about the murder.

The reason I bring this up is that when I look in my electorate and when I look nationally, there is huge disadvantage in Aboriginal communities. This was a young man who died before his 30th birthday. When I look at the APY lands, we talk about the fact that there is often this artificial division that is introduced between the Voice being something symbolic, whereas we should get down to work with all the practical stuff. Obviously, some of this stuff is of a dire nature.

Look at the APY lands—and I have said this before—the biggest issue in my electorate is the fact that the average life expectancy of someone from the APY lands is in the early 50s. The average life expectancy of a male in the APY lands is 48 years of age. When we talk about profound issues in this state and other remote communities, especially in Australia, this is one of the profound conditions. It has been said that the Voice is not going to address that, and other members have said that the Voice is not a panacea. It is not there to be a cure-all for what are often very deep structural and complex issues.

The Voice should be seen not just in a symbolic sense but also in a practical sense. If you are going to build something worthwhile, you are going to need tools and a toolkit. The Voice, in a very practical sense, will be one of the tools and perhaps an important tool in the toolkit when it comes to addressing Aboriginal disadvantage in this state, given the platform that will be provided, given the focus and given the degree of accountability that a Voice of this nature might well generate.

We have our own process here, which is clearly a legislative process. At the federal level, they are looking at a constitutional process. With the short time that I have left, as we are talking about the Voice, I think it is important that Aboriginal voices and the way that Aboriginal voices are condensed in the Uluru Statement need to be put again and again on the record, because it sums up a lot of things that are incredibly important. In our own way as a state, with a legislative approach, we will give a practical platform to what the Uluru Statement is calling for. When the Uluru Statement was delivered, it stated:

We, gathered at the 2017 National Constitutional Convention, coming from all points of the southern sky, make this statement from the heart:

Our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander tribes were the first sovereign Nations of the Australian continent and its adjacent islands, and possessed it under our own laws and customs. This our ancestors did, according to the reckoning of our culture, from the Creation, according to the common law from 'time immemorial', and according to science more than 60,000 years ago.

This sovereignty is a spiritual notion: the ancestral tie between the land, or 'mother nature', and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who were born therefrom, remain attached thereto, and must one day return thither to be united with our ancestors. This link is the basis of the ownership of the soil, or better, of sovereignty. It has never been ceded or extinguished, and co-exists with the sovereignty of the Crown.

How could it be otherwise? That peoples possessed a land for sixty millennia and this sacred link disappears from world history in merely the last two hundred years?

With substantive constitutional change and structural reform, we believe this ancient sovereignty can shine through as a fuller expression of Australia's nationhood.

Proportionally, we are the most incarcerated people on the planet. We are not an innately criminal people. Our children are alienated from their families at unprecedented rates. This cannot be because we have no love for them. And our youth languish in detention in obscene numbers. They should be our hope for the future.

These dimensions of our crisis tell plainly the structural nature of our problem. This is the torment of our powerlessness.

We seek constitutional reforms to empower our people and take a rightful place in our own country. When we have power over our destiny our children will flourish. They will walk in two worlds and their culture will be a gift to their country.

We call for the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the Constitution.

As I said, we are seeking to do that in a legislative sense, not in a constitutional sense. I can understand the arguments at a federal level why it should be done in a constitutional manner.

I mentioned earlier the engagement process that was undertaken in this state. It was an extensive process of consultation, and it was an iterative process. Dale and others went out there,

listened, came back, condensed what they had listened to, and then went out there again to see if they had reflected the views that they heard.

In the Adelaide and outer metropolitan area there were seven areas where meetings were held. I have not counted Murray Bridge in that because I count that as being regional. So there were seven in the metropolitan area. I was very pleased to see the efforts in the APY lands, with all the major communities in the APY lands visited as well. In regional South Australia, consultation processes took place in 15 different communities. A whole series of questions were asked and answered, and this legislation now enshrines that feedback.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:55): All Australians can agree that closing the gap between non-Indigenous and Indigenous Australians is both a national ambition and, closer to home, an ambition here in South Australia. While European settlement first occurred in Australia in 1788, it was not until 1836 that European settlement came to this state, with ideals based on a free and fair society. The electorate of Morphett that I represent is, of course, the site of the Old Gum Tree in Glenelg North, where South Australia was proclaimed on 28 December 1836.

From then forward, each year on 28 December a Proclamation Day ceremony is held, and the Governor reads out to the crowd the original proclamation that was written by Governor Hindmarsh. It stated that his duty was to extend the same protection to the Aboriginal population as to the rest of His Majesty's subjects, and 'to punish with exemplary severity, all acts of violence or injustice' against the Aboriginal people, who were to be protected under the law and 'equally entitled to the privileges of British Subjects'.

At the same time, we inherited the Westminster system of democratic governance, which I believe has been and will continue to be a foundational strength of our state. It is something worth protecting. In fact, I contend that it is the best system of government in the world. That does not mean it is a perfect system. Democracy does have flaws, but it is based on an ideal that values each individual equally.

Governor Hindmarsh rightly intended—although the wording is outdated compared to what we say now—that the rights of Aboriginal people living in this land would not be adversely affected. Unfortunately, in the case of Aboriginal people, the ideals have not been met practically. Tragically, you could say that the opposite has happened. The First Nations peoples were dispossessed and often persecuted, and the effects of the coming of Europeans have continued, over successive generations, to be devastating.

Each year at that Proclamation Day ceremony there is a peaceful protest by Indigenous representatives, demonstrating against the dislocation of this event. It is something that in recent decades has rightly received much more focus at a state level. It is something that both sides of politics in this parliament have grappled with and tried to put significant effort into, after all wanting to provide better outcomes: better health outcomes, better educational outcomes and, of course, better economic outcomes that would then lead to stable housing, family and community life for Aboriginal people, as well as for all South Australians.

We should thus proceed with humility, knowing that the difficulties and challenges the Aboriginal people have faced over the course of our modern history have remained complex problems for public policy, for governments, for parliaments and for those bodies that work in this difficult field.

But that is not to say there have not been positive steps along the way. Certainly, from the 1960s a significant area of focus in South Australia has been related to land rights. In 1966 we saw the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act introduced by former Labor Premier Dunstan. In 1981 we saw the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act; that happened under the Liberal Tonkin government. In 1997, the then Liberal government was the first in the nation to make an apology to the stolen generations. In 2013, the Constitution Act 1934 was amended to include a formal statement recognising Aboriginal peoples as the first peoples and nations of South Australia.

Certainly, the former Liberal government from 2018 to 2022 also has a proud record when it comes to practical work focusing on closing the gap here in South Australia. This included, of course, the former Premier being the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, prioritising this portfolio in his

government, and establishing the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, Dr Roger Thomas, in July 2018. On 3 December 2020, Dr Thomas provided a report on the achievements of his office for the period July 2018 to November 2020 to the South Australian parliament's House of Assembly. This was a historic event, as it was the first time an Aboriginal person had spoken formally on the floor of parliament's lower house.

We also saw the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander flags fly here alongside the Speaker's chair in the House of Assembly and fly alongside the Australian and South Australian flags. It also came with an Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan; the creation of the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young Children, April Lawrie; reconciliation action plans; custody notification services; cultural awareness training; and, of course, the commitment at Lot Fourteen for the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre, now Tarrkarri. Also in Lot Fourteen was The Circle, the First Nations entrepreneur hub. When I was Minister for Trade and Investment, I was fortunate enough to welcome a number of First Nations businesses to The Circle when it first commenced.

But it is not just in parliament where practical change can occur and has occurred. I can certainly reflect on my time in the AFL, which I think can be rightly credited with showcasing what Indigenous excellence looks like on a sporting field. Certainly, an important step that was made while I was playing in the AFL was where the AFL moved to draw a line in the sand that racial vilification was utterly unacceptable. There is no doubt that this led to breaking down barriers that had once existed and, importantly, it led to equality and respect rather than separation and separatism and doubt. It also led to a significant positive shift in society, and out of that came much better efforts to understand the Indigenous players, their upbringing and also their culture.

The result has been that decades later we now have nearly 10 per cent of AFL players being Indigenous, in what is a cutthroat industry. It is ruthless when it comes to performance and results, and each of those Indigenous players has worked incredibly hard to seize the opportunity that they have been presented with and also to be role models who will inspire others to emulate them. Importantly, the game is so much better for this transformation and it has helped to bring a greater appreciation and respect for Indigenous players and their culture. It does give a really good insight into how South Australia and the nation could be better off if we can bring out the best in South Australia's Indigenous population.

While they are leaders from a sporting aspect, locally it has been important over the years that I have been a member of parliament to see Kurna leaders become role models within the community. One of those is Tamaru, who often provides a Welcome to Country at community events, most recently speaking at the citizenship ceremony on Australia Day. When I was Minister for Trade and Investment, Tamaru was involved in developing the department's Reconciliation Action Plan and we both spoke to department staff at the launch of the Reconciliation Action Plan in 2021.

On that occasion, and others such as the recent citizenship ceremony, Tamaru has talked about the challenges that European settlement has meant for him and his family, and also his efforts towards reconciliation. Rather than just talk, he does involve the audience, getting someone from the audience to participate. He starts off placing that person in front of him and he makes the point to everyone present that reconciliation is not about that person walking in front of him. He then places them behind him and he goes on to say that reconciliation is also not about him walking in front of them. Finally, he gets them to stand next to him and, while they stand there next to each other, Tamaru says that reconciliation is about walking side by side together. It is a very simple but powerful message about equality and mutual respect.

Ideally, what that means for us here in this place is having Aboriginal members of parliament here beside us as our aspiration and wanting to aim towards that. We have certainly seen that substantively in the current make-up of the federal parliament, which sees 11 members of parliament from Indigenous backgrounds. That really is an example that we here in our Parliament of South Australia can strive for.

Of course, alongside direct representation in parliament, having advisory bodies that advocate for Indigenous people and issues helps to aid decision-making and policy. In South Australia, there are over 190 such entities that exist to support our Indigenous population, such as the Aboriginal Affairs Executive Committee, the Aboriginal Education and Training Consultative

Council, Aboriginal Family Support Services, the Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia, the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and even the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee here in this parliament.

Certainly this broad number does emphasise that there has been substantial focus that both sides of parliament have put in to both engage and address Aboriginal disadvantage. I think South Australians broadly and on both sides of politics in the South Australian parliament have been committed to Indigenous affairs and improving the lot of Aboriginal Australians and South Australians.

Oftentimes, the broad outcomes to Closing the Gap are agreed on, where we want to aim; but the debate in parliament has been more about how this should be achieved. Additionally, certainly for myself, and I am certain everyone in this parliament would agree, the results have not resulted in the improvements and outcomes that we and the South Australian people desire. As a parliament, we should remain focused on practical actions and outcomes and so we support greater engagement to support better outcomes for Aboriginal people.

The former Liberal government worked diligently to consult with the Aboriginal community, with the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, Dr Roger Thomas, doing so over the period between 2018 and 2022. This extensive consultation resulted in an Aboriginal Representative Body Bill being introduced here in 2021 with the goal to establish an Aboriginal representative body as an independent statutory body. Its role would be to seek the views of all Aboriginal South Australians on matters of concern and interest to them.

The Aboriginal representative body would be able to work within the existing parliamentary committee system, which allows work to be done to aid parliament decision-making. It retains the primacy of the parliament. It was also proposed to replace the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee with a new Aboriginal affairs and representation standing committee. Like any other parliamentary committee, this standing committee would report to parliament annually on the operation of the Aboriginal representation body; however, this mechanism would not create a third chamber in the parliament.

In fact, the committee set-up was a criticism by Labor in the debate of this bill in the previous session of parliament. Rather, the committee should be seen as a virtue and as a body where meaningful, practical work could be done that is transparent to the public. It is prudent, incremental change that respects the Westminster system. It is a model that Labor speakers opposed in the debate.

Instead, we now have Labor's model that we are debating now, which seeks to establish an elected body of Indigenous South Australian representatives known as the State Voice to Parliament that would formally interact with our parliament and with state government. This includes the State Voice receiving notification of the introduction of every bill to state parliament and having the opportunity to address either chamber, although not both, with regard to any given bill.

The proposed State Voice would also require meetings to take place between both the Voice and cabinet, with briefings held for the Voice by the chief executives of every government department at least twice yearly where any matter of interest can be discussed and have the ability to influence decision-making at the highest possible level in South Australia.

So we have Labor's model, which creates a large machinery of engagement that represents a departure from the Westminster system in terms of representatives and representations that can be heard on the parliamentary floor regarding legislation. As I said, the government seeks to set up a body that can speak in parliament on any bill, whether that be government or private member.

Although it would not have the powers of a house of parliament, it certainly would have the potential to act as a third chamber of parliament and, at the very least, a third bureaucracy and with that the de facto powers that may get introduced to delay or obstruct the parliament on any bill before the house.

Alternatively, if you think in terms of timing, it could be considered as a first chamber since the entire premise of the Voice to Parliament is that it is consulted and gets to speak on legislation before it is passed by the parliament and the delays that that might then introduce. I did say 'premise',

though, because the legislation allows for the Voice to speak on a bill after it has been passed, but surely by then it is too late.

There is also the risk that the Voice on the parliament floor will be a platform to voice opinion but with no action and no practical outcomes. Potentially, the Voice may speak on bills, as I said, after they have been passed as the legislation allows. That has the potential then to cause loss of faith or potentially even a push for greater powers for the Voice in the future. If it is the case where there is no practical action, what does the Voice then look to do? Does it instead seek to influence other areas of government? We know that the bill gives access of the Voice to executive government, so is that where efforts would be concentrated rather than here in our parliament?

The opposition therefore is of the view that the model that is the subject of this bill is defective and consequently will not achieve practical outcomes for those in need, and for that reason have opposed the bill. While the bill is defective, there are amendments proposed by the opposition that create engagement and build on the work done by the previously mentioned Aboriginal representative body that can work within the existing parliamentary committee system.

The opposition's position allows work to be done to aid parliament decision-making that does not involve a Voice that creates a third chamber but, rather, retains the primacy of the parliament established in the Westminster system, and the benefits that system brings to progressing the interests of all South Australians, and the firm belief that our current parliamentary democracy is capable of representing a variety of racial and ethnic diversity, a variety of cultures, whether they be a majority or a minority, a parliament that is capable of better health outcomes, better educational outcomes and better economic outcomes that lead to stable housing, family and community life for Aboriginal people, as well as for all South Australians.

As I said before, my desire, like that of all my colleagues on this side of the house, is to search for areas of disadvantage and do everything we can to remedy that disadvantage whatever their background, so that Aboriginal South Australians can thrive based on having access to education, health, employment and ultimately economic opportunity so as to reach their potential and, in so doing, become active members of the South Australian community.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:12): I am pleased to stand with the Premier and our Attorney-General in supporting this legislation, indeed our great party that is making incremental yet monumental change. And it is monumental. It is a remarkable feat that, so long since settlement here in South Australia, we will be the first parliament to introduce a Voice for Indigenous South Australians to the decision-making bodies that have governed.

Looking at the Uluru Statement from the Heart, you quickly realise from the words of Indigenous leaders that the Voice is a gift to Australians. The Voice is a hand out of reconciliation: it is their way of allowing us to atone. It does send a very, very strong message. I will admit, I was always very reluctant to do Acknowledgement of Country because I was not quite sure how that fits into our day-to-day lives and remarks but, after having spoken to Indigenous leaders about that a couple of years ago, it occurred to them to educate me that the Welcome to Country in fact is a gift. It is another gift that Indigenous leaders give us: the Welcome to Country is, in fact, an invitation no different from when you welcome someone into your home.

So the Voice, I think, is that moment, that moment that many members of parliament will look back on in their careers in parliament and say, 'I played a small role in moving reconciliation that little bit further. I played a small role in undoing a lot of harm and righting a wrong, and acknowledging one of the oldest continuous living cultures anywhere in the world.' And then there will be those members of parliament who will look back with regret that they were not part of that journey, that they stood in the way of it. I think those members will regret not supporting this move.

This Voice does not reconstitute the house. This Voice will not impact the constitutional arrangements of constituents. It will not give people an extra franchise: it gives them a voice. I think members who are opposing this, even those who are opposing it against their better judgement—and remember that I have sat in this parliament since October 1997. I have heard year after year after year the virtues of the Liberal Party, that they are not bound by their party, that they can freely

exercise their own internal views and vote any way they see fit on any legislation with there being no consequence.

On this matter of the Voice, every Liberal member of both houses of this parliament is speaking with one voice, and that is, 'No.' None are exercising the rights they have as members of a party of individuals, a party they say is of liberty/libertarian values, small 'l' liberal values, that they can now cross the floor and vote with the government. They will not. They refuse. I think there is a few reasons for that, which I will speculate on. I do not know how accurate they are but I am going to speculate about why it is some members are not supporting it and why they have come to this decision.

This decision, in my opinion, from what I have heard, was roundly endorsed by the Liberal Party party room, with very little dissent, if any. I am not saying that there was not dissent but from what I have been told it was a popular move within the Liberal Party to not support the introduction of a state-based Voice, despite it being the policy of the previous Marshall government. I am not quite sure how they rationalised that internally. In one respect, had they won the election in 2022 and been sworn in on 20 March, they would be introducing a voice—or was that all just words?

Both parties went to the election promising a Voice to Parliament for Indigenous Australians. We offered our bipartisan support for the voice that was being proposed by the then government; obviously, we had our views. But the now opposition, the former government, which still has the former Premier in its ranks, will be voting against the Voice, and that is disappointing, but I respect their right to do so. They are democratically elected and they have their own agency and they have decided that collectively they will act as one here and they will vote against the Voice.

They will offer amendments, I understand, but I do not know whether the government has accepted any of those amendments or not but, regardless, the position of the parliamentary Liberal Party is that they oppose this Voice. I think that is to the detriment of the members who are participating in that 'no' vote and to the detriment of the parliament and the state. I also think that they will live to regret that point, in time, and they will regret that decision.

There is nothing wrong with wanting to offer an alternative opinion on the Voice. I think that is perfectly legitimate. But opposing it outright diminishes the Liberal Party because I think that they are better than that. I think, given that there are people in the Liberal Party who probably do believe this is the right thing to do, yet are still voting no, are doing so for party political reasons, and that is disappointing.

Of course, we are politicians and we all act politically and there are consequences for politics and elections, and one of those consequences is that we are here and they are there, and they are trying to carve out a point of difference. I think what they are attempting to do is to de-Marshallify the Liberal Party, trying to undo what they think was four years of left wing progressive liberalism.

I did not think there was anything left wing or progressive about the Marshall government. I think they were a hard right wing economic re-rationalist government. I do not see any virtues. They might have been progressive on social matters like euthanasia and abortion, but they were matters of conscience. Yes, they were introduced by the Deputy Premier and the then Premier had very strong views on those things, but there seems to be a sense within the Liberal Party to try to distance themselves from their most recent Premier who was the only Premier to have won an election from opposition since Dean Brown in 1993.

In distancing themselves from the one person who was able to bring them out of opposition and into government it seems to me that they are speaking to a base that is ever-shrinking. I am seeing a lot of decisions by the South Australian Liberal Party that I think are raising concerns that they are adopting a Matthew Guy or Peter Dutton style of opposition, and that is an interesting tactic from a historical perspective. We do not know yet how Peter Dutton will perform at the upcoming federal election. I do not know. I have had limited dealings with Peter Dutton. On a personal note, I hear he is very pleasant and very nice, but from a political point of view I do not think he has the ability to—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): There is a point of order from the member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: It goes for as long as we have heard, that there is a 127(1) standing order point to be made at some point, with a 128 consequence. I just note it. I am perfectly content to hear out the remaining minutes, but what we are hearing is—

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The member will be heard in silence.

Mr TEAGUE: What we are hearing is contrary to 127(1) and I call on you, sir, to act in terms of standing order 128.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): I do think the minister may be straying into uncharted territory so I will just remind him to please keep his remarks related to the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I may have hit a raw nerve, sir.

Mr Teague: Not really.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Then why the point of order?

Mr Teague: No raw nerve.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'No raw nerve; I am not upset by this, I just raised a point of order because I could.'

Mr Teague: We're in a second reading debate on a bill. Show some respect to the parliament.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Okay, the minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much, sir. I am not sure I will recover after that.

Mr Teague: I am sure you will.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not sure I will. In fact, I may need to take a Bex and lie down after that vicious, eloquent, witty attack.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Minister, if we could get back to the bill, please.

Mr Teague: Some of us are serious about this bill; some of us are serious about the debate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is true, some people are very serious about opposing a Voice to Parliament, and the member for Heysen is leading that opposition. I think his opposition will forever mar his time in this parliament. I think his constituents will be very disappointed to know about his position, which they will be informed of very soon.

I also think that the shadow attorney-general is letting the entire side down, on the other side of the house, on this bill. The Liberal Party's opposition is after the Uluru Statement from the Heart, where First Nations leaders have reached out to what they would say are governments and parliamentarians who have never ever lived the disadvantage that their communities have.

They have reached out to them to say, 'We are prepared to forgive. We are prepared to reconcile. We are prepared to put the hand of friendship out, and we ask to be (1) acknowledged on a national level in our nation's constitution as Australia's First People,' and we should absolutely do that, but I fear that will be opposed. They also want to have a voice—a voice in the corridors of power.

The establishment of a Voice, led by the first initiated Indigenous man to hold the portfolio of Attorney-General, is I think one of the great leaps forward for South Australia. When you look back at 1836 to now, the firsts in South Australia keep on getting racked up, whether it is the free settler state principle; the initial Indigenous engagement, while having its scars and black marks, was attempted to be done differently to what it was in other states—but, still, lots to be done, lots to be learnt, lots to be sorry for—an apology in this parliament; equal franchise for women; one vote, one value; continually pushing through reforms; and now the Voice.

We will be the first state to legislate the Voice and the Liberal Party are on the wrong side of history again. It is that point of leadership that they lack, that here we are on a second reading speech

of a Voice to Parliament, and the parliament is not unanimous in its agreement for this bill. It seems to me that the Voice will actually help, in my opinion, in better governance. Yes, the Voice can be awkward, and I think the Voice will be awkward. It will be difficult. It can be confronting. There will be questions about funding. There will be questions about resourcing. There will be questions about how budgets are being formulated. There will be questions on bills and legislation.

There will be awkward moments in this parliament, and that is a good thing because whenever we look at disadvantage when it comes to cohorts of South Australia citizens, in those cohorts of disadvantage, our Indigenous populations, unfortunately, are table leaders. They are, unfortunately, leaders in incarceration in our men's prisons. They are leaders in disadvantage in land. They have lower life expectancy. We need to do more and should do more. The intent of the Voice is to try to also help alleviate some of this disadvantage as well as being a political acknowledgement of the longest continuous civilisation in the world.

It is a beautiful civilisation from which there is much that we can learn. This Voice I think gives South Australians the opportunity to embrace their fellow citizens and put out the hand of reconciliation. The model that the bill proposes is for a number of Local First Nations Voices—at least six—to be elected by local regions, and a State First Nations Voice comprising two presiding members of each First Nations Voice.

I do not think the government is saying this is a perfect model. I do not think the government is saying in any way that this might not change as the Voice evolves—and I am sure it will evolve, as it should, like our parliamentary democracy has evolved. At first, it was landowners only. Then, it was men only. Then we had women. Then we lowered the voting age. There was a continual change to the way we enfranchise people and the Voice will be no different.

To give an analogy, it is a bit like the safeguard mechanism debate that is occurring in the federal parliament. The question is not whether we should make legislation that abates carbon. The question is: should we at least get a system in place that can evolve? It is the same with the Voice. I think the Voice is that first step that we have taken since 1788, and since 1836, to actually evolve a better relationship with the people who were here when British colonisation first began.

I think there is a lot more that we can do with the Voice, but this is the first step. You know the old Chinese saying: the longest journeys begin with a first step. Well, this is the first step, and it has been a very, very long journey. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MINISTERIAL RELIABILITY INSTRUMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:31 the house adjourned until Tuesday 21 March 2023 at 11:00.