

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21 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.

Bills

FIRST NATIONS VOICE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 March 2023.)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:01): To conclude my remarks, I returned from Port Augusta yesterday, where we were engaging in consultation for another bill that is not yet before the parliament called the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act. We were talking to, negotiating with and consulting every Indigenous group in the state. It is fair to say that there is a lot of unfinished business. There is a lot of cynicism, a lot of hurt and a sense of betrayal. This is not a partisan attack; this is about government, full stop.

There were elders and young people who were thirsting and looking for the same thing we all want for our families and our homes and that is a better tomorrow, an opportunity and a pathway forward. The Voice will not fix all those things. The Voice will not undo entrenched disadvantage. The Voice will not be the solution to all the ills that have befallen our First Nations people, but it is a recognition that we have made errors and it puts us on the path to move forward where we can have a spotlight on the impacts of the changes that we make in this house that impact on ordinary, everyday Indigenous communities.

Hearing their voices yesterday in Port Augusta in our second round of consultation, the voices are not homogenous; they are diverse. There is a difference in what is thought. There is not one Indigenous voice, there are voices, and they need to be heard, just like our community have voices in this parliament. Let's face it, does the member for Flinders really represent the 20 or 30 per cent or 5 per cent or 10 per cent of the minority vote? Do I represent the Liberal Party vote in my electorate in here adequately? Do they have a voice?

What we are saying is that the most disenfranchised people in our state, who are over-represented in our prisons and who are over-represented in statistics that we would not want to be a part of, like early mortality, poverty, malnutrition, education and imprisonment, have levels of disadvantage in these communities that need to be aerated.

The Voice will not be easy. The Voice will be confronting, especially for ministers who have executive function. For us, the Voice will be the most difficult. For us, the Voice will be confronting, as it should be. The Voice will be the voice of the so far unheard and they will be heard and heard often. Often, what we will hear we will not like. That is the point of the Voice: not to be congratulated but to hear voices of dissent. That is real representation.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:04): I rise in support of this bill. I would like to preface my contribution to this bill with a few comments to help me put this issue and the debate into context. Firstly, people of goodwill with the same set of facts can arrive at different conclusions because of their different lived experiences. While this is true, it is important that we acknowledge what this

debate is and is not about. This is also true for our First Nations people. The fact there is some difference of opinion within the Aboriginal community on this issue of the Voice is not of any surprise.

As part of this discussion and debate we have to address that our understanding of Australian history has been, to date, a European version. That has impacted on our laws and culture. The High Court decision in *Mabo* went a little way to correct this historical record but not far enough. We now understand there is another valid version of Australia's history from the perspective of the First Nations people.

This is also true of Christian theology and the impact this has had on Aboriginal people. We need to understand and accept that there is an Aboriginal interpretation of the Christian faith, if we honestly believe that we are born in His image. The time has come for an acceptance of the Aboriginal Christian theology if we are to truly become a reconciled nation. But that is a discussion for another day.

The Voice process has been informed by the Uluru Statement from the Heart, so I believe it is important to insert into this debate key elements of the statement, as it provides context as to why this bill is important not only to Aboriginal people but to the nation as a whole. Like the Prime Minister has commented, the Uluru Statement is our Gettysburg Address. It is, like Lincoln's speech, a simple statement that has profound meaning. It acknowledges a harsh but truthful reality. It is also a statement of great hope for our nation, as it speaks for a better future, which we know is within our reach. But we need an open and uncluttered mind and a heart full of compassion if we are going to make it happen.

The statement is like a love letter to the nation from the heart of the Aboriginal people and from the geographic and political heart of their country and our nation. This is how First Nations people see our shared history, and I quote from the statement:

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.

Since colonisation or settlement, we have either done it to the Aboriginal people through the dispossession of their lands, language and culture; through killing on their lands; through taking their children and, at times, enslaving them; or, we have done it for them: we have placed them into missions; we have diminished their language and culture, that it was not permitted to evolve over time; and we gave them sit-down money or welfare, which impoverished a generation of Aboriginal people. What are the consequences of these policies? Let me quote from the statement:

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.

Now is the time for us to walk with First Nations people, but we need to start the story at the beginning and the statement provides a First Nations perspective, and I quote:

In 1967 we were counted, in 2017 we seek to be heard. We leave base camp and start our trek across this vast country. We invite you to walk with us in a movement of the Australian people for a better future.

First Nations people invite the Australian people to walk with them. Where do we go from here? I quote:

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 Nation's Voice enshrined in the Constitution.

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.

We seek a Makarrata Commission to supervise a process of agreement-making between governments and First Nations and truth-telling about our history.

These are the three elements of the Uluru statement: Voice, Treaty, and Truth telling. This bill is about creating a Voice to Parliament. This will build a foundation and create the architecture for a treaty and truth-telling process. The Voice underpins the First Nations ability to engage in a treaty and truth-telling process.

What have we, as a Labor Party or Labor government, done to date? I would like to relate some events of Labor's record on Aboriginal affairs. In 1966 the then state Labor Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Don Dunstan, introduced the first Aboriginal land rights legislation in Australia to establish the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

In 1975, Labor Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam, famously poured a handful of red soil into the hand of Vincent Lingiari. This symbolised the legal transfer of Wave Hill Station back to the Gurindji people. It also meant the Gurindji people became the first Aboriginal community to have land returned to them by the commonwealth government.

In 1981, South Australia passed the land rights legislation for the APY lands, built on the work of Labor under Don Dunstan. In 1992, Labor Prime Minister, Paul Keating, delivered the Redfern speech. He outlined the injustices committed against Aboriginal people since colonisation, and asked us all to imagine if it was us.

In 1995, federal Labor Attorney-General, Michael Lavarch, instigated the Bringing Them Home report. The report was delivered under the Liberals, but some findings were rejected and John Howard refused to say sorry. In 2008, the Labor Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, made a formal apology to the stolen generations, whose lives had been blighted by past government policies of forced child removal and assimilation.

In 2015, South Australia became the first mainland state to introduce a Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme under Labor Aboriginal Affairs minister, Kym Maher. In 2019, South Australian Labor leader, Peter Malinauskas, committed the Labor Party and a Labor government to state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

This brings us to what we are debating here today. This bill creates the structures and processes to give First Nations people a Voice to Parliament and state government. It is, importantly, based on a full First Nations franchise. They elect their representatives. The proposal has been criticised for a number of reasons, including:

- it will not make a tangible difference—in other words, it will not improve Aboriginal disadvantage;
- it is race-based and therefore should be rejected;
- a treaty should come first; and
- the issue of sovereignty.

Coming to the first criticism about Aboriginal disadvantage, I concur with the minister's comments just a few moments ago that the Voice itself will not address these issues directly, but, importantly, the Voice will help inform policies and avoid the policy failures of the past. Yes, there exists a huge challenge to address the disproportionate disadvantage that, overall, First Nations people experience, but the Voice will enable parliaments and governments to develop the right policies to make a real difference.

In regard to the criticism that it is race-based, race is a social construct. Its term came about as a way of justifying Western colonisation from the 15th century onwards—in other words, to justify the conquest of other First Nation countries. It has no basis in science. As the Deputy Premier and member for Port Adelaide said in her contribution to this debate, we need to:

...accept the profound difference between the idea of race and that of culture.

Race does not exist. It is an artificial distinction between people that has no foundation in fact. We are all human: there may be a wide variety in how we look, but there is no discernible difference of any significance between

people of any nation on this earth. Any suggestion that this legislation is about this outdated notion of race is simply wrong.

What is important is the idea of culture.

Another of the criticisms is that the treaty should come first. The Voice will determine who will speak on behalf of First Nations people in a treaty process and that is why it precedes the negotiation of a treaty. On the issue of sovereignty, the Uluru Statement itself, I think, addresses this issue very well. I quote:

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 [importantly it] co-exists with the sovereignty of the Crown.

What is the alternative model? To have a Voice which is partially appointed? One which denies the First Nations people self-determination? This would, in my opinion, be a step back to colonial Australia. In speaking in opposition to this bill, the member for Heysen said, in part, as follows:

Let's approach the matter with the humility and the diligence that the subject matter requires because there should not be any hint of grandiosity in what we are debating here. It is true to say, and I do not think that there is anything controversial in an observation, that the difficulties, the challenges, the opportunities that Aboriginal people in this state have experienced over the course of our South Australian history since 1836, have remained challenging and complex problems for public policy for parliaments, for governments and for those who would work alongside Aboriginal people.

While I agree wholeheartedly with the member's sentiments, I do not agree with the conclusion he reaches. As the Premier said in his contribution to the bill:

We must have humility enough to say that what we have been doing has not been working well enough. If things are to improve, things also need to change. This legislation has involved extensive consultation with communities all over South Australia, aimed at ensuring that the Voice will be robust, informed and inclusive.

We continue that journey this week.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:17): I rise to support this bill. This bill represents the implementation of a commitment made by the then Labor opposition in 2019. In fact, I believe it was the very first foreshadowing of a piece of legislation made by Labor in that term of parliament.

The commitment was made again at the 2022 state election and I have personally heard the now Premier mention it on many occasions during that campaign, including in his formal speech at the campaign launch. Consultation on the model to be used was begun not long after the election and, following passage in the other place, we now have a bill before us.

I know that the Attorney-General, who has a deep personal connection to this bill, has worked diligently to produce the most effective model possible. I have observed him to be driven not by ideology or politics but by a determination to achieve positive results for those who have been let down so much in the past.

I would now like to turn to the particulars of the bill. Part 1 of the bill sets out important preliminary matters. In response to feedback from the engagement sessions, the definitions of 'Aboriginal person' and 'country' have been replaced with 'First Nations person' and 'traditional owner'. The definition of First Nations person adopts the tripartite test as stated by Justice Brennan in *Mabo v Queensland (No. 2)*, stating in clause 4:

- (1) For the purposes of this Act, a person will be taken to be a First Nations person if the person—
 - (a) is of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent; and
 - (b) regards themselves as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (as the case requires); and
 - (c) is accepted as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person by the relevant Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander community.

This test is commonly used by governments all around Australia. A reference to a traditional owner in relation to a particular place is now modelled on references in other legislation.

In response to concerns about the interaction of the Voice with existing bodies and agreements, two clauses outline its interaction with other legislation. Clause 7 makes it clear that the Voice does not limit or otherwise affect:

- the functions of any other First Nations persons or bodies under any other act or law;
- an agreement or arrangement entered into or relating to First Nations persons or bodies, such as native title agreements; or
- anything that First Nations persons or bodies can do in accordance with First Nations tradition.

Clause 8 makes it clear that this bill is intended to be read in conjunction with, and to complement, the provisions of any other act that implements measures to progress Truth and Treaty, as contemplated in the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Part 2 of the bill sets out the structure and functions of the Voice at the local level. Regions will be established within South Australia that will be represented by independent Local First Nations Voices with elected members. Pursuant to clauses 9 to 11 of the bill, the number of regions and the number of members that make up the Local First Nations Voice within each region will be prescribed by regulation.

Local First Nations Voices will engage with local communities in order to determine matters of interest to First Nations people in their region, and will communicate those views to the State First Nations Voice. This process will be a collaborative process with a State First Nations Voice. Local First Nations Voices will also have a discretion to collaborate with and assist public sector agencies and other organisations in the development of policies and procedures, and to engage with local government and other organisations on matters of interest to First Nations people in their region.

Part 3 of the bill sets out the structure and functions of the Voice at the state level. The membership of the State First Nations Voice will comprise the joint presiding members, who must be of different genders, of each Local First Nations Voice. The State First Nations Voice will represent the diversity of First Nations people in South Australia and will formally interact with the South Australian parliament and the South Australian government.

In response to feedback which sought greater recognition of, and representation from, young persons, elders, native title holders, as well as members of the stolen generations, the bill requires a State Voice to establish specific committees to represent these important groups. The membership of these advisory committees is to come from the community and not from the existing membership of the State Voice and the Local First Nations Voices.

Parts 4 and 5 of the bill set out the formal requirements for the State First Nations Voice interactions with the South Australian parliament and the South Australian government. The State First Nations Voice will be notified of the introduction of each bill in the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council and will be able to address either house of parliament, but not both, through one of the joint presiding members in relation to any bill.

The State First Nations Voice must deliver an annual report and address to a joint sitting of parliament, and may present a report to parliament on matters of interest to First Nations people. To ensure that the issues raised in these latter reports are appropriately considered, the minister is required to provide a response to the report, including whether any action has been taken or is proposed to be taken.

Interactions between the State First Nations Voice and the South Australian government will occur through meetings with cabinet, briefings with chief executives, and an annual engagement hearing. The ability to directly address the South Australian parliament and to engage with cabinet ministers and chief executives will give First Nations people the opportunity to influence decision-making at the highest levels and have their voices heard where it counts.

The conduct of elections is set out in schedule 1 of the bill. Elections will be run by the Electoral Commission of South Australia and will, with the exception of the first election, be held at the same time as the state election. Transitional provisions will allow the first election of members of

the Local First Nations Voices to be held as soon as possible after the commencement of the legislation.

A First Nations person who is on the state electoral roll and who has completed a declaration of eligibility will be able to vote in an election of members of the Local First Nations Voice for the region in which they reside. A person who nominates as a candidate for a Local First Nations Voice is not restricted to nominating in the region within which they reside; instead, they may choose to stand either where they reside or in a region where the person is a traditional owner.

As agreed to in the other place, clause 13 of schedule 1 of the bill provides for a preferential voting system. Voting is to be conducted using a single transferable vote system in accordance with rules determined by the Electoral Commissioner after consultation with the State First Nations Voice and the minister. These rules will be modelled as much as is reasonably practicable on the Electoral Act's provisions for the Legislative Council vote.

I have outlined what the bill contains in detail, but I also feel it is appropriate to address what it does not do. It does not establish a third chamber of this parliament. It does not give First Nations people a right of veto of decisions made by this parliament. It does not deny or diminish the role that this parliament has as a decision-maker on what statutory provisions should be made for the betterment of the people of this state. What it does do is what it says in the title: it gives First Nations people a voice, a voice to speak on their behalf to this parliament so that we may collectively make better decisions, because we need to make better decisions regarding First Nations people.

Time and again we have gathered in this place and discussed the dispossession, disadvantage and disengagement of First Nations people in our state. The Voice will not solve these problems on its own; it is not being imbued with the authority to do so—that will remain the responsibility of all of us in this parliament—but it will seek to help us make better decisions, something which I am sure we can all support.

I have no doubt that this bill will pass this place, and there will be much commentary on its historic significance; however, the real work begins after that. The creation of a legislated Voice to this parliament is one thing, but it is we who must listen, and that will be the true test, not only of this legislation but also of our collective resolve to make our state a better place. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call Mr Clerk, I recognise the presence in the gallery of leaders from a number of schools across Narungga, guests and friends of the member for Narungga, who is also present with them. Welcome to parliament.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EDUCATION, TRAINING AND SKILLS PORTFOLIO) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November 2022.)

Mrs PEARCE (King) (11:26): I rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Education, Training and Skills Portfolio) Bill. This bill makes important amendments to three separate acts, the first of which is the amendment of the Education and Children's Services Act 2019.

Education is a crucial influencer in the direction our state takes now and into the future, and it is vital that we do what we can to ensure that students who can be in the classroom are there and that they are learning. Attending school provides our children and young people the opportunity to develop important social networking skills, expanding their ability to learn important values that set the foundation of what they will continue to build on throughout the pursuits they undertake in life.

To ensure that students are encouraged to come to school, this bill will amend section 75(2a) of the act to provide clarity that a head of an approved learning program has an obligation, along with principals, to notify the education department's CE of persistent non-attendance or non-participation.

Reducing truancy where we can is a priority of our government because we want to ensure that every child is attending school and gaining the many benefits of doing so, getting the best start possible in life. Since we have come into government, we have gone about making the necessary changes to facilitate a reduction in non-attendance across our schools and to help students feel empowered to attend by adding supports within the education system.

This has included the funding of 100 full-time equivalent mental health and specialist learning support staff to support students. Two of these have been allocated to my local community, with one full-time specialist being allocated to Salisbury East High School and the other being allocated to Golden Grove High School.

Research shows that mental health concerns are most likely to emerge in lower secondary years, and we want to support young people when they are most likely to need it. This investment in mental health and wellbeing will see a workforce, including psychologists, social workers, occupational therapists, speech pathologists and other learning support specialists in place to help young people tackle issues early, helping to look after their wellbeing and helping them to feel empowered to stay in school.

We have also increased the number of staff who work for the Social Work Duty Line by three full-time equivalents, which now means we have over 30 full-time equivalents supporting schools, addressing wellbeing and attendance issues and providing a support service for schools with a high level of demand for its use.

Other work we have been busy delivering includes the nation-leading initiative which has seen our government invest \$28.8 million into ensuring access to an autism inclusion teacher in every public school, as well as R-12 schools. We are also utilising education family conferences, which are an evidence-based approach to engaging with family members, schools, relevant department staff and other professionals.

These conferences offer a strength-based approach that provides families with the opportunity to be actively involved in deciding on and actioning arrangements to improve their child's attendance at school. Since coming to government, we have also been supporting a new partnership with Kornar Winmil Yunti (KWY) to deliver a new program of intensive support for Aboriginal families with children who are not attending school.

This bill will also amend section 130 of the Education and Children's Services Act to provide the chief executive of the education department with the discretion to waive, reduce or refund a charge, allowing it to be paid by instalments or require a person to give security for a charge under section 130 of the Education and Children's Services Act.

This amendment to section 130 aligns the legislation with the practice, moving power from the principal to the department, as the practical administration of this currently lies with the department. We are proud of our support to overseas students studying in South Australia and we continue to support the Department for Education's International Education Strategy 2019 to 2029, with a strong commitment to continue supporting international education. We have in recent times exercised this ability to waive fees for Afghan evacuees and Ukrainian families, showing compassion where we can and supporting those families in a time of need, and it is this section of the act which allows us to do this in the future.

This bill also looks to amend the Education and Early Childhood Services Act, amending section 22 of the act to allow a deputy member of the Education Standards Board to fill a vacancy in the office of the member for whom they are the deputy. Currently, if a vacancy falls before the current term of the appointment ends, the deputy member cannot act in the place of the member. This change allows for a more efficient and effective board, with the person appointed to be the deputy of the member being able to act as a member of the board with respect to the vacant position. This would be for the balance of the term of appointment or until a person is appointed to the vacant office under the act, whichever occurs first.

The Education Standards Board is responsible for the regulation of early childhood services and schools, and is key to ensuring an education system which operates at the highest quality. This amendment is another step made by our government to ensure that the Education Standards Board has the support it needs to continue with its important role in our education system.

This is in addition to the work we have done to date for the Education Standards Board, which has seen this government provide the ESB with additional funding—over \$2 million across two financial years—to offset reductions in commonwealth funding and appoint Alana Girvin as the new presiding member of the board. A great fit for the board and with extensive leadership experience, including as principal of several schools, Ms Girvin also established the education department's Incident Management Directorate to respond to critical incidents.

Also contained in the statutes amendment is an important amendment to the History Trust of South Australia Act. South Australia has the unique benefit of having the History Trust as an agency of the South Australian government, with the act setting out its functions, which include to carry out and promote research relevant to the history of SA; accumulate and care for objects of historical interest; disseminate, or encourage the dissemination of, information relevant to the history of SA; encourage the conservation of objects of historical significance to SA; and manage and administer museums and other premises placed under the care, control and management of the trust.

Across South Australia, the History Trust's museums include the wonderful Migration Museum, which tells the stories of South Australians while celebrating cultural diversity. The National Motor Museum in Birdwood, which I was more than happy to visit recently as part of my participation in the Bay to Birdwood, is a wonderful venue that showcases this state's rich motoring history. The South Australian Maritime Museum located in Port Adelaide preserves our state's maritime history and holds the oldest nautical collection in Australia, a museum which my two love to visit and explore, due to the amazing and creative ways that they promote learning within the museum. The Centre of Democracy does an amazing job showcasing the people, the movements and the ideas which have helped to shape, and continue to shape, South Australia.

The History Trust also hosts events outside its museum, such as university campuses, and this proposed amendment is to change section 2 to broaden the definition of 'a premises' to include premises used by the trust to conduct activities and events. Allowing this amendment will be an important change for the History Trust, granting them the power to deal with any inappropriate behaviour at any of their events, helping to manage parking and the bringing of animals to events. The act's regulations provide for a range of penalties for a breach of behaviour, with this change extending those penalties to temporary exhibitions and events.

The History Trust do an amazing job showcasing the rich history of our great state, and this is an important amendment to the act to protect exhibitions in our history. This will ensure that more South Australians can access many more of the fantastic opportunities available from the History Trust. All of these amendments seek to add value and incentive within our education system, which is why I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:35): I am very pleased to make a few remarks on the Statutes Amendment (Education, Training and Skills Portfolio) Bill. I commend the minister for bringing the bill to the house and indicate that the opposition will support it. I will place on the record some reflections on the nature of legislation in the education space and on each of the four measures in this bill.

For the first 18 months, I suspect it was—maybe even two years—that the Marshall Liberal government was in office, we sought to undertake reform of the Education Act and the Children's Services Act—acts that have been in place since the early 1970s, which were completely rewritten by the Education and Children's Services Bill. It was an evolution of bills that had been prepared, first, in the late period of the Brown-Olsen-Kerin government.

Under Malcolm Buckby work started on things that needed to be updated in that education bill, and then through subsequent years the Labor Party initially, when they first took government in 2002, focused only on the age of compulsory education, and ultimately some work was done, particularly under the auspices of the now Deputy Premier, in a rewrite of the bill. There were some

significant sticking points to enable this work to be done, and that bill was never given the priority necessary to get it through the parliament, let alone resolving those sticking points, but I acknowledge that certainly a great deal of the body work in that bill was started in that 2016-17 period.

In 2018, we were elected with a mandate to implement those reforms, but with some variations. We put in place a new approach to dealing with attendance and truancy, an approach that I note the minister is now seeking to work with and which I would certainly have looked forward to seeking to work with had COVID not been a significant barrier to any reasonable approach to dealing with truancy throughout the 2020 and 2021 school years.

I hesitate to say 'for obvious reasons', because I have noted some commentary that suggests that they were not for obvious reasons, but I will say it: for obvious reasons during that period of the pandemic it was very difficult to determine a student being absent from school as truant when we were urging parents, were there any sign of illness, a sniffly nose—any sign that somebody might have flu-like symptoms, a potential COVID case—to keep those children home. It was very difficult in those circumstances to rack up somebody as being a truant in those circumstances.

It was in that legislation that we established the education family conferencing, which I note the member for King talked about as an important reform and which is now available as a tool, a mechanism, to help the education department engage effectively with families and ensure those kids get back at school, because every day lost at school in a child's learning is a lost opportunity to engage with the curriculum to help find a pathway towards a successful future in which that student may thrive and fulfil their potential. We need kids to be at school. One of the most important things that any family can do is ensure their child is getting to school.

The education family conferencing notifies the significant role that families play in getting that child to school. We do not want to impose huge truancy fines on a family that is doing their best, and, indeed, a court would never impose such a fine. The importance of the court's involvement in a prosecution is something that was lost from the original Labor bill in 2016 and 2017 when they were endeavouring to introduce an expiation notice for a child not being in school. We thought that that was a missed opportunity. We thought that actually the engagement was very important to getting that child back to school.

While it meant that there was a risk of a greater fine, being \$5,000, if the family was not attempting to get their child to school, it would require a court's engagement in the process so circumstances could be taken into consideration. However, to enable both the best forward-leaning opportunity to get that child back to school and also to provide an easy measure of whether a family was interested in helping their child get to school, the education family conferencing model was developed and indeed piloted and trialled during the term of the former government.

I am sure it is going to be a boon to the now minister as he seeks to do this because, in an education family conference, you can bring in the principal, authorised officers (whether they be truancy officers or potentially police, if needed), behaviour and wellbeing-related staff, and, indeed, the family, to find an understanding with the student of what is the block to their attendance at school. Should that family not engage in an education family conference, then that is a sign that potentially the stick of the prosecution may be necessary. I tell you what, having those larger fines certainly captures the attention of anybody who is not interested in engaging positively and proactively with the process at the first point.

All of this work was part of the 120 or 130 clauses of the Education and Children's Services Bill 2019, which put in place these measures. During this period, we also increased by 50 per cent the resource available for truancy officers, or social workers engaging in attendance—there are a number of different classifications they use within the department, but effectively, truancy officers were increased from 20 to 30 during the period from 2018 to 2022 in line with our election commitments.

We felt that there were too many schools, too many students requiring support by each one of these people with an important role and powers to help get those kids back to school. Again, in 2020 and 2021, COVID prevented the full benefits of this work being realised, and now the newish minister, about to celebrate one year in the role tomorrow, has the opportunity to do this work. We

trust and we expect and we will accept nothing less than continued improvement in relation to this matter.

The clause that is relevant in this bill is one that deals with an ambiguity—certainly an intentional ambiguity—and one where it is not clear that there is a problem. Certainly, if there is a suggestion of ambiguity, and we are dealing with other matters as well, then we will fix it. When a student is engaged in a VET program as part of their school studies, that program may involve a student doing some of their hours outside of the school in a registered training organisation or through a service or, indeed, it could be a school-based apprenticeship. As that relates to truancy, this bill makes it clear that there is no difference, from the truancy point of view and accountability for school attendance, whether that student is at the RTO or inside the school grounds: they must be present performing that sort of activity.

As I say, I am not convinced that that was not the case under the previous law, but rather than give any opportunity in one of the truancy-related prosecutions that may well potentially come up in the future, should a child's family be prosecuted in this way, I think it is fair enough to make it clear beyond any doubt.

The second clause that is relevant in the bill is in relation to international students. About a decade ago, the former Labor government, under Jennifer Rankine I think it would have been at the time—the minister might remember because he was the Chief of Staff in her office—made a budget decision. Potentially, the now Treasurer, who would have been the economic adviser to Premier Weatherill, might have been the one who made the decision; it might not have been the Minister for Education.

It might have been the now Treasurer under the former government who made the decision that a budget savings measure would be put in place, where the former government said that international students could no longer get free education in our public schools. Instead, they would be charged significant fees—significant to the point, I should say, that one of the significant effects of it was that many students in that situation left our public school system and went to low-fee independent schools or Catholic schools because the fees at those non-government schools were lower than the public school fees that these international students were required to pay.

Of course, circumstances differ from school to school. Indeed, international students are in our schools for a range of different reasons. Some were always intended to be fee-paying students—students who, particularly in senior secondary years, are invited to come to study, to pay the fees and to have that one-year or two-year experience in our schools. That is not what this deals with. This deals with students who are in a situation where potentially their parents have come from overseas for whatever circumstances. Indeed, they are not citizens, they do not have permanent residency, but they are in our school system and being charged thousands of dollars.

In that environment, the savings mechanism was created when the budget measure was allowed, that a school principal could apply a school discount or an exemption. From the very start, and I stand to be corrected, but certainly when I arrived as education minister in 2018, it was already the practice that a principal delegated that authority to the chief executive. Effectively, it was Chris Bernardi, the chief finance officer, now chief operating officer of the department, who would have the authority to do this. My understanding is that between 2012 or 2013—when the budget measure came in place—and 2018, it was one that had rarely been used.

However, circumstances arise—as I am sure all members can imagine—whereby very sympathetic cases present themselves, especially where there are multiple children, where somebody's circumstances change abruptly. Indeed, the power was exercised a number of times when I was the minister to either significantly reduce or, in certain cases I believe, exempt some families from paying that fine.

We also took a view when we were in government that, while there were a great number of metropolitan schools that were very much at capacity, and it would not be possible to completely reinstate free public education for many people in these visa categories, we did take the view that there was absolutely nothing to be lost by allowing schools, particularly in regional areas and in the Adelaide Hills—many of them small schools—to have more international students.

Many people in agricultural and horticultural communities rely on workforces from overseas, and we thought it would be an excellent idea for those families to be incentivised to come to work in South Australia by allowing their children to attend schools. Many of those schools, particularly at the smaller end, would benefit greatly from having those extra students, and there was no risk of capacity being a problem. So we did change that fairly significantly when we were in government to free up the opportunity for many of these families to send their kids to public schools. I do not have any data on it, but I would be very surprised if that did not see a significant uptake.

This clause is an administrative change. It moves that power from the principal, which has been delegated for years to the chief executive or the chief finance officer. It changes the legislation, so it removes the question. It takes away that principal's authority and gives it to the chief executive. In effect, this is an authority that has never been used by a principal, and you would not necessarily think it was appropriate for that principal to have that power.

It puts the principal in an invidious position if somebody comes to the principal with one of these questions. It is a very awkward situation when somebody is asking for their school-fee burden to be relieved because of awful personal circumstances they are in. The principal then has to make a judgement. That is not fair on that principal and that is why, I suspect, in practice it has always been delegated, and that is why I support and the opposition will support moving it in practice in this legislation.

The third part of the bill is in relation to the Education Standards Board or, to give it its full title—and I challenge the minister in his second reading response to say this full title without reference to his notes; I am not going to try—the Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board, which is a catchy title. Again, I think Jennifer Rankine may have been the minister who passed that act, and the minister was therefore the chief of staff and is responsible for this. The board itself is referred to as the Education Standards Board these days because everybody prefers to call it the ESB than that other name.

When I became the minister, the chair of the Education Standards Board was John Dawkins, the former Labor federal Treasurer, and the registrar was Chris Chatburn. Chris Chatburn had in effect been the registrar since the board was formed. The board brought together three different registration authorities and combined them into one. It was a useful reform, it was an important reform, and it was a reform that I think has been gratefully received by many.

It was particularly important in the period after the National Quality Framework for early childhood standards was brought into place. This was about a decade ago. It was a federal reform, supported by the Education Ministerial Council, as it was then. That reform was particularly important in relation to early childhood services but also to preschools and out-of-school-hours care facilities. It provided national consistency in the manner in which OSHC, long day-care services, occasional care services, family day-care services and preschools were given authority to continue their work.

It had seven categories, such as the infrastructure of the service, which were a series of requirements, effectively, that services needed to match up to. We needed the registrations of those around Australia to be relatively consistent. The board is also responsible for the registration of schools, including new schools—there were a number of new schools given authority to come into existence while I was the minister, which was very encouraging—and ongoing monitoring, assessment and rating of them. When John Dawkins stepped aside from the chairmanship of the board, Ann Doolette, who had been the deputy, stepped into that role. We were pleased to reappoint her; we thought she did a good job.

I note that earlier this year the minister and cabinet endorsed Alana Girvin to take on that role. Alana Girvin is an exceptional educator, but the reason I have great confidence and commend the minister for that appointment is the experience I had with her not only during the period when she was in charge of effectively monitoring internal disciplinary situations within the Department for Education, which is a very important role indeed, but also because her last role while working for the education department was very focused on being the liaison with the COVID management team within SA Health.

Throughout 2020 and 2021 and even more so at the beginning of 2022, the interface between SA Health and the education department could not have been more important. The fact is

that South Australian school students had less disruption to their education; they had disruption, to be sure, but so did every student in the world. By comparison with every other jurisdiction in Australia, Western Australia was the only jurisdiction that came close to the low levels of disruption that South Australia had, and compared with jurisdictions elsewhere in the world, it was chalk and cheese.

Ensuring that early childhood services and schools, non-government and government alike and the Catholic system, were singing from the same song sheet, were giving the same information to their families, parents, staff and students, was critically important. Alana Girvin played a really key role through that in ensuring that the messages from SA Health had a conduit to education that the education department trusted and that the non-government sector in education trusted, and also somebody with significant experience in education was embedded in the SA Health office.

At the points where decisions were being made early on and recommendations were being produced in short time as evidence came to light in the most difficult of circumstances, Alana played a key role in ensuring that there was an education insight in that office able to provide feedback, and she did a great job. Did we get everything perfect? No, of course not; nobody in the world did, but I think that it is beyond question that South Australia did a damn good job in ensuring that our students were always at the centre and that their health, safety and wellbeing were supported, as was their right to an education, which also plays an important role in their health, safety and wellbeing. So I commend Alana for that work, and I commend the minister for recognising her expertise and, with the support of cabinet, elevating her to the role of the presiding member.

Chris Chatburn, I mentioned before, did a great job as the registrar of the ESB for a long time. She decided, against my strong recommendation, against my advice and against my request, that she thought that it was important that at some point in her life she be allowed to retire. Cruelly for me as the minister, she proceeded with that plan towards the end of our time in office. I commend Chris for her tremendous work and the tremendous career that she had in that role and the broad respect that she had within the education system and the education sector. I thank her on the record on this occasion for the support she gave me as minister, particularly in relation to some complex matters. Kerry Leaver was the choice to replace her. I know that we all wish Kerry well in that work going forward.

The Education Standards Board's role in assessing compliance, supporting and ensuring that new services are fit for purpose and the ongoing monitoring, assessment and rating of schools and early childhood services is critically important. We invested an extra million dollars of state taxpayers' money in our first budget, within the education budget, to ensure that it could continue that work at the level that was expected, because we wanted to ensure that our children, particularly through early childhood services, were not slipping through the cracks due to a lack of ability to assess and monitor their compliance with safety issues.

It is no small thing, whether it is a private service or a not-for-profit service, for the Education Standards Board to come in and put some sort of block on the service being able to be offered. Indeed, there is a difficult task when somebody is in breach of their conditions to decide whether this is an accidental, one-off circumstance that could not have been foreseen, that was no-one's fault and the service needs to be supported or whether it is a more significant systemic issue that requires that service to cease. The Education Standards Board works very hard to get those calls right. During our term, it has expanded its role to also include more work in the student exchange programs as well, which are very important.

I mentioned Alana Girvin's work during COVID, but the ESB had a particular role during the pandemic. Again, they had a liaison embedded in SA Health at a couple of points when the case numbers were high. They provided important advice, and I recognise that work.

They also provided an important conduit. There are more than a thousand of these early childhood registered services in South Australia. Some of them are run by government as part of schools, preschools or OSHC services. There are a number that are attached to non-government school services, there are standalone preschools and standalone kindergartens, and there are government preschools. The government ones were fine, but we engaged in that manner with the schools and early childhood services, many with their own private ownership situations—dozens run by councils, hundreds run by bigger organisations, and there are also about 100 community-based

organisations—each with their own boards and committees running those organisations. To get all of them on the same page, understanding the COVID restrictions and the best advice coming out of SA Health, was a significant challenge.

The Education Standards Board was really the only conduit that the health department and the education department could use, short of going through the media. The Education Standards Board ensured that all of our early childhood services had accurate information. That, too, contributed to our state's strong response during 2020 and 2021 to the COVID pandemic.

It gave reassurance to many families who were in a situation where they were able to keep taking their children to child care, and certainly early on when little was known about the disease. Then, when it became clear that that first iteration of COVID was not having the same effect on children and it was not being transmitted by children in the same way that later variants did, that was a very significant job, and I thank the ESB for the role they played in supporting the government during that period.

They also played a role in early 2022, when the situation was changing significantly when our Chief Public Health Officer determined that rapid antigen tests were to be part of the mix and, again, early childhood services were able to benefit from the work that the ESB did in assisting with ensuring that there was some access to those RATs, and that was important too.

The work of the Education Standards Board is supported by an excellent board full of people who have varying experiences within the school and early childhood sector, and I commend them for that work. They have deputies, and this bill's significant change—well, maybe not that significant, but no doubt it will make life easier for the Education Standards Board and the cabinet office—is that if those members of the board step down or are removed for some reason, the deputies can act up without having to go through the whole cabinet process again. We have no particular problem with this move, so are happy to facilitate it.

The final part of the legislation relates to the History Trust. The History Trust is a fantastic South Australian institution, which celebrated its 40th anniversary in, I think, 2021. The History Trust came about under the Tonkin government and from conception to legislation passing took less than six months, a task I offer to those opposite: to conceive of a new institution that will stand the test of time and be seen in future decades to be more and more appreciated. From conception of the idea to legislation through the parliament in less than six months was a significant feat. I commend the late the Hon. Murray Hill for his particular role there as well as the late the Hon. Dr David Tonkin.

The History Trust is responsible not just for managing its museums, although it is no small thing to manage the Maritime Museum, the National Motor Museum at Birdwood and the Migration Museum, as well as the more recent addendum, The Centre of Democracy. It is also responsible for the state's history collection, which is a vast treasure trove of items, artefacts, memorabilia, and things with significant value to our state—both real and inherent—that are able to be part of telling the story of what South Australia is, who we are in the world and where we have come from, both truth-telling and also celebration.

I think that the way the state's history collection is used by the museums is positive and strong, but there are tremendous opportunities in the years ahead—and I hope they will be taken up by the new government—to expand on the way that we tell stories of South Australia's past, being proud of the very many different stories of how our current South Australian community is made up of people who have come here for different reasons, and arrived at different times, but together we, understanding that past, are able to work together to make our state stronger.

The History Trust is important. We tell those stories particularly during May, the month of the History Festival. It started off as a history week, and indeed a couple of decades later we now have a month-long History Festival, which is one of the most significant community participation events in our state. Not only are there significant events put on by glorious institutions—the museum, the library, indeed the parliamentary library, and Dr John Weste and his team put on an event every History Festival—but right across South Australia from Farina to Port MacDonnell, from Ceduna to Port Adelaide, there are community organisations, councils, National Trust groups and so many other organisations telling the stories of South Australia in their own ways.

Whether it is through open days at buildings or history talks by luminaries, such as Keith Conlon, on different aspects of South Australia's history and life, it is a great opportunity for people to participate. What I love about it is the way that people who have insight into our communities take those opportunities to tell those stories. Whether it is to 10 people in a room or a thousand people in the town hall, they are all equally important to that festival and equally valued by that festival. I commend Greg Mackie and Elizabeth Ho, and indeed all the trustees of the History Trust, for the great work that they do.

The History Trust has certain modest powers in relation to maintaining good order or protecting property under the care or control of the trust on their premises. Those exist in the current legislation and they could be used to deal with offensive behaviour relating to a particular group's display at the Migration Museum, or it could be relating to the protection of important artefacts. Under the act as it stands at the moment, somebody could be banned from a site for a day or for longer in order to protect good order. It has not been used, it has not been required to be used, but I can certainly envisage circumstances in which it might need to be used and where it is an appropriate set of powers.

The clause in this bill extends those powers to sites being used temporarily by the History Trust to conduct activities or events related to its functions. The Migration Museum might want to rent a room to do a display, for example, perhaps while it was undergoing some of the significant renovations, including those funded dramatically by the former Liberal government—and I thank Rob Lucas for that investment. It could be to do with the Bay to Birdwood renting some space in an adjacent property. These are the sorts of circumstances where the History Trust might use some other spaces, and this bill extends the powers they currently have for those opportunities. If these powers are to exist for their current purpose then this seems to be a logical extension, and so it has our support. These are the four measures that are in the bill:

- clarifying that VET programs are equally captured by the intent of the bill for truancy accountability in school attendance;
- ensuring that the current practice relating to principals delegating their authority to waive or amend international student fees to the chief executive is set into legislation;
- enabling deputy members of the Education Standards Board to serve as full members without having to go back to cabinet; and
- the History Trust being able to rent spaces and continuing to have their powers.

I think I have summed up everything that could possibly be said about these four powers. I look forward to hearing if there are any government speakers who have something new to add to that. The opposition will support the bill.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (12:07): I thank the member for Morialta for having such faith in the next government speakers.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: We're very excited.

Ms CLANCY: Yes, I am so excited to be here. Welcome back to another sitting week, everybody. If anybody knows any good trigger-point massage, let me know because my back is killing me. I rise today in support of the Statutes Amendment (Education, Training and Skills Portfolio) Bill 2022. It is a bill that seeks to amend the Education and Children's Services Act 2019, the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011 and the History Trust of South Australia Act 1981.

I would like to thank our Minister for Education, Training and Skills—who is nice and close by and is a great minister—the staff in his office and the Department for Education and everyone else who has been involved in the process of bringing this bill to this place. Largely administrative bills such as this one might not be sexy enough to make it to the 6pm headlines, but they still require hours of dedicated work from passionate staff, so thank you.

Education is at the heart of our government's agenda for reform in South Australia. It is why we took policies to the election that were about more than just the next four (or now three) years: they were for the next generation, for the future.

Proposed in this bill is an amendment to section 75(2a) of the Education and Children's Services Act 2019, which clarifies that the head of an approved learning program has an obligation to notify the chief executive of the Department for Education of persistent non-attendance or non-participation. We know that not attending school can have large and lasting impacts on a child's development. Consistent non-attendance has been shown to be detrimental to students' academic and social development and can lead to social isolation and emotional and behavioural difficulties.

Reducing student truancy is absolutely a priority for the Malinauskas Labor government. Truancy, also known as chronic truancy or non-attendance, refers to the unauthorised non-attendance of more than 10 school days per term. This does not refer to approved student absences, such as family holidays, illness or family and cultural obligations.

The Australian Education Union suggests that principals have reported student truancy as a problem in almost 50 per cent of students at disadvantaged schools. That is compared to just three per cent at advantaged schools. When we have children not attending school at that rate in already disadvantaged communities, we see those gaps between the haves and the have-nots get bigger and bigger.

We tackle truancy not to punish parents but to give the best opportunities to our children. We understand just how difficult it can be for some parents to get their children to school. I have to drag miss six out of bed at eight o'clock, if I am lucky, just to wake her up. But while there is no excuse for parents preventing their children from going to school, we also want to ensure we are removing barriers and ensuring schools are a safe and secure environment for our children.

One little thing that helps with that is our government's support of the breakfast in schools program. At least if you can get them there, even if you could not feed them beforehand, they are able to be fed and nourished before they start their education.

This is part of the reason why we are funding an autism inclusion teacher in every public primary school, including reception to year 12 schools, area schools and special schools. It is why we are employing a central pool of 100 new mental health and learning support specialists for primary and secondary schools, and it is why we are banning mobile phones in secondary schools during school hours. This is a \$50 million commitment that we have already started delivering in our first 12 months in government to keep children in the classroom learning, collaborating and succeeding together in a safe and aspirational environment.

Just last night at Springbank Secondary College's governing council meeting, there were conversations about the mobile phone ban and the way students are interacting with each other more and actually enjoying that connection with one another without their phones. As someone who got her dad's hand-me-down mobile phone in year 12, a phone that had no games, not even Snake, I can say I really enjoyed my years at school without one. I almost count year 12 in that because only about three other friends had mobile phones at that point and without Snake, let alone the internet, where is the joy?

I tend to think I am pretty good at leaving my phone alone when it is not needed, but even then I hate to think about how many times I have missed something because I have been distracted by it or how many hours I have spent scrolling or how often I have foregone sleep because of exciting messaging with someone like the member for Newland who is telling me about how great chocolate custard and M&Ms are and then that is all I can think about and I keep texting about it. It is a game changer. It is a fantastic dessert—highly recommend it—but I should have gone to sleep.

But you get the idea: phones are incredibly distracting. I could not have imagined trying to focus during school with a smartphone, let alone the instantaneous bullying behind a screen all day. We used to have to wait until we were home on MSN before that had to start.

The Malinauskas Labor government has also increased the number of workers at the Social Work Duty Line to over 30 full-time staff. The Social Work Duty Line assists schools to address wellbeing and attendance issues and plays an integral role in supporting our schools. We are also supporting a new partnership with Kornar Winmil Yunti to deliver a new program of intensive support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families with children who are not attending school.

Education family conferences also provide additional support for students who are not attending school regularly. These conferences are an evidence-based engagement approach that provides voluntary independently facilitated meetings between families, schools and relevant staff from the Department for Education and other professionals. By bringing everyone together, education family conferences provide parents and families the opportunity to be actively involved in deciding on and actioning arrangements to improve their children's attendance at school.

This amendment to the Education and Children's Services Act 2019 also includes TAFE SA and universities, which will be obliged to report non-attendance and non-participation. It is of the utmost importance to our government that all students, from the time they are smaller than their backpacks to when they can responsibly enjoy a burger and pint between lectures, are supported in their dreams and aspirations. We have a duty to not only support the educational needs of our children but also their wellbeing needs. We know from experienced classroom teachers that the prevalence of poor mental health among students has increased dramatically.

As the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention, I am particularly concerned by the growing rate of reports of students experiencing anxiety and depression-related mental illness, including students as young as primary school age reported to have experienced thoughts of suicide. We can and we must be better at recognising the patterns of non-attendance that are having such a damaging impact on our students.

This bill also seeks to amend section 130 of the Education and Children's Services Act 2019 to provide the chief executive of the Department for Education with the discretion to waive, reduce or refund a charge, allow it to be paid by instalments or require a person to give security for payment of a charge under section 130. Such a change would only relate to full fee paying overseas students, enrolled students who are not South Australian residents and enrolled students who are the dependant of someone who is the subject of a visa of a kind prescribed by the regulations.

We know that diversity in the classroom is just as important as diversity in the workplace, and as important as diversity in this place. The presence of international students in our classrooms only enhances the education experience of all students by bringing together knowledge, culture and language to forge new ways of learning about our globally interconnected communities. This is especially true at the Clovelly Park Primary School in my electorate, a school in which diversity and culture are so beautifully celebrated every single day.

I understand that currently fee discretion sits with our principals; however, in practice the practical administration of fee discretion sits with the Department for Education. It simply makes sense to align the legislation with the practice.

Since Vladimir Putin's illegal and unprovoked invasion of Ukraine, we have welcomed 400 Ukrainian refugees to South Australia, waiving their fees for schooling and providing guidance for families in job-seeking services. This year, over 40 Ukrainian families enrolled in public schools have continued to have their school fees waived, with similar support being provided to Afghani refugees, since the occupation of their home by the Taliban. I am really proud to stand here today, and every day, as a member of the Malinauskas Labor government, a compassionate state government committed to providing support and relief for those in need.

This bill also seeks to amend section 22 of the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011. Such an amendment would allow a deputy member of the Education Standards Board to fill a vacancy in the office of the member for whom they are a deputy. Introduced by the Rann-Weatherill Labor government in 2012, the Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board, known more commonly as the Education Standards Board, is an independent statutory authority responsible for the registration and regulation of early childhood services and registration of schools for domestic and overseas students.

The board's priority is to minimise any risk to the safety, health and wellbeing of children. They respond with regulatory action that is responsive and proportionate to the risks and harms being addressed. As it currently stands, if a vacancy on the board occurs before the current term of the appointment ends, the deputy member cannot act in the place of the member. It would certainly appear to me that the role of a deputy—as in your case, Mr Deputy Speaker—would be to step up in the absence of the member for whom they are a deputy.

The Malinauskas Labor government strongly supports the Education Standards Board. After all, it was a Labor government that established the board and I am sure the current Minister for Education in his role in that government probably played a very important part in it. It is why we are introducing such a simple adjustment to provide for a more efficient and effective board. An efficient and effective Education Standards Board is key to ensuring an education system of the highest quality for the students of South Australia.

Since our election, the Malinauskas Labor government has appointed Alana Girvin as the new presiding member of the board. I understand Ms Girvin has been involved with the Department for Education for 39 years, holding roles in the principalship of several schools and having worked executively within the department. Alana Girvin was convenor of the early years portfolio and the early years reform agenda, the regional literacy improvement priority and the regional office leadership team planning group. Ms Girvin also established the department's incident management directorate to respond to critical incidents.

The Malinauskas Labor government has also supported the Education Standards Board by offsetting reductions in their commonwealth funding with additional funding to the tune of \$2 million across two financial years. By keeping existing students in school, bringing more international students into our schools, and strengthening the Education Standards Board, this bill goes a long way to improving the education and welfare of our students.

The Malinauskas Labor government is steadfast in its commitment to legislate, not just for our first term of government but to legislate for the future in the best interests of the next generation. Our agenda is unapologetically progressive, evidence-based and in the best interests of our students, our teachers, parents, families and caregivers.

Finally, this bill seeks to amend the History Trust of South Australia Act 1981. The History Trust of South Australia is a unique state government agency established to promote the history of South Australia. The trust is responsible for the dissemination of historically relevant objects and information in South Australia and to encourage the preservation of objects of historical significance to our state. They also manage and are responsible for the operations of the Migration Museum, the National Motor Museum, the South Australian Maritime Museum—I can almost smell that Maritime Museum just hearing the name of it; it reminds me of every primary school excursion—and The Centre of Democracy.

By amending section 2 of the History Trust of South Australia Act 1981, we seek to broaden the definition of a premise to include premises used by the trust to conduct activities and events. This is an important change for the trust so that they can be empowered to deal with any potential inappropriate behaviour at their events. Such an amendment will also help to manage parking, bringing animals to events, and prevent the reproduction of exhibits. This is an important amendment to protect exhibitions and our history, and to make sure that all South Australians can access the fantastic activities of the History Trust. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:22): I, too, rise to speak on the amendment of three bills within the education, training and skills portfolio. It was my experience as a School Card kid, proudly educated in the public system, and the first in my family to go to university, that inspired me to become a journalist, and specifically a journalist in education.

This is an area of government that I have continued to have a great passion for, and I am very proud that it is something that our government is also so incredibly passionate about, which is reflected in the many commitments and initiatives that the Malinauskas government has implemented since coming to government 12 months ago—things like expanding Adelaide Botanic High School, banning mobile phones in schools, and increasing the threshold to the School Card.

These policies are all incredibly important for children but in order for them to benefit from state-of-the-art schools and through these important policies, they do need to actually be at school. I know it was a topic that, as a former journalist, I would cover quite regularly, and it is a requirement of the department to constantly focus on. I know, from being at the state budget and covering that as the education editor at *The Advertiser* in 2010, that even back then the previous Labor governments were investing heavily in this space. I remember writing a story about the introduction of an additional 15 truancy officers at the time.

One of the amendments that we speak to today is the amendment of the Education and Children's Services Act 2019. Amending section 75(2a) of this act will obligate the heads of an approved learning program to notify the Department for Education's chief executive of persistent non-attendance or non-participation. As an example, it would require TAFE SA and South Australian universities to report student non-attendance or non-participation.

This is particularly important when we reflect on the announcements of the past week with Adelaide going to build the next generation submarines. We are going to need the skilled workforce in order to build these incredible machines and so making sure that our students are rocking up to TAFE, rocking up to South Australian universities and undertaking the required training to ensure that we have the skilled workforce of the future.

These amendments strengthen the act by ensuring that any student non-attending is reported to the department, because we know how important it is that children and young people go to school. It is why tackling truancy is an important priority for our government. Since coming into government, we have been undertaking some important work specifically around reducing non-attendance. Some of those things include funding 100 mental health and learning support FTEs in order to support students and prevent them from missing school due to reasons such as mental health.

Speaking on that, it is why the ban on mobile phones in schools is so important. It is so heartening to hear the opinion pieces of principals talking about the fact that now in the classrooms, in the schoolyards, rather than the sound of a phone buzzing or dinging, rather than kids sitting around staring at a screen, they are actually conversing, kicking a football, having a chat with their mates. This is so important, this genuine social connection, to balance out the challenges that young people can experience around mental health, in particular anxiety and depression.

We are also increasing the number of staff working the Social Work Duty Line by three FTEs. We are supporting a new partnership with Kornar Winmil Yunti to deliver a new program of intensive support for Aboriginal families with children who are not attending schools. This one is incredible: we are providing access to autism inclusion teachers in every public primary school, to make schools more inclusive and welcoming places where students actually feel safe to attend. I am incredibly proud that this government is, we believe, the first in Australia if not the world to have an Assistant Minister for Autism in the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC in the other place undertaking this important work.

We are also taking action, including prosecution, against parents who are deliberately preventing their children from going to school and holding education family conferences, which is an evidence-based engagement approach which provides voluntary, independently facilitated meetings between family members, schools and relevant departmental staff and other professionals. These methods have seen a number of families sending their kids to school after prolonged periods of absence, but this is something that we have to consistently and constantly focus on in order to ensure that our kids are attending school.

This bill also proposes to amend section 130 to provide the chief executive of the education department with the discretion to waive, reduce or refund a charge; allow it to be paid by instalments; or require a person to give security for payment of a charge under section 130. This relates to full fee paying overseas students, students who are enrolled in schools who are not residents in the state and children enrolled in schools who are dependents of a person who is the subject of a visa of a kind prescribed by the regulations.

The Malinauskas Labor government is proud to support overseas students studying at our schools. Again, as an education journalist under the former government of Mike Rann, this was certainly something that the former Labor government did have a huge strong push in in terms of making us one of the sought after cities for overseas students.

In recent times, the Malinauskas Labor government has been focused on supporting overseas students, in particular in areas of extreme need—Afghan evacuees and Ukrainian refugees—to support these families in this time of need. In this section of the act, it allows these fees to be waived. This amendment is further demonstration of our strong commitment and compassion to those students.

Last year, in August, I was privileged enough to attend with the education minister a TAFE class that was teaching Ukrainian refugees English. We waived these fees and we provided this course for free. I know the minister and I found it an incredible privilege to meet some of these students—in particular, Victoria, who had come over here in April last year having fled her country. You can only imagine that to flee your country and to come to another where you do not have strong English skills must be absolutely terrifying and overwhelming. To be able to just provide that little bit of assistance in the form of TAFE English courses is something that we are incredibly proud to do, and I hope that those students are doing well here in their adopted country.

Another amendment that we will be undertaking is the amendment of the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011. Amending section 22 of the act will allow a deputy member of the Education Standards Board to fill a vacancy in the office of the member for whom they are deputy. Currently, if a vacancy exists before the current term of the appointment ends, the deputy member cannot act in the place of the member. Therefore, this change will allow for a more efficient and effective board. The Malinauskas Labor government strongly supports this board. It is responsible for the regulation of early childhood services in schools, and is key to ensuring an education system of the highest quality.

Since coming into government, the Malinauskas Labor government has also appointed Alana Girvin, who has extensive leadership experience and established the education department's Incident Management Directorate to respond to critical incidents. We have also provided the Education Standards Board with additional funding of more than \$2 million across two financial years to offset reductions in commonwealth funding. This change is a step by our government to provide the Education Standards Board with the support they need.

A final act within these three amendments is the amendment of the History Trust of South Australia Act. We have the unique benefit of having the History Trust as an agency of the South Australian government. The History Trust museums include the Migration Museum in the CBD, the National Motor Museum in Birdwood, the South Australian Maritime Museum in Port Adelaide, and The Centre of Democracy in the CBD. In addition to their physical spaces, the History Trust often hosts events at other sites, in particular at university campuses. The History Trust of South Australia Act sets out its functions, which include:

- carrying out and promoting research relevant to the history of SA;
- the accumulation and care for objects of historical interest;
- disseminating or encouraging the dissemination of information relating to the history of SA; and
- managing and administering museums and other premises placed under the care, control and management of the trust.

The proposed amendment is to change section 2 of the act to broaden the definition of a premises to include premises used by the trust to conduct activities and events. This is an important change for the History Trust. It will allow them to have the power to deal with any inappropriate behaviour that might occur at events. It also helps them to manage parking and bringing animals to events, and assists them with preventing the reproduction of their exhibits.

The act's regulations provide a range of penalties for breach of behaviour, and this change will extend those penalties to temporary exhibits and events. This is important to protect exhibitions and our history, and make sure more South Australians can access the fantastic activities of the History Trust. With those comments, I commend the bill to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (12:32): I rise to speak on the Statues Amendment (Education, Training and Skills Portfolio) Bill. I am proud to speak on this bill, because there are few things more important than ensuring our children receive a quality education, whether that be at preschool, school, TAFE or university. We know that across the world, this is not an opportunity that is available to all children and young people, especially girls. UNESCO informs us that two-thirds of the illiterate adults in the world are women.

On this point, I would like to acknowledge the work of one of my own constituents, Julia Gillard AC, whose work has been to improve educational opportunities for women on the global stage, including serving as Commissioner at the International Commission for Global Education Opportunity and as patron of the campaign for female education.

Our government values the importance of education and our educators, and has acted swiftly but responsibly since we have come to government to improve public education in South Australia. This bill is no different. We all know that you cannot benefit from quality education if you cannot attend. This bill proposes to amend section 75(2a) of the Education and Children's Services Act 2019. The aim is to provide clarity that a head of an approved learning program has an obligation, along with principals, to notify the education department's chief executive of persistent non-attendance or non-participation.

Our students in South Australia are lucky to have the opportunity to participate in learning beyond the school classroom at TAFE or at university; however, this is not an opportunity for students to not attend. All students must respect this opportunity.

I support this amendment and highlight that tackling truancy is an important priority of the Malinauskas Labor government. We know how important it is that children and young people go to school. Poor attendance is related quite often to poor student outcomes, especially once patterns of non-attendance are established. We want every child to be going to school regularly.

Since coming to government we have started important work to reduce non-attendance, including funding 100 full-time equivalent mental health and learning support staff to support students and prevent them from missing school due to reasons such as mental health, one of the biggest barriers for children attending school, as well as increasing the number of staff working for the Social Work Duty Line, which assists schools to address wellbeing and attendance issues.

We are also providing access to an autism inclusion teacher in every public primary school to make schools more inclusive and welcoming places where students feel safe to attend. Every student has the right to feel safe and supported in their school environment, which is why our government is banning mobile phones in schools to reduce the incidence of bullying and screen addiction in school time. We know that we have already seen positive results from that change in the schools that have so early adopted this policy change, with students becoming more engaged with each other.

I thank the education department for their work with families who engage in persistent truancy and are not valuing their children's education. Pleasingly, the threat of prosecution has seen a number of families now sending their children to school after prolonged periods. However, it should not get to this stage, and as a community I do remind everyone that we have a responsibility, if we believe children are being denied an education, to report it.

The next amendment will not affect most South Australians but is an example of our government being progressive. Many members would be aware that many international students attend our TAFE and universities but may not know that around 1,500 international students attend our public preschools and schools.

This bill proposes to amend section 130 of the Education and Children's Services Act 2019 to provide the chief executive of the education department with the discretion to waive, reduce or refund a charge, allow it to be paid in instalments or require a person to give security of payment of a charge under section 130.

This change relates to full fee paying overseas students, students enrolled in schools who are not residents in the state and children enrolled in schools who are dependants of a person who is the subject of a visa of a kind prescribed by the regulations. This change will move from it being the principal with the power to the department. The change reflects that practical administration lies with the education department so it makes sense to align the legislation with this practice.

In recent times, our compassionate government has waived the school fees of Afghan evacuees and Ukrainian refugees to support these families in their time of need, demonstrating our humanity and why South Australia is such a good place to reside.

If we are going to have quality education, we do need standards. Therefore, the Malinauskas Labor government strongly supports the Education Standards Board, which is responsible for the regulation of early childhood services and schools and is key to ensuring an education system of the highest quality.

This bill supports a more efficient and effective board by amending section 22 of the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011 to allow a deputy member of the Education Standards Board to fill a vacancy in the office of the member for whom they are a deputy. Currently, if a vacancy falls before the current term of the appointment ends, the deputy member cannot act in the place of the member. This is a sensible change that I fully endorse.

If we do not know where we have come from, we cannot fully embrace the future, so it is important that we continue our support for the History Trust of South Australia, an agency of this government. The History Trust plays a vital role in South Australia, and part of that role is managing the important Migration Museum, one of my daughter's favourites as a child; the National Motor Museum, one of my brother's favourites; the South Australian Maritime Museum, one of my son's favourites as a child; as well as The Centre of Democracy. If members have not visited for a while, I would encourage them to go out and visit these museums.

The proposed amendment in this bill will change section 2 to broaden the definition of a premises to include premises used by the trust to conduct activities and events. This is an important change for the History Trust, for them to have the power to deal with any inappropriate behaviour and manage parking and bringing animals to events. It also helps with preventing the reproduction of exhibits. These changes are important so the History Trust can ensure the safety of everyone at their events and, additionally, protect exhibitions and our history. I commend this bill to the house.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:40): I rise too to support the Statutes Amendment (Education, Training and Skills Portfolio) Bill, and in doing so I would just like to make a few comments in relation to the amendment of the Education and Children's Services Act 2019. The bill proposes to amend section 75(2a) to oblige heads of approved learning programs, along with principals, to notify the education department's chief executive of persistent non-attendance or non-participation in the educational institution. Included in this, of course, is TAFE SA and our universities being required to report non-attendance or non-participation.

This strengthens the act, to ensure that any student not attending is reported to the department. It can sound a bit heavy-handed, but tackling truancy is an important priority of the Malinauskas Labor government. We know how important it is that children and young people go to school. From my former role as a schoolteacher, I can tell you that for children who regularly miss school the outcome is not good. Poor attendance has been related to poor student outcomes, especially once patterns of non-attendance are established. Every child should be encouraged to attend, and the expectation would be that parents encourage their children to attend and do whatever they can to ensure that their children attend school on a regular basis.

What I particularly like about this amendment is that it will put a focus on the child or student who is not attending, and that means that the opportunity may be there to check in on the student, to see how they are travelling, to see what the issues are in relation to their non-attendance. I am talking specifically here really about those more senior students and students at TAFE and universities, because very often their non-attendance is related to issues that the teaching staff may have no idea even exist.

Sometimes those issues are beyond their control. They can be related to the environment in which they are living, long-term sickness in the family, relationship issues or even, for some of those students, not being able to reside in a permanent home and having to couch surf, for reasons that are outside their control. Doing this actually draws attention, draws the focus onto that student, through the head of that educational institution. It also means their teachers have to take note that there is regular inattendance, and hopefully some of those issues will be able to be resolved, and that will deal in itself with the problem.

In our first year of government, there are a number of things in relation to education and work to reduce non-attendance that we are very proud to be able to stand here and report on, including:

- the funding of 100 full-time equivalent mental health and learning support staff;
- increasing the number of staff working for the Social Work Duty Line by three full-time equivalents. This line assists schools to address wellbeing and attendance issues;
- supporting a new partnership with the Kornar Winmil Yunti to deliver a new program of intensive support for Aboriginal families with children who are not attending schools; and
- providing access to an autism inclusion teacher in every public primary school to make schools more inclusive and welcoming places where students feel safe to attend.

A really important one, too, is the voluntary engagement of independent facilitated meetings between family members, schools, relevant departmental staff and other professionals, because these conferences enable the issues to be talked about and very often the opportunity for solutions to the non-attendance to be put forward.

Another amendment to this bill that I would like to speak to briefly is the amendment to section 130, to provide the chief executive of the Department for Education with discretion to waive, reduce or refund a charge, allow it to be paid by instalments or require a person to give security for payment of a charge under section 130. Importantly, this relates to full fee paying overseas students, students who are not residents in the state enrolled in schools and children enrolled in schools who are dependents of a person who is the subject of a visa.

That is one of the issues I would like to speak briefly about. In my electorate I have had many students who live on these visas and they have to pay a significant amount to our education department schools and institutions for them to attend. I had a young boy whose mother became terminally ill, so she had to give up work, and the father was working to try to keep the family surviving. They had medical expenses as well as everyday living expenses. Of huge concern to the family was the fact that this young boy went to one of our public schools and the fee for the family was out of their reach. They were not able to pay that fee.

After representation and advocacy, over quite a significant period of time—a few months—that was able to be waived for that period. Sadly, his mum passed, but that fee was waived, and that took a huge burden off that family, who had been living in South Australia, working in South Australia and contributing to our community in such a positive way. When that fee was waived for a certain period of time, it was a great relief to the family and they could focus on things that were important to them. A number of really positive amendments are included in the bill before us, and I am very pleased to stand today and support them.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (12:47): I rise to support this bill. Ensuring our children have all the opportunities they can to start and continue their education is very important to me. As a parent who raised their child on their own, I believe this bill will work to not only ensure that parents are held accountable for making sure their children attend school regularly, but I believe it will also assist parents who do advocate for schooling, but who sometimes are dealing with strong-willed children, to have that next level of authority. What do I mean by that?

Some students are dealing with a lot as they head to school. It is overwhelming, but they are also sometimes victims of bullying, are dealing with confidence issues and can feel like the work is overwhelming, especially if they have learning difficulties. They may feel that they cannot cope, and that going to school makes them physically sick.

Our government is moving to put things in place to support these students, with mental health and learning support, increased numbers of staff working for the social work duty staff, assisting schools with wellbeing and attendance issues and the access to autism inclusion teachers in every primary school. I believe supporting students from within and identifying issues early will help support students, giving them a welcoming experience at school. Also, addressing bullying early and taking into consideration students' circumstances are incredibly important.

The bill proposes to amend section 75(2a) to provide clarity that a head of an approved learning program has an obligation, along with principals, to notify the education department CE of persistent non-attendance or non-participation. I believe that there are times when students' non-attendance is not taken seriously, and when parents reach out for help it is not always provided. This

may be controversial, but sometimes the threat of authorities is what is required. Explaining to children that they actually have to go to school or parents can be held accountable needs to be followed up with actual action. Ensuring that principals and heads of learning programs have to notify the department puts into place that level of accountability.

This also works in reverse. There are some parents who, through their own needs and wants or neglect, keep children at home. Whether to keep them company or for other reasons not known to me, they are detrimental to their child's future and, again, this new obligation will mean that the department is engaged earlier to assist the student.

Since coming to government, we have also introduced education family conferences. These are an evidence-based engagement approach, which provide voluntary, independently facilitated meetings between family members, schools and relevant departmental staff and other professionals. The conference process offers a strengths-based approach, providing families with the opportunity to be actively involved in deciding on and actioning arrangements to improve the attendance of their child at school.

It can be the case that students are living between two family units, and having these conferences will allow all family members to be involved, as well as the school, other professionals who can offer advice and further support, and departmental staff to ensure agreements are maintained. We are taking non-attendance seriously by taking action against parents who are deliberately preventing their children from going to school.

There will be no hesitation to use prosecution as a tool where a child has been prevented from going to school. Sadly, it is this level of enforcement, or the threat of it, that is required to ensure that parents and students take attending school seriously. As mentioned before, the battle to raise a child is real. In some cases, getting them to school can cause a great deal of stress and emotional collapse. This provides that next level of authority and I believe it will help parents and students.

The bill also proposes an amendment to section 130, to provide the chief executive of the education department with the discretion to waive, reduce or refund a charge, allow it to be paid by instalments or require a person to give security for payment of a charge under section 130. This change relates to full fee paying overseas students, students enrolled at schools who are not residents in the state, and children enrolled in schools who are dependents of a person who is the subject of a visa of a kind prescribed by the regulations. This change can be an incentive to encourage parents who may be working here on visas to send their children to public schools. This is especially encouraging for our regional areas.

Recently, our government waived school fees for Afghan evacuees and Ukraine refugees to support these families in their time of need. They arrive in our communities with almost nothing and we believe the ability to attend school no matter what helps to provide a stable environment, an opportunity to engage with other children their age and, for a time, to just be a kid. It is this section of the act that allows these fees to be waived.

We are also seeking to amend the Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011. Simply, the bill proposes to amend section 22, to allow a deputy member of the Education Standards Board to fill a vacancy in the office of the member for whom they are a deputy. This allows for a more efficient and effective board. Our government strongly supports this board and since coming to government, we have appointed Alana Girvin as the new presiding member of the board. Ms Girvin has a lot of experience and, along with additional funding, we look forward to great outcomes.

This bill also seeks to amend the History Trust of South Australia Act. The History Trust is an agency of South Australian government and does incredible work preserving and celebrating history. We have all been to the Migration Museum, the National Motor Museum in Birdwood, The Centre of Democracy in the CBD, and, my favourite, the Maritime Museum. These places provide us all—especially our children—with a link to the past, an opportunity to learn through seeing, hearing and touching history. I know that as a parent I visited the Maritime Museum many times with my son, who always enjoyed the displays and exhibitions they have there.

But the History Trust also works outside of these establishments. They often host events celebrating history, and this amendment seeks to support them in doing just that. I know in my electorate we will be having a number of history week events put on by Blackwood Action Group. Last year, I attended one of these events, which took participants on a bus tour of the Belair National Park, learning about its history, both more recently, as it is home to the Old Government House, but also its greater history and its use by both the Kurna and Peramangk people as a key trading area. I have lived nearby that park for nearly my whole life and I thought I knew a lot about it, but it was the case that I did not really know much at all. I thank Blackwood Action Group for hosting it, and Peter Raine for his incredible knowledge, as he drove us around the park.

The Blackwood Action Group also hosted a Belair train line trip, hopping off at various stations to speak about the history of the suburbs at which it stops. I am looking forward to attending this one this year, as our area has a history that you would not even believe. As I learn more about it, I am really touched by how we are preserving it.

History is important, and this change will give the History Trust the power to deal with any inappropriate behaviour at any of their events. Just to be clear, there were none at Belair National Park when we were there. It also helps them to manage parking, bringing animals to events and preventing the reproduction of exhibits. The act's regulations provide a range of penalties for breach of behaviour. This change will extend those penalties to include temporary exhibitions and events. It is important to protect exhibitions, and our history, and to make sure more South Australians can access the fantastic activities of the History Trust.

Ensuring that our young people have access to school, that parents have support to encourage attendance, supporting international students appropriately and resourcing the Education Standards Board, and ensuring it can be efficient and effective, are all important outcomes of these amendments. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (12:55): I rise to thank those other members of this place who have made contributions to this important bill. I start by thanking the shadow minister for education, the member for Morialta, for his generous words, but also for indicating the support of those opposite for the carriage of this bill. In addition, I thank the members for King, Elder, Adelaide, Torrens, Gibson and Waite, all of whom I think have spoken very passionately and earnestly around why these changes are important.

Even though this is a portfolio bill, which is traditionally used to clean up a few issues that have arisen from previous iterations of legislation, I think that should not in any way be taken as belittling the importance of the changes that we are making here. Perhaps I could point most specifically, in the context of this bill, to the changes we are making around the reporting of truancy. As the member for Morialta said—and I was really proud to hear the members on this side speak with great sincerity around why tackling absenteeism and truancy is so important—we do have a lot more work to do. It is not a problem that is specific or unique to South Australia.

The pandemic served to perhaps speed up the disengagement of many students from our education system—whether public, independent or Catholic—who may have been on the precipice, if I could put it that way, of disengaging and not going to school anymore. Those three years of interrupted learning and school right across the world probably resulted in some of those young people choosing to disengage a bit earlier and making it harder for all those staff at schools—whether they were classroom teachers, SSOs, principals, year level coordinators, administrative staff or governing council, all of whom collectively do a lot of work to try to make sure that their individual school caters for all students—to do what was necessary to re-engage those kids.

It is really a case of needing to have all hands on deck in terms of us doing absolutely everything we can do, to use a bit of carrot and stick where it is appropriate. There has been some discussion in this place this morning around prosecution, which is a tool in the toolkit of a government and the minister, to take action against those parents who might be deliberately standing in the way of their child attending school.

I want to reiterate that it is in extreme cases only. I have foreshadowed that I am prepared to use it, and we are investigating a number of cases, but we are only talking about the really pointy end here, when it is a case of parents actually deliberately seeking to prevent their kids from going

to school. In other cases, we are using all those positive measures around engaging with families and going to their houses. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CASUAL VACANCIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—

Report 1 of 2023—Update to the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2022
[Ordered to be published]

Report 2 of 2023—Consolidated Financial Report Review [Ordered to be
published]

Independent Commission Against Corruption—Evaluation of the Practices, Policies and
Procedures of TAFE SA

By the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Annual Business Plans 2023-24—

Green Adelaide

Landscape Boards—

Hills and Fleurieu

Northern and Yorke

South Australian Arid Lands

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Local Council By-Laws—

District Council of Karoonda East Murray—No. 7—

Local Government Land (Public Facilities)

Ministerial Statement

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I inform the house that I have announced that an independent review will be conducted into the Women's and Children's Health Network Cochlear Implant Program. I have asked the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing, Dr Robyn Lawrence, to commission an interstate and independent expert to undertake the review. She has already made contact with interstate colleagues to identify the best available independent expertise.

It is clear that issues in audiological mapping over at least the past five years have led to some families having understandable concerns about the impact on their children. I am sure that all members would share with me our concerns and deepest sympathies for the children and the families who have been impacted. Over many years, some children did not receive the appropriate care that they needed, and I want to acknowledge the deep distress and hurt that this has caused.

Unfortunately, it has emerged that this issue of incorrect audiological mapping is a longstanding one, dating back at least five years. Last year, the Women's and Children's Health Network announced that they were rapidly identifying the full extent of patients affected, communicating openly with families involved in the program and implementing safeguards to ensure these issues would not continue.

WCHN took action to investigate families' concerns and notified the families of all 117 children in the program that an independent review was taking place. This review was also announced, and I have spoken about it in the parliament.

WCHN has now identified approximately 30 children who have not had their maps correctly adjusted over the course of at least five years and have taken steps to adjust those maps. WCHN is currently in the process of procuring independent clinical experts from a tertiary hospital interstate to review these individual children's cases. This is in addition to the independent review of the program.

The independent review of the program will be focused on how these mapping issues were enabled to occur over many years, and what needs to be put in place to ensure that other children can be assured of appropriate services in the future.

I have asked that all impacted families have the opportunity to contribute to this review, ensuring that their experiences and suggestions shape the reviewers' conclusions. The findings of this review will be made public and, unlike those opposite, we will not be politicising this issue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert is warned—before question time. Minister.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —as has occurred over the past five years, and we will be focused on putting safeguards in place to ensure that this issue does not happen again.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is also warned.

HOGAN, MS M.

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) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: It is with incredibly deep sadness that I rise to speak about the loss of Michelle Hogan, a much loved and highly regarded woman who has made enormous contributions to the labour movement, to women and community.

Over four decades, Michelle worked tirelessly and with compassion and wisdom to advance workers' rights, to achieve gender equality, to ensure respect, fairness and dignity for women and to ensure community organisations were supported to effectively work with and for people, and particularly those most vulnerable, in ways that made a difference in their lives.

In all that she did, Michelle relentlessly sought to empower and encourage other women. She was an extraordinary Chair of the Working Women's Centre and a steadfast and long-term supporter of the Anna Stewart Memorial Project, which seeks to empower and support women in the union movement.

Her work as SA Union's Assistant Secretary two decades ago was innovative and transformative and always focused on including people and amplifying the voices of others, particularly those most vulnerable.

Michelle served as a Port Adelaide Enfield councillor and contributed to community life in a range of different ways both here and overseas, including through her steadfast commitment to APHEDA Union Aid Abroad.

Michelle was renowned and so loved for her wisdom and empathy and her generous mentoring of other women. I and others, including the member for Gibson and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos MLC, have benefited so much from her kindness and care. She was tireless in campaigning for fairness, peace and women's rights, and it was an honour for many of us to campaign alongside her.

A kind friend to many, a passionate and compassionate advocate and an outstanding leader, Michelle will be deeply missed by all who knew her. Her willingness to support and empower others will continue to inspire us and future generations.

Vale Michelle Hogan. May you rest in peace. We offer our love and condolences to her partner, Rob, all of her family and the many, many others who loved her.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (14:08): I bring up the 26th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled South Australia Police APY Police Post Construction.

Report received and ordered to published.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I recognise the presence in the gallery of leaders from Prince Alfred College who, I understand, are here as guests of the member for MacKillop. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

AUKUS SUBMARINES

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Minister for Defence and Space Industries. When will construction commence at Osborne of the first Australian nuclear submarine? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Last week, the Minister for Foreign Affairs said, 'We will look at around the early 2030s of being able to have that design and construction in Adelaide.'

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:10): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question because it is on a subject that is fundamentally important to the interests of our state and its people. The federal government has made it clear on more than one occasion, particularly the Deputy Prime Minister, who is also the Minister for Defence, Richard Marles, that the construction on the new SSN-AUKUS submarine, the first of Osborne, will start at the end of this decade, most likely in 2029. The term that the defence minister has used, I think, in the public realm is that that is when we expect steel to be cut on the first of the SSN-AUKUS submarines.

It is important for South Australians to know, however, that the very first of the SSN-AUKUS submarines will be produced in Barrow in the United Kingdom, which is actually in our interests as a state and as a nation. The fact that the British will produce the first of type of the SSN-AUKUS means that many of the problems, challenges and risks that we know are associated with the first of type will be worn by the British. Then we can learn from all of that and then seek to apply that knowledge in the construction of the first of the SSN-AUKUS submarines here in South Australia.

For a little bit more detail: while construction of that submarine is due to commence at the end of this decade, it will largely take throughout the 2030s for that to be completed. That first of the Adelaide-built SSN-AUKUS submarines needs to be available to the Navy by 2042.

That seems like a really long time. I think it's reasonable for any person to ask themselves why on earth it would take 12 years for a submarine to start construction and then be completed. But that is largely the experience when it comes to nuclear submarines, particularly first of type. I understand that for the first of the Astute class submarines produced in Barrow, which entered into the service of the Royal Navy some years ago, it essentially took a decade as well.

Given that the British have a lot more experience in building nuclear submarines in comparison to us here in Adelaide, that time line of essentially more than a decade to produce it, or approximately a decade to produce it, is actually somewhat ambitious. We have to get to work quickly. Of course, the federal government announced last week they aren't wasting any time down at Osborne, with \$2 billion being allocated across the next four years for investment in infrastructure down at Osborne. That will be all about gearing up the land itself to be in a position to start to accommodate the building of the physical facilities that will be required to build the submarines, which will be large.

Having seen firsthand the physical size and enormity of the buildings that are required to build the nuclear submarines, the size of the construction activity down at Osborne could not possibly be overstated. The submarine construction yards at Osborne for the nuclear submarines will be three times larger—three times larger—than what was the case for the Naval French submarines. So, there is a lot to do between now and the end of the decade when we expect the construction of the first submarine to start here in Adelaide as per the member's question.

AUKUS SUBMARINES

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received a briefing on any AUKUS pathway that does not deliver the first Australian-built submarine in 2042? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: In recent days, the Premier has said that he was alarmed 'about just how ambitious our time line is to achieve this national endeavour'.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:14): The short answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question is no. All the briefings that I have received from the commonwealth have made it clear that the commonwealth is committed to building nuclear submarines in Adelaide, the first of which is to be available to the Royal Australian Navy by the beginning of the 2040s. But I do absolutely concede and publicly acknowledge—and will continue to do so—that the task before us to realise that time line is a big one and it will require a great degree of ambition on behalf of not just the federal government but, indeed, the state government too.

I can't again overstate the size and the complexity of this national endeavour. The British and the US have over 60 years' experience that has culminated in them being in the position where they are today—building nuclear submarines where their own time lines are not currently being met. The British are behind in the provision of both the Astute class and the Dreadnought class of submarines that are currently under construction in Barrow and, of course, the US Navy are behind in construction of the Virginia class submarines at both the Huntington Ingalls and the Electric Boat sites.

Even with 60 years of experience building nuclear submarines, they are behind their own targets, so I think it's a plain statement of truth to acknowledge that our targets of trying to replicate what they do in the UK and in the US in the space of a decade is ambitious by nature and that will present challenges. But I tell you what: there's one thing I know, and that is that we are capable of meeting those ambitions. We are capable of delivering on the commonwealth's ask, because every time South Australians have been asked to step up to the plate when it comes to our naval shipbuilding program or any other substantial industrial activity of our past, provided we have had the assurance of ongoing commitment and genuine flowing of dollars to the South Australian government and the South Australian people, then we have met our targets.

We are capable of doing this, but it is going to require long-term effort and it is going to require ongoing bipartisanship, which I know exists in this place, to commit ourselves to this effort. The honest truth is: of course this project is going to outlast the life of this government, but it will

outlast the life of the next one too, and the one after that, and the one after that, and the one after that. This is a 100-year project. As ambitious and as challenging as we know the task is, the only thing we can take comfort in is the fact that we now have started and we will continue the journey and we will do whatever it takes to make sure that the Royal Australian Navy is provided with the highest quality equipment that we are capable of building here in South Australia.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Defence and Space Industries. Can the minister assure the house that the life-of-type extension for all six Collins class submarines will go ahead? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: Last week, the federal defence minister said in response to that question that, 'the honest answer to that question is that will give future governments options in terms of precise mix of the submarine fleet.'

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) (14:18): Yes, we have been assured that the plan is for the life-of-type extension for all of the Collins class submarines. That is very important, not only for the extension of the use of those submarines which, of course, is very important for the defence of our nation but it is also important as part of preparing for the construction of the SSN-AUKUS. What we need are people who not only have a high degree of skill but also have experience.

The combination of the full cycle docking and then the life-of-type extension work is absolutely important to make sure that we have a flow of people who are competent and capable—and demonstrably so—to be able to do work on the submarines. The commonwealth government understands that well, and has said that the plan for the LOTE will be for all of the submarines to go through that.

TECHNICAL COLLEGES

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. How many places will the government reserve in its five technical colleges for school-based apprenticeships in our defence industries, and will the government continue to offer flexible industry pathways to defence careers in our public schools?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:19): I thank the member for Morialta for the question. I am always pleased to be on my feet in this place talking about this government's election commitment to build five technical colleges in South Australia and, of course, to remind members of this place that they will be built in Port Augusta, Mount Gambier the Tonsley Innovation Precinct and The Heights School in the north-eastern suburbs, and that the first, which will be opened at the start of 2024, so not long away now, will be at Findon.

So far, we have announced the streams or the specialisations for just one of those technical colleges and that is Findon, of course, because it will be the first to come online in 2024. They will all be online and operational by the start of the 2026 school year. In terms of the Findon one and its application and relevance to the issue of this enormous opportunity that South Australia has with AUKUS, I am pleased to inform the house that one of the three streams we are offering there is advanced manufacturing.

That will include pathways in areas like engineering, and then underneath some of those broader pathways specifics around things like metal fabrication and welding. It will be coming right down to some of those individual, precise kinds of skills that the state is going to need if we are to deliver on this incredible opportunity.

The member for Morialta asks about a specific number of apprenticeships. I don't have a figure for him on that, but I can proudly tell the house about one of the most innovative things that we have done, not just in revisiting, I guess, the whole notion of technical colleges, which was

something that was a mainstay of the education system nationally for decades and then disappeared—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: In the olden days.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The member for Unley is not a fan of them. In fact, he spoke recently in this place about why we shouldn't be investing in bricks and mortar, so it is disappointing we don't have the bipartisan support for our technical colleges there, especially given now this announcement around AUKUS—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —and how important these technical qualities are going to be. I am very disappointed, but not surprised, of course. We have struck an agreement with BAE, such an important player in the defence space and in the South Australian economy particularly, so that those students who go into the technical college at Findon—and they will enter from year 10, so years 10, 11 and 12—and who go into the advanced manufacturing stream and come out with some of these skills and qualifications that I have just mentioned will then have the opportunity to take an apprenticeship with BAE.

We hope that that is not—in fact it won't be—the last partnership of this type that we announce with our technical colleges. I don't even think it will be the last partnership that we announce at the Findon Technical College, but it is an incredibly important one. What it provides is not just certainty for the young people from the early high school years to be able to see what their pathway is, in terms of going to year 9 and then transitioning across in year 10 to the technical college, continuing to do their SACE but also picking up qualifications in one of the streams, but then knowing that at the end of it they will have an apprenticeship with one of these big employers in an area of such importance to our economy, like BAE.

It provides security and certainty to the young people and their families, but it also provides that much-needed security and certainty to those players like BAE who are going to have such a huge part in this commitment. What we know is that the skills part of this equation and how we deliver that is perhaps the most complex part, so we need to be making sure that we have a continuous pipeline of the skilled people to take those positions.

YORKE PENINSULA HEALTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:23): I have a question for the Minister for Health. Will the minister update the house on whether health advisory councils have a role to play in the future? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: The Yorke Peninsula HAC is down to three members and has been steadily losing quite a significant amount of corporate knowledge with recent resignations and there are genuine fears about its ability to attract new members. Will the government enter into a campaign to recruit members for the health advisory council?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): Thank you very much to the member for Narungga. I thank him for this important question. I did have the opportunity when we were at country cabinet in the member for Narungga's electorate to meet with the local health advisory council covering the southern portion of the Yorke Peninsula. As the member said, it has seen a reduction in the number of people who are on that health advisory council—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned a second time.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Ask a question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think that this is an important question and the member for Narungga and his constituents deserve an answer. We have seen a number of very longstanding members of that health advisory council decide to step away after very long periods of time. The member for Narungga has raised with me whether we can work together to promote being part of that health advisory council, and I am very happy to commit that we will do that. I have really spoken to the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network to do that because I do think that health advisory councils are important. They are an important part of the legislation; they are an important part of making sure that local communities are represented in the health system.

We did see various discussions at points of time over the past five years as to whether they might be abolished or not. There had been discussions that bringing in the local health network boards would not mean that we need health advisory councils at all. I have been consistent that I think that we still need those health advisory councils. They still have a very important role to play, and I look forward to working with the member for Narungga and the local health network to promote people being part of that health advisory council.

The other element, which I think is important to this, is that we enable the health advisory councils to meet, to share their learnings, to share their experiences and ultimately improve their advocacy on behalf of their local communities. For a number of years, there used to be a health advisory council meeting that would happen once a year where all the advisory councils would be able to come together and share their experience. That was put on hold, I believe, for a couple of years.

It has now restarted in the past couple of years, which is excellent because we need the ability for that network of health advisory councils to meet and ultimately for them all to grow and strengthen their ability to advocate to state government. I thank the member for his question and look forward to working with him to promote his local health advisory councils and those councils right across the state.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I recognise the presence in the gallery of Marlee Glatter, who is a guest of the member for Davenport. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier still committed to fixing ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 20 February 2022, the Premier said, and I quote, 'Labor is determined to do what is required to fix ramping.' Labor's pre-election policy promised Labor will fix the ramping crisis. Thousands of election posters promised Labor will fix the ramping crisis. Since then, South Australians have seen the worst 10 months of ramping on record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned for a third time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:27): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question because it is as important a subject as his earlier questions with respect to AUKUS. Of course, this government is committed to fixing the ramping crisis. On repeated occasions throughout the election campaign to which the Leader of the Opposition refers, I made it abundantly clear—on repeated occasions—on the records—

Mr Pederick: That you would fix ramping.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —in media interviews, in leaders' debate, every time I was asked, that fixing the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —ramping crisis actually means getting ambulances rolling up on time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: That's right.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens, order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The hyperventilation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey will cease his interjections and the member for Hammond will confine himself to traditional dance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The hyperventilation of those opposite, particularly the member for Morialta—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is striking because it speaks to an incapacity to actually discern the facts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Frome!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The member for Morialta is right: a number of election corflutes that we had up made it clear that Labor was committed to fixing the ramping crisis. People repeatedly asked—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —including journalists, what does that mean; what does fixing the ramping crisis mean?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated. The member for Hartley will depart under 137A for the remainder of question time. The member for Chaffey is warned for a final time and the member for Frome is warned for the first time. The member for Morialta is reminded that he is on two warnings. The member for Badcoe, I note your interjections.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Premier.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The member for Morialta is right: the election poster said 'fixing the ramping crisis'. When we were asked, 'What does that mean?', we made it clear that fixing the ramping crisis means—

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

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —reducing the level of ramping so as to see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —ambulances rolling up on time. The Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond and the member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —asks about—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The Leader of the Opposition asks about February, and I can report. I asked my team in anticipation of these questions—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —they were entirely predictable—'Can we please cite some examples of when we made that clear during the campaign?' So in February, the month to which the Leader of the Opposition refers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —I was asked clearly, and I stated, 'What I'm committed to is ending ramping to the extent that we get ambulances rolling up on time.' On 28 February—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —speaking to David Bevan on ABC Radio Adelaide, I said, 'What I'm committing to your listeners, but indeed all South Australians, is that by the end of our first term we would significantly reduce ramping to end the ramping crisis to the extent that is now actually resulting in ambulances not rolling up on time.' In the leaders' debate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —on 10 March—

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —I made it clear that 'we want to reduce ramping to the extent that it sees ambulances starting to roll up on time, and that this is the critical point that people need to understand'. And here's a good one: on 17 March—

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned for a final time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —days before the election—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —on ABC's AM program, I said in black and white, it's all there—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —'our commitment is to fix the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The member for Morialta: again, I'm not complaining; I hope he keeps his breath.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned for a final time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: 'Our commitment is to fix the ramping crisis to get ourselves back in a position where the ambulances are rolling up on time again, and we think we can achieve that by the end of our first term if we are given the privilege on Saturday.' Then on 18 March, a day later, the Liberal Party—I'm happy to go on, sir.

The SPEAKER: The Premier may continue on indulgence for 15 seconds, given the number of interjections. The Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The Liberal Party, having background journalists on the back of that ABC AM program, thought they had struck a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is warned for a final time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —major revelation, to the extent that SALibMedia tweeted the very fact about what the commitment is they now complain about. It is quite extraordinary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is warned for a final time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is called to order, the member for West Torrens is called to order and the member for Badcoe is called to order.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Premier. When will the government fix ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 16 March 2022, Ambulance Employees Association Secretary, Leah Watkins, told the ABC that ramping could improve quickly after the election, including that a new government could, and I quote, 'start having an immediate effect within one or two months'.

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:33): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, please be seated. Order! The volume of interjections to my left is considerable. There are also some interjections to my right. The member for Hammond will leave under 137A for the remainder of question time. The member for Chaffey will follow him, and very shortly after, if there are continued interjections, will be the member for Morialta.

The honourable member for Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Mr Speaker, have I got good news for the Leader of the Opposition because here we are, 12 months into a brand-new Labor government, and we have already substantially improved ambulance response times—already substantially improved them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I might remind the Leader of the Opposition and all those opposite, who seem to have their head in the sand on this issue—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —just like they did this time 12 months ago that, in January last year, for priority 2 cases we saw ambulance response times at 36 per cent. Well, I am pleased to report that in February this year we have taken it from 36 per cent to 53 per cent. We have got a long way to go—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —but the trajectory is the right one. On that critical measure of addressing ambulance response times to try to get it back to the levels—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that those butchered back at the beginning of 2018—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned for a final time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —we are seeing ambulance response times improve, and it's not just true for priority 2 cases but also priority 1 cases. So for the P1 cases—that is, the particularly acute life-threatening emergencies—in January last year, it was 47 per cent; and under the most recent figures in terms of February this year, it's now 63 per cent. Ambulance response times have improved very substantially in the space of 12 months.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: So here's what we know. The government changed and ambulance response times have improved. There are South Australians today who are calling 000 with ever-increasing degrees of confidence knowing that already after 12 months in office we have improved ambulance response times. Those opposite can spend all the time they like—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —traversing the transcripts, looking at old video footage—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —looking at the leaders' debates that occurred—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members to my left!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —throughout the course of the election campaign. I encourage them to do it because what they will see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is a consistent commitment on behalf of the South Australian Labor Party that we are committed to reducing ambulance ramping so that we can see ambulances rolling up on time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and that is already what we are proud to have delivered throughout the course of our first 12 months.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

AUKUS SUBMARINES

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:36): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house about his recent trip to the United Kingdom and the AUKUS agreement?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey can leave the chamber under 137A—he had sufficient warning—for the remainder of question time. The member for Badcoe can join him. And there was an interjection earlier, I think from the member for Newland, which I did hear, but the Premier obscured you and so good graces mean that you must remain.

The honourable members for Chaffey and Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:36): Can I thank the member for Newland for her question because I know the member for Newland is particularly passionate about young people within her electorate. The member for Newland can see the extraordinary amount of opportunity that exists amongst future generations of Newland constituents to have not just a better job but a job that is highly skilled in nature that brings a greater security and greater prosperity, but also a job that has an extraordinary amount of purpose associated with it.

If there was one prevailing emotional response that I experienced in respect of the AUKUS announcement was around seeing young people in the BAE academy in Barrow where there were literally hundreds upon hundreds of young people being trained with extraordinary skills to build nuclear submarines in Barrow, but the sense of purpose and pride they took in that study they were undertaking, and then vis-a-vis the work that they were committing their careers towards—it was genuine. You can't fabricate this stuff. You get a sense from young people about what it is they care about and what they are passionate and enthusiastic about, and this came through overwhelmingly throughout the visit to that academy.

But the one lesson that was being asked upon us to learn throughout their experience in the UK was that we must take a long-term view in terms of investing in education, training and skills to develop the workforce that is required to build the nuclear submarines—a truly national endeavour.

They have been on a journey in Barrow themselves. They saw throughout the course of the late nineties and the early-2000s underinvestment in naval shipbuilding in the UK that saw not quite their own valley of death but their equivalent of it and a hollowing out of the workforce and the skills that were required. And the consequence of that, for the better part of the last 20 years, has been an ongoing and sustained effort to turn that ship back around, so to speak, to try to rebuild that capability, which has had an extraordinary degree of expense associated with it.

So, at every level of government and industry and the Navy, it was being implored upon us first and foremost as Australians to make sure that the investment in naval shipbuilding is sustained and ongoing and produces a long pipeline of demand. That is something that I think is now acknowledged by the current federal government. Also, in the recent years of the former federal government, we now have a federal bipartisan position, which is to be applauded, that we need long-term sustainable investment in naval shipbuilding demand that will underpin the training that is required for the workforce of tomorrow.

The responsibility invested in us in this state government and our successors is to make sure that we take that long-term investment and translate it into investment in education, training and skills to put young people on a pathway to enjoy those jobs of tomorrow. We have a plan to do that. Everything from three-year-old preschool to what we are doing in technical colleges to what we are doing in TAFE and what we plan to achieve in terms of university amalgamation in no small way is orientated towards this endeavour, this most ambitious of enterprises.

We need a lot more young people—particularly young women, I might say—engaging in STEM-related subjects, becoming the engineers and the degree-qualified tradespeople of tomorrow so that we can honour our pledge of building nuclear submarines here in Adelaide and, most importantly for the member for Newland, her pledge to ensure that another generation of prosperity is enjoyed here in the state of South Australia.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is the government walking away from its election commitment to fix ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: *The Advertiser* reported today: 'The state government says it never committed to reducing ramping hours, despite its election pledge to fix the ramping crisis.'

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:41): As the Premier has already outlined, we are saying exactly the same thing now as we said before the election. Before the election, the Premier was asked repeatedly: what does 'fixing the ramping crisis' mean? Repeatedly, on radio and at press conferences, even at the press debate with all the media encircled and all the cameras there, he very clearly outlined that 'fixing the ramping crisis' means reducing ramping so that we can improve and get ambulance response times back to where they were in 2018, before the member for Dunstan was elected as the Premier.

What we saw was, over that time, ambulance response times getting worse and worse to become the worst in the nation, which was—

Mrs Hurn: Why have you just started talking about response times?

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on a final warning.

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas: We always have.

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is warned. Member for Schubert, you are on a final warning, and both you and the Premier are warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We have been very clear and said exactly the same thing then as we are saying now. I think the community understands that the risk of ramping is that it means that ambulances are not responding on time in the community. While we have seen some improvement—which is very welcome and I think to be applauded, the work that has gone into that improvement in terms of ambulance response times—there is a significant amount of work to do to get ramping down so we can get response times up.

That is what we are committed to do. It is not just one thing that needs to happen: it is hundreds of things that need to happen right across the system to make sure that people can get out of the emergency department and into the beds they need to get off the ramp, and ultimately the ambulances can get back out into the community to respond to those 000 cases. It is a plan that goes end to end right across the health system to do that, and we were very clear that it is going to take four years to be able to implement that plan. We have to build new hospital beds.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We have to build new infrastructure, and we have said it time and time again. Those opposite, when they were in government, criticised us at the time, and the Premier has referred to those tweets that were put out at the time saying that we should have been going further in our comments and commitments. We were very clear in terms of what our commitments were doing. It was about getting those ambulances out into the community so that they can respond to people in critical need on time. We had a situation where priority 2 ambulance response times—

Ms Pratt interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Frome!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Ambulance response times went from about 85 per cent back in 2018 for priority 2, lights-and-sirens cases—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —down to 36 per cent in January last year. It meant that one in three times that somebody called for a lights-and-sirens priority 2 case, the ambulance rocked up on time. We have that back up to over one in two, but there is still a long way to go to get back to that 85 per cent mark that we were at back in 2018. We are committed to doing it, and we have to reduce ramping to ensure that we can do that.

Our hospitals are still under significant pressure. We have opened up every hospital bed that we can in the system, but we need to build more, and we are building more, to make sure that there is the capacity to get people through the emergency department, to get those ambulances responding back out into the community.

DEFENCE INDUSTRIES

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:44): My question is the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier inform the house about the contribution of our higher education institutions to defence industry and workforce?

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) (14:45): Yes, it is a pleasure to answer this question because, as the Premier has outlined extensively in public and also in this chamber, the task and the opportunity before us are both considerable with the announcement of AUKUS.

We have the great pleasure in contemplating 5,000 ongoing jobs associated with building the submarines and around 4,000 in the construction leading up to that, but we know that we must prepare our workforce to be able to fully participate in that opportunity. To do so requires us to go

right through the education system as well as finding people who already have a degree of skill and experience.

The university end of that equation cannot be underestimated. The Premier just mentioned even the consideration of the amalgamation between two of the three universities has to be seen in the context of assisting us in lifting the quality of our education and the amount of research capability that is able to be invested by that institution in order to be able to prepare us to fully realise the opportunities of AUKUS not only in the direct jobs but also in the supply chain, which ought to be considerable.

The universities themselves, though, have of course been very activist in participating already in ways in which they can contribute to preparing young people to be skilled up. Flinders University has already entered into an agreement with the University of Manchester and the University of Rhode Island. Both institutions have been long teaching nuclear engineering degrees. That agreement will be the basis on which they will be able to start exploring ways in which they can offer that kind of qualification and also experience overseas in those universities for students.

The University of South Australia has recently received \$450,000 from the state government so that they are able to partner with the Ai Group and also with the defence industry to create a pilot for apprenticeship degrees in software engineering—that is, degrees in software engineering that enable people at the same time to both work and earn in the field. Therefore, in that sense, it is more akin to an apprenticeship but nonetheless achieving a degree. That is in order to accelerate the number of people we have who are qualified in software engineering, which will be a considerable demand. It is not just about welding and spanners, although there will be a lot of that kind of work; it is also in the cyber and IT world.

Adelaide University since, I think, April last year has had the Defence Trailblazer program, which is considerably funded by the federal government. It is a partnership with the University of New South Wales, with industry, with the federal Department of Education. That is about defence R&D and also provides industry with access to highly skilled talent at the PhD level as well as interns and undergraduates. So that is already contributing to our defence skilled workforce and will only do more.

But we know, if we are going to have university students interested in studying in these STEM areas, we are going to have to prepare further down the supply chain of young people and therefore the importance of the work that is being undertaken in the education department here. The minister has already outlined the contribution that technical colleges will make. We have just today announced scholarships for university students wishing to learn teaching—women in STEM so that we can encourage more young girls to take up STEM because they see that they have female teachers.

It is not irrelevant that we are undertaking the royal commission on how we are going to deliver three-year-old preschool, because we need to improve the standard of education all the way through if we are truly to realise the potential of this announcement.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. When was the minister first advised of issues with the Women's and Children's Hospital cochlear ear implant program? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: At least 30 children's cochlear implants were incorrectly programmed at the Women's and Children's Hospital causing potentially irreversible damage to the children involved. The opposition has been advised that the issue was raised with the Women's and Children's Hospital network in April 2022.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): As I have run through in my ministerial statement, there are concerns about this issue, which I reiterate. In terms of the specific question, I understand I was advised about this in August last year before a statement was put out on this subject in September last year making it clear that the Women's and Children's Hospital health network were going back and contacting all of those families involved and

undertaking a recheck of those audiology patients to make sure that the mapping had occurred as appropriate.

That statement was put out publicly in September last year, I understand. I believe it was reported in *The Advertiser* at the time and I believe the opposition also asked me, about the same time, about this issue as well. Importantly, the health network worked to make sure that they went back through the cases, undertook analysis of those cases that have occurred, and made sure they provided support and follow-up to the people to firstly assess whether there was an issue, secondly to assess how difficult the issue was and thirdly to provide that additional support.

Now, as I said in my ministerial statement, we are in a situation where at least 30 of those patients had an undermapped cochlear implant over the past five years, at least. I think that that necessitates us now going to an external review in terms of the running of this program and that's what we are putting in place.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is the minister aware of comments by Dr Sonja Latzel yesterday and can he offer a guarantee to the parliament that this error will never happen again? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: Speaking on ABC radio yesterday regarding the incorrect programming of cochlear implants at the Women's and Children's Hospital, Dr Sonja Latzel, who is the Director of Surgery at the Women's and Children's Hospital, was asked whether this would happen again and Dr Latzel replied unequivocally, 'It won't happen again.'

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:51): I certainly support Dr Sonja Latzel, who is a very respected ENT surgeon in South Australia. Even before I was the minister, she operated on my own son in fact. Many children in South Australia have received operations from Dr Latzel, and I have significant confidence in her as the Director of Surgery for the Women's and Children's Health Network in the work that she is doing. I think I speak on behalf of all the clinical team, all the doctors and allied health professionals who are committed to making sure this doesn't happen again.

I guess that's the other added benefit of the external review as well, to make sure that we find out how this was allowed to happen over so many years, what led to that and what were the safeguards not in place that caused that and not picked up, and to make sure that we improve those to make sure that this doesn't happen again.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Did the minister's Chief of Staff call Little Allied Health on Sunday questioning their participation in a planned press conference with the opposition?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): I'm not sure. I will have to take that on notice.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:53): Supplementary: can the minister assure the house that there will be no negative repercussions for Little Allied Health as a result of their involvement with the opposition's press conference?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): Yes.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What does the minister say to Dale and Lauren? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: Dale and Lauren Smedley's son, Logan, was one of the children whose cochlear implant was incorrectly programmed. Dale said, and I quote:

As a result of the hospital's failure to turn up Logan's cochlear implants...we believe he's severely delayed in his hearing and his speech and for our family, we just don't want to see any other family have to go through that, what we've had to go through.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): To that family and to all the other families involved in this case, as I said in my ministerial statement, I share, and I think all South Australians and all members of this house would share, the absolute despair I think all of us could imagine if our own children were going through such a situation. I think that's why it is incumbent on us to make sure that we identify how this was allowed to happen over so many years at the hospital and why it was not picked up over the course of at least the last five years, and to make sure that this doesn't happen again.

I think all of us, whether you have children or not, can imagine how difficult it would be to find out that news, to go through this situation where you believed that something had been installed that was correctly set that was providing that care for your child, and then to be informed that it hadn't been set appropriately to begin with and that your child may have had a different outcome if that had been set better many years ago.

I think for everybody in this house, our sympathies and our thoughts will be with those families. That's why we are determined to make sure that this doesn't happen again, that systems are improved, and that the appropriate care can be provided to those children who have been affected by this issue.

STATE ECONOMY

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:55): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer provide the house with an update on recent economic statistics on the South Australian economy?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:55): I thank the member for Mawson for his question, because I'm very pleased to update the house on recent economic statistics that have been released in the last few days about the South Australian economy. Last Thursday, the Australian Bureau of Statistics released their labour force data for February. It painted an extraordinary picture of South Australia's labour force: the strongest it has ever been since records began.

South Australia's unemployment rate has never been lower, never been lower—a record low of 3.8 per cent in the most recent figures. This is equal with Queensland and, remarkably, lower than Western Australia and the Northern Territory. There are now a record 936,000 people employed in South Australia. This is up more than 4,000 from the previous month, and there are almost 28,000 more South Australians in work now than at the time of the last state election. Of this record number of people in work, more than 614,000 are in full-time work—again, another record for the South Australian labour market. This is also higher than at the time of the last state election: 16,000 higher than at the time of the last state election.

Remarkably, this record high employment and record low unemployment rate has been achieved while labour force participation actually increased in the last month by 2½ thousand people to bring the participation rate to 63.8 per cent. These are remarkable results. Pleasingly, so enthralled are you, I see Mr Speaker, time has stood still, such is your enjoyment of these statistics. So I will continue, Mr Speaker.

Last week we also had population figures released for South Australia, which showed that in the last 12-month reporting period South Australia's population—

Mr Cowdrey: To September.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I was reading some further statistics, and it occurs to me that when the member for Colton blurts something out in question time he's desperate to be heard. Do you know what the worst thing is, worse than being talked about? Not being talked about.

The SPEAKER: Mr Treasurer, that may not be an economics textbook. That appears to be a prop.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Proves himself an irrelevance to Wakefield Press as well.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will not use props, and neither will the Leader of Government Business.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The population figures, as I said, for the last 12-month reporting period (in case there has been some sort of waxy build-up for the member for Colton) showed in that last 12 months—

Mr Cowdrey: You want to talk about business confidence—down 20 per cent?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —25,000 more people in South Australia. The population grew by 1.4 per cent.

Mr Cowdrey: Business conditions down 12 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That shows two things: not only a record number of migrants coming to South Australia from overseas but four consecutive quarters of net interstate migration in the positive. Compare that to the previous reporting periods: annual population growth at only 1 per cent and before that 0.9 per cent, and before that 0.6 per cent. This is a trajectory heading in the right direction, and the reason is because people think this state is heading in the right direction, well led by the Malinauskas Labor government. These are remarkable results.

However, there is one thing we should point out. Despite the very positive overseas migration numbers, despite the very positive net interstate migration numbers, there was an unfortunate fall in the year to September for the natural increase in population, almost a record low natural birth rate. Of course, September was approximately nine months on from the December/January period when the state was thrust once more into heavy restrictions because the opening of the borders was so badly bungled by those opposite when they were in government.

These are terrific figures, something that should give South Australians a lot of confidence that the economy is heading in the right direction, and despite the headwinds that may blow globally and nationally in the coming 12 months we confront whatever they may be from the strongest position the state's economy has ever been in.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has the minister or SA Health written to all families who have received cochlear implants at the Women's and Children's Hospital advising them of the avenues for a second opinion? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: Families can get a second opinion from a private provider with no out-of-pocket cost.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:00): I know that there has been extensive contact with the families from the Women's and Children's Health Network in terms of follow-up in relation to this care, and I know that they are also in the process of contacting people who have left the program over the course of a much longer period of even more years. In terms of the content of that letter and whether that specific inclusion is made, I will have to take that on notice.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:01): Is the minister confident that every impacted family has now been contacted by SA Health and the Women's and Children's Hospital, and when did that occur?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:01): I refer to my previous answer.

SERVICE SA CENTRES

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister inform the house of the importance of Service SA centres in assisting South Australians?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Sorry, hang on a sec.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you will not use that text as a prop.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Sorry, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:01): I thank the member for the important question. Once again, Service SA is stepping up to the plate, offering free licence replacements for those affected by the recent Latitude data breach. The government is awaiting further details from Latitude about affected customers in South Australia, after which we will be able to provide an option to request a replacement licence online. In the meantime, South Australians who have been told by Latitude that they should obtain a replacement licence can do so by taking the information they have received from Latitude to a Service SA centre.

Assistance isn't just about waiving fees; it's also about accessibility. The Optus data breach demonstrated the importance of face-to-face contact for many South Australians. Not every South Australian has internet access or is able to complete forms online. It wasn't that long ago that a previous government announced the closure of three important Service SA centres: Prospect, Mitcham and Modbury. Interestingly, all three of the Liberal MPs representing those areas have been defeated, or not re-elected.

I remember it well, a proposed cost-saving measure in the former government's first budget and the immediate reaction from the South Australian public—a very angry reaction. Despite being amongst the most utilised Service SA centres in South Australia, the previous government didn't seem to care about the many thousands of customers who attended those centres for assistance, and simply abandoned them. However, not at Mount Barker, where I understand a young ambitious backbencher at the time made sure that that Service SA centre was completed.

The Malinauskas Labor government took to the state election a commitment to keep these Service SA centres operational and to even increase the hours in which they are open. In line with that election commitment, I am pleased to advise the house that starting on Saturday 6 May this year, Service SA centres in Elizabeth, Marion, Modbury, Prospect and Seaford Meadows will be open on Saturdays from 9am to 5pm, offering important services and information for customers who are unable to attend during regular business hours.

The Malinauskas Labor government is making it easier to drop in and access important services and advice. The five Service SA centres chosen to open on Saturdays are some of the most visited locations and provide convenient options for customers across Adelaide. An additional 12 full-time staff will be allocated to these centres to ensure we can cater for the additional operating hours and we thank our Service SA staff for their willingness to be flexible to support more easily accessible services for South Australians.

In closing, I provide the house with this important statistic: for the 2022 calendar year, the Mitcham Service SA centre completed 99,322 transactions; Modbury, 149,146 transactions; and Prospect Service SA completed 138,621 transactions. Those opposite wanted those centres closed,

so when they ask themselves why they lost those three seats, perhaps they should ask the hundreds of thousands of people they would have denied services to.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What was the catalyst for the government launching an independent investigation into the cochlear implant program at the Women's and Children's Hospital? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: It has been reported to the opposition that the issue was first raised with the Women's and Children's Health Network in April of 2022, and the minister has advised the house that he was aware in August, yet it took until yesterday for the minister to confirm an independent investigation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of Government Business is very absorbed in that text and must not use it as a prop.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:06): I refer again to my ministerial statement where I outlined the actions that the Women's and Children's Health Network have been undertaking, over many months, to go back to talk to those families, to undertake an analysis of whether there had been issues in terms of the mapping of those cochlear implants and their settings that had been put in place. That work now having resulted in those 30 identifications of issues, combined with concern from the families, I think has now necessitated us to have an external independent interstate expert undertake a review of this matter.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the Minister for Trade and Investment advise how recent international agreements will drive trade and investment for South Australia?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (15:07): I thank the member for Torrens for her question. We started on the good news about the AUKUS agreement. We started question time on good news and will finish on good news, because the AUKUS agreement really does put this state at the centre of a very important global defence network. It really is a momentous decision for this state.

As the Premier has outlined and the Deputy Premier has outlined, there have been big investments: \$2 billion in the shipyards, 20,000 high-skilled jobs over the next three decades; Flinders University already forging pathways and partnerships with the University of Manchester and the University of Rhode Island; the government's four technical colleges—these are all excellent news, but, of course, AUKUS also gives us new avenues for trade and investment, new avenues to grow South Australian business, to grow our skill levels, to grow our industrial base. Of course, all of that investment in the end ends up with high-skilled, high-paying jobs.

This is an industrial transformation that cannot be overestimated. Even beyond submarines, we have opportunities generated by the AUKUS agreement. Quantum technologies and artificial intelligence are already critical elements of the AUKUS pact, and they will help drive economic benefit for South Australia. Through our innovation precincts, Lot Fourteen and Tonsley, we have already developed an ecosystem that is necessary to provide the highly skilled research capability that is absolutely essential to capitalise on the AUKUS opportunity.

The Australian Institute of Machine Learning, based at Lot Fourteen, MIT bigdata Living Lab, the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre, Adelaide's QuantX Labs—these are all part of that innovation ecosystem that will help us absolutely drive investment opportunities in South Australia. Already, the Department for Trade and Investment is working with industry on the industrial applications of those technologies.

We have tasked our offices in San Francisco, Houston and New York to seize the opportunities generated by the AUKUS agreement and our old ally, the United Kingdom, accessed of course through the Office of the Agent General, is also seizing those opportunities through the Australia-UK Free Trade Agreement. We have seen 99 per cent of goods traded between the UK and Australia being tariff free. We have seen our exports grow to \$376 million in the last 12 months. We already have a substantial trade partnership. The UK is the state's fourth-largest source of investment. Since 2003, \$2.8 billion has been invested, and over 2½ thousand jobs in our state.

Just last month we saw a group of 25 leading UK space companies comprising 40 delegates visit Adelaide. The contingents' visit follows recent announcements by Airbus, SSTL and Equatorial Launch Australia, all establishing bases here in South Australia. We saw delegates from the United Kingdom interact with the Australian Space Agency and start to see opportunities where they can partner. They were, of course, here between Singapore and the Avalon Airshow—a very important initiative by our UK office to bring them here in the middle of that trip. The UK office saw the opportunity and seized it, and that's the sort of entrepreneurial action we want to see out of our trade offices.

Clearly, the AUKUS agreement is a momentous investment in our state. We have to absolutely meet that challenge. The Premier and the government are absolutely committed to doing that.

Grievance Debate

MALINAUSKAS LABOR GOVERNMENT

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (15:11): Sunday marked the one-year anniversary of the 2022 state election, and 12 months on—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Look at this—this is what we mean when we talk about arrogance: their sneering, chortling arrogance—and that's what they are all about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —the giggling on the backbench, the sneering, the chortling, the arrogance. And one of the things that we saw when they came back into office after just four years in opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —was that sort of whooping, that immaturity, the puerile nonsense that comes from the other side, and South Australians are already sick of this gamesmanship. That is what they see from those opposite. They think it is a game: gaslighting, trickery, playing games, spending all sorts of time—

The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —spreading rumours, spreading innuendo, and the usual nonsense and noise from the opposition: smoke and mirrors, selfies and influencers, but very, very little—

The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —in the way of actual delivery from those opposite. We see that firsthand with their central election promise falling apart dramatically within the first 12 months in office. We saw it on all those corflute posters up and down the highways and streets in

neighbourhoods and suburbs and towns right across South Australia: 'We will fix the ramping crisis', 'Labor will fix the ramping crisis', yet 12 months on that problem has doubled.

Just last night, there were 108 patients trying to seek urgent attention through the emergency department at Flinders Medical Centre, yet those patients were not getting the care that they needed. Our hospital system, whether it is in the regional communities of South Australia or whether it is across metropolitan Adelaide, is in a far worse crisis than it was just 12 months ago. You could not open social media 12 months ago without seeing those claims that 'Labor will fix the ramping crisis'. In fact, some members opposite went even further. The now member for Elder claimed that Labor would be ending ramping. Conveniently, we have the member for Hurtle Vale in the audience today, and she said that Labor would stop ramping—stop ramping.

The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: She shouts, she distracts, but the reality is that the member for Hurtle Vale will not accept the truth that her government—the government that she is part of—has failed spectacularly on their primary election commitment. No, Mr Speaker, instead the Malinauskas Labor government has presided over the worst ramping on record.

The statistics are clear. Over the last 10 months, we have had the worst ramping in South Australia's history. In fact, a year on from the election, ramping statistics are twice as bad as they were in comparison to the last full month under the former Liberal government. Despite staggering attempts from both the Premier and his health minister to shift the goalposts, everyone in South Australia who was present during that election campaign remembers that they said they would fix ramping.

Now they are talking about response times, now they are talking about reducing ramping to 2018 levels by 2026. I did not see the asterisk on those corflute posters, and let me tell you that neither did South Australians. When I am out and about, when the member for Schubert is out and about, when members on this side of the house are out and about meeting people in shopping centres, community groups, on the doorstep, in sporting clubs, they hear that South Australians are equally as concerned about this matter.

We also know that while we are getting selfies, and bread and circuses, and smoke and mirrors, and expensive overseas trips, minor royals, and Sam Smith, we are not having any response around our soaring cost-of-living crisis. Inflation is rocketing. The average mortgage is up by more than \$1,000 a month since they came to office. Petrol has skyrocketed by almost 16 per cent. But there are no solutions from those opposite.

This state is facing a triple crisis: a crisis in health, a crisis in the cost of living and a crisis because they are stuck with this lot.

NEWROZ

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:16): Strong, courageous and determined. These are a few words that come to mind when I think of the people with Kurdish origins. To be honest, they have had to be all those things and more because for too long the Kurdish have struggled for freedom, independence and peace. They have had to fight not only for their land, their language, their food and their culture but for their right to exist because of the atrocious acts that have been perpetrated against them for generations.

Today is a very special day for their community. It is Newroz. With a history dating back over 3,000 years, there is no doubt that the Newroz festival holds deep meaning and importance in the hearts of many. It is a time for festivities and celebration, family reunion and new friendships. It brings with it a sense of renewal alongside all the hallmarks of Middle Eastern spring.

For Kurdish people, Newroz is also a symbolic celebration that marks their struggle for freedom, independence and peace. Over the Newroz period, we look back at the challenges and complications of the year that has passed. It is a time of reflection, to learn and to think on the lessons learnt—and reflecting on the year that has been for Kurdish people is deeply heartbreaking.

I have come to know my local Kurdish community very well during my time as the member for King. In fact, this community was one of the very first to welcome me with open arms when I first

put my hand up to run for parliament. I am a big believer in striving for a better, fairer and more equitable future, and I am prepared to fight for that just like Kurdish people. They have suffered ethnic cleansing, disproportionate policing and incarceration. All they ask for is to be heard and given freedom of expression, to be able to gift their children Kurdish names—and have it be legal—because her name was Jina Amini and she should be remembered as such.

On that note, I want to thank my local Kurdish community for how hard they have fought this past year for their culture, particularly my good friend Tara. I respect how empowering Newroz can be. I read the following quote which highlights this:

The Newroz torch will always be a light on the path of our people, and we will liberate our people with the spirit of Newroz.

This celebration brings an incredibly unique sense of individuality with it. Their heritage, vibrancy and diversity, which I have been so fortunate to witness and participate in, is unrivalled. It is wonderful to see such passion for cultural history and to meet people who are so keen to share this with the greater community, because I know and appreciate that it is our diversity that helps to strengthen us.

Newroz encourages all to look forward to the year that is to come and the opportunities that undoubtedly lie ahead. To all celebrating today, I sincerely hope that this year blossoms with happiness for you and your families. May the light of Newroz bring your families good health, joy and freedom for Kurdistan. 'Newroz piroz be'—happy Newroz. May 2023 bring better tidings, lighting the path thanks to the spirit of Newroz.

AUKUS SUBMARINES

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:20): In September 2021, the former federal Liberal government announced the establishment of AUKUS, which is a landmark trilateral security partnership signed between Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States as a result of the rising security challenges in the Indo-Pacific. The first initiative was to support Australia acquiring nuclear-powered submarines to be built in South Australia and also to outline the optimal path to achieving this.

The shift from conventional to nuclear-powered submarines is a key decision in both the nation's and also this state's history. At the time, I was the Minister for Trade and Investment, and the enormity of that decision and the ability for it to upskill not only the industrial capability but also the workforce here in South Australia was immense. As a result, the former Liberal government supported the move and actively began work in getting the state ready for this enormous challenge, including establishing the South Australian Submarine Taskforce.

Last week, the Prime Minister announced the optimal pathway to Australia acquiring nuclear-powered submarines. AUKUS will deliver a conventionally armed nuclear-powered submarine capability in the 2030s by purchasing between three and five US Virginia class submarines. Importantly, Australia will also build nuclear-powered AUKUS submarines that will be based on the UK's next-generation design and will incorporate technology from all three nations, and that build will occur at Osborne in South Australia.

The South Australian Liberal Party supports the announcement that the AUKUS nuclear-powered submarines will be built at Osborne in South Australia. The program will extend over many decades, and a key element of the program's success will be bipartisan support at both the federal and state levels. Even the 18 months between the initial AUKUS announcement and last week's announcement show that governments change but, through that, the security of the nation and the sustainability of the defence industries that support that are essential and require bipartisanship, which is the case here in South Australia.

Adelaide is the home of shipbuilding in Australia. Even before this announcement, Osborne is currently the location for the construction of the Future Frigates as well as the maintenance of the Collins class submarines. Significant infrastructure work was a focus of the former Liberal government at Osborne and has already taken place as part of the previous submarine program. That work was going to transform Osborne into the most advanced dual submarine and surface shipbuilding yard in the world.

The scale of the Osborne shipyards will now have to triple in size to cater for the construction of the new AUKUS submarines. Not only is this important for Australia and South Australia but it is also important for both the UK and the United States. Currently, the US has two submarine shipyards and the UK has one at Barrow-in-Furness—the location where the AUKUS submarine design will first be built—that are already at capacity. Building the submarines in South Australia will strengthen the combined industrial capacity of all three countries, with increased cooperation making trilateral supply chains much more resilient whilst at the same time providing great opportunities for South Australian defence companies.

Without submarines being built at Osborne and also enlarging that total allied capacity, it is hard to see how the US would have been able to provide Virginia class submarines, so it should give confidence to the AUKUS submarines being built right here in South Australia. AUKUS also maintains the Collins submarines with the full cycle docking and life-of-type extensions to occur at Osborne, which was delivered by the former federal Liberal government after massive effort from the former state Liberal government. We must ensure that the life-of-type extension work on the Collins boats is done successfully while the AUKUS submarines are built, as they will remain crucial to our military capability over the next decade and beyond as well as our industrial capability.

AUKUS was commenced under the former federal and state Liberal governments and is now being continued by the current Labor governments. It will strengthen our nation's military capacity and also our defence industry capability right here in South Australia. The state Liberal Party supports the AUKUS partnership and the construction of nuclear-powered submarines in Adelaide.

RSPCA SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (15:25): The Malinauskas government has provided a 70-year lease to RSPCA SA for the seven-hectare site located in my electorate of Davenport on Majors Road at O'Halloran Hill. This fully integrated animal care campus is a game changer and will be a centre of excellence for animal welfare in our state. It will include the state's first 24-hour wildlife hospital and for the first time enable the RSPCA to care for a far more diverse range of species. It will be somewhere our community of animal lovers will want to come to learn and to take up opportunities of making a difference in the lives of our wildlife.

It will provide a huge economic boost to the southern suburbs with more than 500 new jobs expected to be created through the construction of this \$26 million campus. It is exciting to see the RSPCA's vision become a reality with the foundations being laid next month, the first buildings expected to go up in July and completion due by February next year. This site will make leaps and bounds for animal welfare and protection in this state.

You may have seen in recent media reports that the RSPCA at Lonsdale was recently forced to shut its doors to new intakes as the shelter was exceeding maximum capacity. This morning I spoke with the new CEO, Marcus Gehrig, who advised they currently have more than 600 cats and 120 dogs in their care at Lonsdale patiently awaiting adoption, and a further 600 to 700 more in foster care also waiting for their new forever home.

The new CEO says that it was a tough call to make to shut its doors but that the volume was creating a welfare issue for animals and for their staff and volunteers. He said the growing need for adoptions is due to a number of factors, the rental crisis being one of these. Rental properties are hard to come by as it is, but trying to find one that is pet-friendly is almost impossible at the moment, so people are having to surrender their family pets just to keep a roof over their own heads. Hopefully this is something that we can address through the residential tenancy legislation.

Mr Gehrig says that cat management is another contributing factor and believes there needs to be statewide consistency on how this is managed, rather than relying on councils to set their own by-laws around cat containment. He is also keen to see more free cat desexing clinics rolled out across the state. In my time as Mayor at the City of Onkaparinga, I worked with the RSPCA to implement a free cat desexing and microchipping program at Lonsdale. It was a huge success and saw almost 1,000 cats desexed in the south. Sadly, that program has finished, but the RSPCA are keen to reinstate more programs like this one to address the root cause and stop more unwanted kittens being born.

Right now the RSPCA needs the help of South Australians who are in a position to either temporarily foster or provide a forever home for a new furry family member. So, if you are able, please head to the RSPCA website, social media pages or shelters to start a conversation about adoption or foster care. I am pleased to have such an important and esteemed organisation like RSPCA SA within my southern suburbs electorate.

I would like to take this opportunity also to acknowledge the tireless efforts and good work of Bev Langley and her incredible team at Minton Farm Native Animal Rescue Centre in Cherry Gardens. Minton Farm is a not-for-profit, non-government organisation run entirely on community goodwill and volunteer time. The objective of the centre is to educate and enrich the lives of our community through the rescue and care of injured and orphaned native animals—and boy do they have their hands full.

For a long time, Bev and her team have been passionately advocating for new laws that would see domestic cats contained to the properties, just like dogs are, to stop the devastating impact that they are having on our wildlife. Each time I have visited Bev at the rescue centre, I have witnessed multiple ringtail possums and small birds being brought in by local residents who have rescued them from the mouths of their own cats.

Bev would have treated thousands of cases like this. A quick look at their Facebook feed will show you the trail of destruction that is frequently left behind by roaming cats. Those roaming cats, often not desexed, are also adding to the problem that the RSPCA is left with. It is time to take a serious look at cat management, both for the welfare of our family pets and, importantly, the protection of our native wildlife.

CHAFFEY ELECTORATE MARCH LONG WEEKEND

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:29): I rise to speak about some of the fun and frivolity over the March long weekend up in Chaffey. If the March long weekend is a taste of things to come, Easter has a showstopper about to launch upon us. We all know that the Chaffey electorate is a great place to live and a great place to visit. The March long weekend that has just gone was a great example of how much there is to do and see throughout the Riverland. Also another great show of the resilience of our towns has been to recover and get on with life after the floods. From auto street parties to harvest festivals, there was something for everyone.

The Riverland Auto Street Party saw over 300 collector cars participate in the street party with an estimated 6,000 attendees, both local and interstate. As reported, all the food and drink vans sold out. There were 13 awards presented, including the now famous MP's Choice that went to David Scholz's 1965 orange XP Falcon sedan.

The Riverland Youth Theatre held the Teddy Bears Picnic, a Fringe event presented by Country Arts SA and the Loxton Waikerie Council. It was hosted by Sophie Landau and the Riverland Youth Theatre and kids from around the Riverland had the opportunity to picnic with their friends and their teddy bears and participate in a range of activities, including creating songs and sharing stories.

The March Long Weekend at the Distillery was also another showcase event, including live music, an outdoor can bar, tasting flights and dancing. I must say that the food at the distillery is next level. The Renmark Fire Station Open Day celebrating 20 years was also a great family event to look at the infrastructure and the officers who keep our community safer. The Rustons Fest showcased craft spirits, local produce and food stalls. It too had live music with a lineup of local artists and performers. As I understand it, it was a great outing.

The Ski for Life Saturday community event was held at the Cobby Club with guest speaker Mary O'Brien from Are You Bugged Mate?, which offers an inspiring outlook toward helping mates who are stuck in the mud. It is for mental health and suicide prevention. I must say I have had a number of meetings with Mary and as a public speaker she is outstanding. She is really one of Australia's leading public speakers. The Sunday event was the Renmark Club's Mates on a Mission with speakers Ben and Mike and that included more live music. As you can tell sir, the theme of food, wine, spirits and live music was a core theme to the March long weekend.

The Mallee Harvest Festival, supported by the Rotary Club of Loxton, was a fundraising event to support the Royal Flying Doctor Service Patient Transfer Facility and Bringing Communities

Together program. This included a dinner and an auction which raised over \$11,500 for the Royal Flying Doctor Service. It was a great initiative.

Other events that happened over the long weekend were the Riverland Speedway Calperum Hill Challenge, the Barmera markets, which never disappoint, and the Rotary Club of Waikerie's Fringe Twilight Market. That is just a taste for what is coming up at Easter.

The upcoming Easter events, as well as the support from the state government for Rise Up for our River, will be a showcase of what the Riverland region is all about. That will include the Berri Easter Carnival and Breakfast, the Barmera Easter Twilight Market and Open-Air Cinema, the Loxton Easter Picnic as well as the Riverland Speedway Easter Wingless Cup, which is, of course, at the now famous top of Calperum Hill.

The Australian Tourism Awards are also something I would like to give a mention to because the Riverland tourism businesses were well represented at the national awards. We saw both Destination Riverland and Murray River Trails as finalists. The Murray River Trails were in the Eco Tourism category and Destination Riverland was in the Tourism Marketing and Campaigns category. Congratulations to Pamela, Kate and the Destination Riverland Board and, of course, to Tony and Susie Sharley and the entire team at Murray River Trails that were over there. They do an outstanding job. They are a leading ecotourism business nationally, but unfortunately received no awards.

As I have said, Easter is around the corner. Book to ensure if you want to come up and see some of the wonders of the Riverland and, of course, to look at the aftermath of the flood and its environment, because we know that the environment is screaming out to showcase what it has, which is so beautiful.

BUCKNEY, MS K.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:34): I rise to speak about a woman in my community who is making a difference: Kylie Buckney, a woman making positive change in the world of Australian Rules football. Kylie has been President of the Marion Rams Football Club for the past four years, and during that time she has updated most of their policies, developed a strategic plan, survived the pandemic, introduced female teams, and secured the future of the club.

Despite this impressive workload of volunteering over the last four years as President, she could not quite step away at the last AGM and took on the role of the club's first wellbeing officer for the benefit of the whole Marion Rams community. Kylie will be looking after the welfare and mental health of players and officials—an important role, and I congratulate Kylie for this initiative.

On 2 March this year, the senior players and coaches attended a mental health seminar led by Rosie from Mindseye Training and Consulting. Over the past few years, we have seen increasing numbers of sports players having the courage to speak up and even take time away from sport to prioritise their mental health, and I encourage every club to support such initiatives. The Rams now have someone who is available to chat, has the contacts of professional mental health organisations if someone needs them, and is organising these information sessions. The benefits of community and exercise in times of hardship are well known, and it is fantastic to see the Marion Rams supporting their members in this way.

I will also take this opportunity to mention the work of the Rams' cultural adviser, Christine Abdulla, who created the guernsey for last season's Indigenous round—one I was proud to wear during their Indigenous games. I even had the opportunity to present the players with their Indigenous guernsey on game day. It is such important work that is being carried out by the volunteers at the Marion Rams Football Club, and I am looking forward to the 2023 season.

I would now like to speak about some Australia Day award winners in my community, starting with the City of Holdfast Bay where I was proud to see 70 residents from 22 countries become Australian citizens—a truly special day for them and their families. Cheryle Pinkess was the Holdfast Bay Citizen of the Year for starting the Grocer with a Heart shop at the Brighton Church of Christ. The Rotary Club of Holdfast Bay received the Active Citizenship award for their twice-yearly food drives in local shopping centres. These food drives began in 2019, and since then they have distributed over \$90,000 worth of essentials to people in need.

Hayley Hosking was named Young Citizen of the Year for being a role model for young female surf lifesavers. Bronwyn Watt was named Local Hero after raising \$80,000 for FightMND, and the Event of the Year award went to the Somerton Park Rotary Club for their highly successful Youth Photographic Exhibition.

At the City of Marion, Pat Munden, volunteer of 40 years, was Citizen of the Year and received a commendation in the South Australian 2023 Award for Active Citizenship. Pat was recognised with this award for her fantastic work running the Cooina Café at the Cooina Neighbourhood Centre. Pat coordinates the volunteers, the groceries and the cooking. She even runs ceramics classes twice a week. It is safe to say Pat is a woman behind the scenes and the success of the Cooina Neighbourhood Centre. For those interested in taking a class or stopping by, the Cooina Neighbourhood Centre can be found just off Diagonal Road.

Zane LeBlond received the City of Marion's Young Citizen of the Year for his work with the City of Marion's Youth Collective Committee as their social media officer. The YCC, as it is known around Marion, handed down their Safe Space Project report in December, which focused on the mental health of young people in the City of Marion. Included in the five recommendations made in this report was the provision of support for family and friends of young people experiencing mental health issues. Zane is an active member of the community, attending my recent Clean Up Australia Day event and being appointed to the Minister for Human Services' Youth Advisory Council.

Finally, the Marion Community Event of the Year went to none other than the Oaklands Estate Reserve parkrun. I have seen this five-kilometre run, organised by Emma Steel and Kevin Thomson and a team of volunteers since 2022, become incredibly popular, and I attend most Saturdays either as a participant or as a volunteer. It is a fantastic community activity that can be enjoyed by people of all ages and all abilities, and of course dogs are very welcome.

Bills

FIRST NATIONS VOICE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:40): I rise to make a brief contribution to the First Nations Voice Bill. As many of my colleagues have already done in this place, I would like to again, as we do at the start of every sitting day, acknowledge that we gather as a parliament to debate these bills on the land of the Kurna people, and I would like to pay my personal respects to elders past, present and emerging.

I would also like to acknowledge that members of this chamber, including myself, are speaking from a place of privilege. As a non-indigenous Australian, I acknowledge that I cannot truly speak for First Nations people or for the impact that this bill will have on their communities. That is not my story to tell.

First Nations people have been living on this continent for at least 65,000 years. During this time, they have adapted to the extremes of the Australian landscape and fostered a deep connection to the land that still stands to this day. As I said, I am speaking from a place of privilege, and I say this because we have seen arguments against this bill and against the referendum for a federal Voice to Parliament, which go along the lines of, 'Why should First Nations people have a Voice to Parliament when there are other minorities or other sections of society which are not given their own dedicated voice, which are not given their own say outside of our representative democratic structures?'

At first glance, of course, these arguments may seem persuasive, but the comparisons simply are not appropriate. Within the context of our relatively affluent Western society, I am the product of a disadvantaged background. I was born and raised on a council estate in North London. My family then emigrated and settled in the working class suburb of Elizabeth. The expectation for someone like me to succeed and thrive was pretty low. But again, my circumstances simply do not compare to a people who have suffered intergenerational trauma as a direct result of an invasion of

their country and the historical attitude of those who arrived in their country towards those people, entirely on the basis of a historical and constructed view of hierarchy and superiority.

The discrimination against our First Nations peoples is deep and it is structural, and it is so deep and embedded in our history and our shared world view that it is difficult for some people to see and accept. Indeed, the assumptions of our society, which this bill and other so-called symbolic measures seek to address, go back further than European colonisation of Australia, and it is important that we take a look at this through a historical lens so that we can understand the assumptions on which a lot of the public discourse on this issue rests.

Racism, as the Deputy Premier and others have pointed out, is a construct. It has no basis in genetics, but the idea of race, of course, has a powerful history. A hierarchy of race permeates British history for at least the last thousand years, and I say this as someone who has no small amount of pride in my own English heritage. I have to say, in passing, that I was deeply moved by a lecture delivered by Professor Aileen Moreton-Robinson, who laid out in very stark confronting terms the foundations on which our legal and political system is built. It set me to really thinking about those foundations before I spoke today.

Racial prejudice, as I said, may well have been a feature of society for thousands of years. We only need to read Shakespeare and his contemporaries to find disparaging references to ethnic groups set against the dominant culture, but it was of course the slave trade from the 16th to the 19th centuries which cemented and legitimised the already widespread view that certain races, particularly those with dark or black skin, were inherently inferior to those who controlled that trade.

The discourse which grew up around that legitimised the slave trade, with the explicit support of the then monarchy, of the constitutions of those countries involved in the slave trade and of the laws which governed the ways in which they behaved. There was a hierarchy of race, a construction which placed those with black skin at the bottom. Indeed, in the 16th century, the Oxford dictionary defined blackness as 'being deeply stained with dirt, foul, iniquitous, atrocious, horrible, wicked'. It was against this backdrop that Europeans arrived in Australia.

When Willem Janszoon arrived on the west Cape York Peninsula, he described the First Nations people he encountered as 'savage, cruel, black barbarians'. The historian Michael Meadows, who has written extensively on early colonial attitudes, quotes diary entries of colonists which described Aboriginal people as 'the most miserable of the human form under heaven, more like monkeys than warriors' and as 'altogether the most stupid, insensible set of beings'. Read today, of course, these are confronting descriptions.

This ingrained assumption of a racial hierarchy was inadvertently, I think, weaponised by the widespread dissemination of Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection, which, of course, was groundbreaking and world changing, but it had, we must assume, the unintended consequence of further legitimising the view of a hierarchy of human races, leading to the idea of terra nullius, the guilt-free invasion of the lands of the First Nations people, the paternalism of our early laws and constitution, the overt racism of the White Australia policy, and the arguably well-meaning but ultimately misguided policies which led to the shame of the stolen generations.

This is the historical background on which this debate is being had. It is this received reality which permeates our culture. It serves to separate in the minds of many the so-called commonsense opposition to measures like the Voice from the real collective memory and the reality for thousands of First Nations peoples. I do want to add on top of all that that I do not believe that the opponents of this bill and the opponents of a concept of a Voice to Parliament are racist or are motivated by racism, or I hope that that is, in the main, true. I just want to put into historical context the debate we are having and the cultural preconceptions that measures like the Voice are seeking to redress.

The bill represents a significant moment in our shared history. South Australia is yet again at the forefront of progressive change. It was in 2019 that Labor and then opposition leader Peter Malinauskas made the commitment to deliver a state-based Voice to Parliament. This was reiterated in the 2022 state election campaign, and on coming to office we immediately got to work on commencing in-person and online consultations.

The First Nations Voice Bill is a substantial step towards improving the economic, social and political situation of Aboriginal people in our state. It is a simple step. As others have acknowledged, it is not the silver bullet, but it is an essential step in giving those people a voice to our parliament. Government leaders in the past have attempted to fix the very real problems that First Nations people face in today's society: poverty, poor educational outcomes, distressing figures around incarceration, particularly around the incarceration of Aboriginal male youths. But it is fair to say, as others have recognised, that those policies have largely failed.

It is our view that if we are really invested in closing the gap, we need to include the advice and experiences of those we are trying to help. The First Nations Voice Bill is fundamentally different from the old policies that have failed Indigenous Australians. For the first time, First Nations people will be able to speak directly to the heart of government. The Local First Nations Voices will be directly elected by the First Nations peoples living within the region the Voice is to represent.

With a State First Nations Voice deriving from at least six Local First Nations Voices, this bill promotes self-determination and inclusivity for all ages and genders from the grassroots level. The State First Nations Voice will communicate directly with the South Australian parliament and government to present the views on matters of interest to Local Voices; to provide an annual address on issues affecting First Nations peoples; to speak through its joint presiding members on the floor of the parliament in relation to any bill it considers relevant; to present reports on issues affecting First Nations people, either of its own initiative or on request of either house of parliament; to meet with cabinet and departmental chief executives at least twice a year; and to hold an annual engagement hearing with ministers and chief executives on initiatives and expenditure within their agencies affecting First Nations people.

The opportunity to advise the parliament and the government on issues affecting First Nations people will be deeply felt by many members of the First Nations community in Australia, but not least in my own electorate of Elizabeth. Elizabeth is home to almost 2,000 First Nations people.

I have reflected at times in this place that, when I arrived in Elizabeth in 1981, it was monocultural. I was wrong—it was not monocultural. Of course, it was bicultural. There was an overwhelming number of people who looked like me and then there was a very small number of people who were First Nations people. So I want to correct the record right now.

Elizabeth is home to almost 2,000 First Nations people. Within the City of Playford, the suburb of Elizabeth South is home to the highest proportion of First Nations people. Elizabeth is also home to Marni Waiendi, which is the valuable community service that connects First Nations people with mainstream and Indigenous-specific services through information and direct referrals. The centre also offers first-aid training, driver education and leadership and literacy courses, removing the barriers to opportunity.

I would like to briefly acknowledge a young local in my electorate, Kiana Stewart, who has been able to build up her qualifications through Marni Waiendi to help secure one of her dream jobs. Kiana was able to access first aid, White Card and driver training through Marni Waiendi, to prepare her for a traineeship in early childhood education. Now in her early 20s, Kiana is set on becoming a mentor or support worker for Aboriginal students within schools. Having a mentor when she was growing up, Kiana knows firsthand the impact such support and guidance can have on one's life. Kiana is now embarking on her education journey in childhood education and care, and Aboriginal studies, and I think she will be a strong voice for young Aboriginal people in South Australia and, in particular, the northern suburbs.

Before I finish I would like to acknowledge, as others before me have, the Commissioner for First Nations Voice, Dale Agius, for his extraordinary work in leading the consultations for this bill, which have been extensive, and ensuring that the bill is consistent with the spirit and objectives of the Uluru Statement from the Heart. As others have, I want to acknowledge the strong leadership and the hard work of both the Premier and the Attorney-General, Kyam Maher in the other place.

The Premier and Kyam Maher in the other place knew this was the right thing to do to fully deliver on the Uluru Statement from the Heart. They never shied away from it. At times it was a brave decision and at times it has been seen as controversial in some quarters, but it has always been the

right thing to do and I think that the Premier and, in particular, the Attorney-General are to be commended for this.

As I said, and as others have said, we know this is not a panacea. The passage of this bill does not mean that we neglect our responsibility to take other measures to redress the deep inequality in our society, the educational outcomes, the mortality rates and, of course, the horrendous rates of Indigenous incarceration. I believe, and we believe on this side of the house that, to make any of this work, we need to hear loud and clear the voices of our First Nations people. That is why it is time for us to take a seat, to listen and to act. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr TEAGUE: Will the government be continuing the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The government is currently considering whether or not to continue with that body, so we do not have a definitive answer for this bill.

Mr TEAGUE: I put that question in terms that were put to the minister in June last year at estimates and the minister's answer, to the member for Dunstan as it happened on that occasion, was along the lines of the Deputy Premier's answer just now. I take the opportunity again—I think I might have referred to this in my second reading contribution. The government at that stage had no intention to alter the council and, in terms of continuing to extend or appoint its members, the minister gave an indication that he would be taking advice and turning his mind to that, and again it was something that he would be looking at and taking a decision on. So, in that sense, the answer just now indicates, I suppose, that that remains the view of the government.

In the circumstances, perhaps just slightly more fulsomely than I outlined in my second reading speech, of course this comes against the background of the bill that was before the last parliament—the Marshall Liberal government bill—that was predicated upon replacing the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council with the Aboriginal Representative Body, as was explained by Professor Roger Thomas at pages 22 and 23 of his report as the South Australian Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement covering the work that he did between July 2018 and November 2020. I commend the whole report to those who are interested in this subject, but more particularly those pages 22 and 23 that provide that background. We will come to it further in a moment.

Of course, it is all very well to talk about the broader historical context with which we come to consider legislating in this place at this time, but I really do want to emphasise that the more particular context in which we come to debating this bill is a matter of merit and substance that ought—in my respectful view, and again I put it on the record—have proceeded expressly off the foundation of the work of Professor Roger Thomas; that is, the engagement process that he undertook and the feedback that was obtained over the course of 2018, 2019 and 2020.

As we also learned in the course of estimates last June, that was not the course that the minister took, that the government took. The minister, when that question was put, said rather to the contrary, 'We will do our own work,' and then what we have seen in my view is the unnecessarily described as inaugural, described as novel and so on, establishment of the role of commissioner in terms of the work that Dale Agius has then carried on in the course of the second half of calendar year 2022—two rounds of consultation leading to a draft bill in about November and a final bill that was circulated shortly prior to the introduction of the bill that we are here debating.

That in fact is the foundation upon which the work ought to have expressly proceeded, but I am concerned with the nature of the model insofar as nothing I have heard so far indicates that the model is set to replace the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council—we will come to it when we get to clause 7—or any other current action or engagement by Aboriginal bodies. In highlighting that point at the outset and Dr Roger Thomas's work towards the way in which this might provide a

pathway forward, I hope it might provide, for those who are interested in the debate and the way it has progressed, some better context.

I might just say for completeness—I was given to understand that the Premier was going to conduct the committee process, and I would have taken the opportunity to ask him directly, so I will just put it on the record again—when the Premier on 7 February indicated on ABC radio that we did not see a bill in the course of the last parliament, the Premier highlighted what perhaps characterises the extent of his engagement in the process. If nothing else it underscores that, so far as the government is concerned, there has been a, as it were, putting aside of that very substantial aspect of the history of engagement on this topic.

I would say perhaps one thing more. In terms of the range of contributions—because it was a relatively extensive second reading debate in the course of October and November 2021—the criticism, such as it was, that was directed at the bill as then presented was what was described as an inadequate consultation process, an inadequate lead time prior to its introduction to the house, and so on. Again, the minister had the opportunity in estimates last year and did not have anything further to add in that regard. I have not heard anything rising any higher than that in terms of direct engagement with that model.

The government would come along to the parliament, as it were, against the context of hundreds and thousands of years of history and then, again, against the context of what has happened between about August 2022 and now. It is important both for the purposes of the record of work that has been done and in terms of confronting and comparing the detail of the different models that it led to that there was this really very significant and productive body of work led by Dr Roger Thomas over those years of the previous government. I again pay tribute to him. I got to know him over the process, and I have a lot of respect for Dr Thomas. My second question in relation to clause 1 is: what exactly was Dr Roger Thomas engaged with post 30 June last year and what, if anything, is his role going forward?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That is not something that we have a briefing on here, and nor is it something that is germane to the contents of this bill. I can take it on notice and see if the minister wishes to give a response.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr TEAGUE: Clause 4 provides eligibility criteria for voting. It is not complete—we need to go to schedule 1, part 3 at clause 7 in order to then take the step of a positive declaration of that eligibility—but clause 4 deals with the criteria for eligibility. It is a form of the tripartite test, and it has been referred to on a number of occasions. I think it captures the tripartite elements in a form that has been expressed in its own way. My question goes to clause 4(1)(c). Just for the sake of clarity, and the words are going to need to speak for themselves, it appears to me that the reference to the relevant community really must be the community in (a), but I wonder whether the Deputy Premier has anything to add about that.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Understandably, these matters are complex and sensitive. As I understand the question, the member is asking what constitutes a community for clause 4(1)(c). There is no exhaustive definition of that sitting in this piece of legislation. It is part of that tripartite test that is well established in Australia, that the relevant community accepts the person. If an Aboriginal person is able to state which group they are from and have not had their ties severed, say through stolen generation experience, then that becomes a relatively straightforward matter. In the case where that is unable to be claimed, then who constitutes the community that accepts is less easily defined.

What is reassuring about this is that should there be a wish to take it to court, then courts are able to review all of the evidence available, hear from members of the community who are willing to welcome the person as being an Aboriginal person and the court can make a final judgement. But the expectation is that the tripartite text is robust enough and is used in other circumstances to work as a way of identifying who is First Nations for this legislation.

Mr TEAGUE: I am grateful for the Deputy Premier's response. I note that it was preceded by a deal of time in considering what effect that might actually have. Again, I just want to emphasise that there is not an attempt here to read into the aim of the particular form of drafting, it is a particular attempt at expressing the tripartite test and that the words will need to do the work. Conscious of circumstances and realities about difficulties and all the rest of it, the words have to do some work.

It is helpful to have an understanding of whether the government's view of those words might be something other than that the relevant community is the one in (a). We will get to schedule 1, part 3, clause 7 and the kind of seriousness with which those who would participate in the voting process are going to have to subscribe and the consequences of that subscription so that it is in everybody's interest and primarily theirs.

I hasten to add I am not so eligible, at least as far as I am aware. It is in the interests of interpretation and knowing the seriousness with which the declaration in schedule 1, part 3, clause 7 will need to be entered into. I think I am just adding to the response and there is no fresh question perhaps. It seems to me clear enough that those words must relate to (a). It would be a pity, indeed, if we were to embark on a process where there is somehow some inherent uncertainty about what this means and we are embarking on a process where the courts are going to be called in to adjudicate about the meaning of the clause. That is quite apart from an individual's circumstances. It sounds like we might need to leave it at that.

Mr McBRIDE: It is very, very interesting when we talk about accepted Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. Could the minister explain to the parliament and perhaps to the people who are out there listening to this what role women and females play in the Aboriginal culture and how do you think they may play a part in this Voice process. It is my understanding they were very much divided in their communities between male and female.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Thank you to the member for his question. I am struggling a little to tie it firmly back to this clause. I understand the intent of the question, and in that spirit would like to seek to answer it.

In many Aboriginal cultures there are particular roles that are expected and are the responsibility of men and of women. In part in recognition of that, as well as, of course, our Australia-wide acceptance of the importance of recognising both genders as being of equal value, this legislation allows—in fact, requires—both a man and a woman to be elected by each person who is voting, and that there be both a man and a woman who will be the chair of each of the regional First Nations Voices and that that then translates to the Voice to Parliament as well, in order to make sure that there is equality from the start, something that has not been ensured in this parliament. That is in partial recognition of the matters that I believe the member is raising.

Mr McBRIDE: Thank you for that answer. That was a difficult one, knowing a little bit of a history and having sort of seen these communities. Minister, one of the things that clause 4 talks about is:

- (c) is accepted as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person by the relevant Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander community.

One thing that has really perhaps failed us as an Anglo society in trying to assist and help Indigenous Australians, wherever that may be in South Australia or Australia, is finding the representatives that represent perhaps the largest cohort possible—not just in the one community—knowing there are many communities.

If this Voice process is going to work, deputy leader, then it is really, really important that these representatives are perhaps coming from the largest community, the largest base, largest in the sense of collective that can capture the sentiment of Indigenous Australia or South Australia, as this parliament is trying to deal with, for the best outcomes.

It is my understanding that if we look at the failure of history in trying to address the issues that I think we all would love to see answers to, the groundswell of solutions and answers is not getting back to the communities in which they are needed. So my question to you, deputy leader and minister, is: how are you going to make sure through this Voice process that the solutions and the

message and the answers by these representatives to parliament are going to have the effect that we are looking for?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As I understand the question, it is partly related to this question of a relevant community, recognising that there are a number of groups of Aboriginal people (sometimes called nations) that make up the rich tapestry of the variety of Aboriginal culture in South Australia. This piece of legislation does not seek to have a quota allocated on the size of each of those communities. It could have been something that someone wanted to suggest, but it is not something that this government proposes or supports.

The idea of this representation, this Voice, is that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people represent the culture that existed uniquely in Australia, including the Torres Strait Islands, and that it is able to be recognised in a special way as a unique Australian culture, and that the people who are the inheritors of that culture, the carriers of that culture, are the people who will choose those representatives from amongst their own.

I do not want to put words into the member's mouth in any way, but a possible interpretation of the question is that there would be a certain proportion that would be allocated to Kurna people and that effectively only Kurna people would be able to vote for those representatives. That is not the model that has been adopted, deliberately.

There is a recognition of the difference in population. You will see when we come to clause 11 that the size of the regional voices is able to vary. That will be defined by regulation, and that recognises that the metropolitan area might well have a larger regional voice than the regional areas.

What is not possible under this model, and would not be desirable in our opinion, is the idea, say, that Torres Strait Islander people who live in South Australia would be deprived of having a vote on the Voice because Torres Strait Islander culture does not come from South Australia (it comes from Torres Strait), or that people who grew up in Perth but now live in South Australia but are nonetheless Aboriginal people would be unable to vote for Voice because they are not living in their home town.

A decision early on was made that that was not a model that would be adopted, recognising that in the interests of having diversity there are regional voices from which is drawn the central Voice and that gender diversity is enshrined in the way in which we have structured this.

Mr McBRIDE: Just in regard to clause 4(2) and the fact that you talk about Indigenous people being able to vote and find a representative to the Voice that is obviously authentic and representative, trusted and perhaps the community has confidence regarding, when we have state and federal elections does the government have any understanding or idea about the percentage of Indigenous Australians, or Indigenous South Australians, who participate in voting in today's election system, and does the government expect this to increase or be better in defining who and how the Voice works for them?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The population of Aboriginal people, the proportion, is about 3 per cent. We do not track people's cultural background on the electoral roll to then be able to say what proportion of people were born in England but now live here and are citizens, people who were born here but their parents came from Greece, people who are Aboriginal, how they vote, whether they vote or not. We just do not collect that kind of data.

Mr TEAGUE: I think it might have been remiss of me not to have noted on the way through—and I will endeavour to do this—the contribution at submission 9 to the commissioner's second round of engagement that the author's name and details have been redacted. But I acknowledge that the author describes himself as a 60-year-old Aboriginal man, and his particular concern that is set out in submission 9 highlights the objective, as well as subjective, problems associated with self-identification and the problems that that causes.

Again, I have adverted to the step in schedule 1. We see there an expression of concern in relation to processes by which it will be necessary both to have the requirement that there be a declaration entered into and that there then be an appetite and capacity to ensure that there is probity and integrity in that process at every stage.

The CHAIR: I am not sure if that was a statement or a question. Minister, would you like to address that?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Sorry, I did not hear it as a question, no.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr McBRIDE: In clause 5—Meaning of traditional owner, it says:

...reference to a traditional owner in relation to a particular place will be taken to be a reference to a First Nations person...

Deputy leader, when we look at all the issues that as a society we are trying to address here and find solutions for, is it really the traditional owners who are following cultural practices and who are really fully engaged in their earlier cultural type of lifestyle who are the real people we are trying to help? Do they recognise, do you think, that they have solutions for the new generations who have come after them? Minister, in that question, because it talks about the traditional owner here, are they the best people to seek solutions for what we believe are the problems to solve?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Just clarifying, the reason why 'traditional owner' is being defined here is because, as I discussed earlier, if you are an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person, you have a right to stand for election and you may choose to do that where you live, even though that is not where your cultural heritage derives from. For example, there are many APY people, Anangu, who live in my electorate some of the time or all of the time. A member of the Pitjantjatjara mob might well choose to stand in Adelaide but nonetheless has a cultural heritage that clearly ties back to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands.

At the same time, someone may say, 'Even though I live in Adelaide most of the time, I wish to stand in a place where I have my traditional ownership, where I have my cultural heritage.' This definition enables a mechanism for defining how the person would be able to say that that is where they want to stand. I think the earlier part of the member's question is more an esoteric one about the role which traditional culture plays, and I will not seek to answer that. We can have a conversation some time about my opinions, but I think in terms of the way in which this legislation is written, that is an important definition in order to facilitate the capacity for people to choose to stand for election in either place but not both.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7.

Mr TEAGUE: Clause 7 is one of those changes that arose from the second engagement round, so I have one eye on the first draft that was attached to the engagement report August to October, and one eye on the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill of 2021 and 2022. This takes us back to my opening in relation to the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council. The clause as it was in the draft—and it was then clause 7 of the draft—is in precisely the terms of clause 9 of the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill, and clause 9(2) in the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill translates to clause 7(2) in the draft of the Voice Bill. I here acknowledge the work of parliamentary counsel in relation to the Representative Body Bill, and all the way along.

It is trite but hard to resist again, in the context of the Premier's remarks, that parliamentary counsel's work in relation to engaging with me in the course of the process of considering this bill and amendments, as well as their work in terms of preparing the bill that we are now stepping through, was certainly made considerably more straightforward by the fact that there had been work done on the subject of the bill in 2021 and in 2022; indeed, the bill that is sitting on the private member's *Notice Paper*, including clause 9(2) as it was and clause 7(2). That is by way of lead-up.

The point of substance is that, as we have seen, the new clause as the minister described to me on my one and only substantive opportunity to hear from him in the lead-up to this on 24 January was introduced in response to many of the 42 submissions that were received in the second round from Aboriginal bodies of various kinds saying, 'Okay, go ahead with your initiative but,

as advised, just don't step on our patch, just don't engage or change what we are presently doing,' and, if I might say with a little bit more force, in many of those cases going further to say, 'We are not actually convinced about the efficacy of this model and, in expressing something that perhaps rises to not greater than ambivalence, we urge upon you to at least step away from a model that is expressed in terms of ARB 9(2) or First Nations draft 7(2), which was expressly geared in terms of requiring the body to engage, consult, develop, reform, bring everybody along.'

We now see a clause 7 that expressly says completely the opposite. It says, 'Nothing to do with anything else, we won't be stepping on your toes,' and goes back to the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council and the reform or lack thereof in that regard and what we are seeing, which is a compartmentalising of groups and activities, including the addition of a group that is now expressly to operate in a universe on its own. It is important to put that context on the record, and I will say more when it comes to the particular form of engagement with the parliament.

The risk is that, in stepping through a process that has led to the change in clause 7, you are rendering the whole exercise unambitious and ineffective as well as, in terms of engagement, incoherent, because it is designed to step away from being coherent, and reforming the existing structures. Instead, it creates a new compartmentalised body that has, as it were, expressly removed from its remit the objective that we found in both the ARB and the first draft of this bill.

That is—and I say it for the sake of completeness—to the extent that they are performing a function, the ARB, or the State First Nations Voice as set out in the draft, must take reasonable steps to consult with and express views of that person or group they are engaging with. So we have seen a step away from that. I have characterised that in terms of a step away from ambition in terms of functionality, and I wonder if the Deputy Premier might be able to shed any more light on the reasons for that change in course from draft to what we see in the bill now.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am not going to agree with your characterisation of the origins of this clause, having been the old clause 7(2) in the previous bill. That was drafted by the previous government and removed deliberately on the basis of its ineffectiveness, we felt, and that it was unnecessary once the consultation was undertaken.

Mr Teague interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Sorry, the original draft. The purpose of this clause is to ensure that it is beyond doubt that this piece of legislation does not stop the functions of other activity that Aboriginal people participate in. It may well be that the government makes other choices about the existence of other bodies but not as a direct result of the existence of this piece of legislation; that is what it is trying to do.

I think it is also acknowledging that the Voice is not the one chance that Aboriginal people get to interact with civil society and with government, that this is now their one and only place to have a voice on anything in any jurisdiction on any matter. The Uluru Statement from the Heart does not ask that everything else be abolished and be replaced by a Voice mechanism. What it says is, 'We have not been heard by parliament, we do not have a way of expressing, and we would like one.'

So this, as a result of the consultation, was regarded as the way in which we would ensure this piece of legislation acknowledges that there are other ways in which interactions occur and does not in itself bring an end to any of those.

Mr McBRIDE: Thank you for that explanation and that goes some way to helping me ask my next question, Deputy Premier. When this clause 7 states that it is not meant to impose and affect the way of life of Indigenous or Aboriginal South Australians and even Torres Strait Islanders, my question to the Deputy Premier then is: does that mean that parliament, with its standing orders and its agenda, is going to have to be more nimble to make sure that it can meet the cultural importance of the members who do want to come to parliament, knowing that I and all MPs in this chamber, 47 of us, have to come in on 16 weeks in a normal sitting year? Obviously, when we have legislation and processes that we may be considering for the Voice, how do you guarantee that the parliament will meet cultural importance, activity and time lines?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Again, I want to try to answer the question, although I do not believe it is explicitly tied to this question of the existence of other bodies and that this legislation does not in

itself prevent those other bodies from existing or acting. The question is nonetheless an interesting one about the way in which we will behave differently as a result of the existence of the Voice and the fact that in this legislation people from the Voice, representatives, are able to speak to us here about pieces of legislation. There will be a way in which parliament responds to that.

There is a clause that says that nonetheless parliamentary activity can occur—it is clause 40, so some distance away from where we are now—recognising that, for example in times of COVID, we passed legislation very, very quickly because we needed to because we were in a pandemic. So in terms of the nimbleness that might be taken away from us, that nimbleness is preserved further on in the bill. In terms of nimbleness in being able to accommodate having a representative of the Voice speaking to us, that is one of the challenges and opportunities that this piece of legislation offers us.

You do not get to wear these badges, do an Acknowledgement of Country, be friends with Aboriginal people and respect their culture without being required to do something, in my view, without being required to consider the impact of the existence of Aboriginal culture. That means the way in which we conduct ourselves outside as well as inside this chamber ought to be influenced by the fact of our reconciliation process, which this is a very big part of but is not the whole story of reconciliation for this nation.

Mr McBRIDE: I do understand the way you have tried to answer this. It is almost like I am getting the wrong end of the stick, and my apologies for that. Clause 7 says the act 'does not limit functions of other First Nations persons or bodies'. I just think if this parliament is going to discuss and resolve and find solutions, it will be in a legislative form. The First Nations may want to participate and involve themselves in the parliamentary processes. I am reading this as though the parliament now has to become more nimble and more adaptive to meet the requirements of clause 7, otherwise you are going to miss them.

They might have something more important to be doing out where they come from than to be able to turn up here in this chamber at the right time at the right place and have their voice heard. The question is: does the minister believe at all that the parliament has to become more nimble to meet the requirements of First Nations persons and representatives with all their cultural and important ceremonies and requirements, which can be given because of a death in the community or a very important meeting and cultural practices?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Again, I do not think it is this clause, but I do not think that matters because this clause is simply saying the APY Executive runs the APY. The existence of the Voice does not stop them doing that. It is just saying that the work that occurs with other bodies that Aboriginal people are involved with continues, exists and is not taken over, subsumed, by the Voice.

Nonetheless, the question you ask is about the way in which parliament conducts itself in order to facilitate an Aboriginal person who may, as a representative of the Voice, also have cultural obligations elsewhere, which I think is the connection that is being drawn, and therefore would be unable to come to give a representation at a particular time. It may be that when we have passed this piece of legislation and contemplate any changes to standing orders there may be accommodations considered, but it may well be that there will not need to be.

People who choose to be on the Voice will take their responsibilities very seriously, as we do as members of parliament. There will be a number of members of the Voice and therefore a number of opportunities for ways in which they might wish to interact. I would be surprised if, on every piece of legislation that we debate, a member of the Voice would want to come and address us. I would be surprised, although without prejudging choices that the Voice will make. I think what is more likely is that for the bills that are of interest to the Voice there will be a consideration made about whether they make representations through a report or in person, and our standing orders will accommodate how that can occur.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

Mr TEAGUE: We are here talking about the functions of the Local First Nations Voices. I refer here to submission 23, the submission of AMYAC dated December 2022 and in response to the second round of engagement. The second recommendation of AMYAC is that the draft bill be amended to limit the Local Voice's functions to exclude matters concerning culture and country, noting the Local Voice is an inappropriate body to represent native title holder and traditional owner views on such matters.

I put the question to the Deputy Premier in this way: is it an example of the kind of compartmentalising that is at risk, given what we have seen clause 7 amended to? What capacity is there to reconcile the functions as set out in clause 15 on the one hand from the views expressed by the AMYAC board—and they are not the only one; it is an example of such a view—in this case in respect of the functions of the Local Voice?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The particular issue that is being referred to is around the question of native title. That is the concern that was largely raised in the submission, as I understand it. The Local First Nations Voice is not restricted on commenting on any particular matter of interest. We have not defined what matters of interest ought to be, and we are not restricting what comment might be made. That is very different to operating as a native title holder and making decisions.

Clause 7 makes it explicit that this Voice does not replace or prevent the activity of other bodies that exist, and clause 15 does not, by my reading, subsume the role of any native title group in making any decisions about native title. For that reason, the judgement is that there is no need to change that clause as a result of that submission.

Clause passed.

Clause 16.

Mr TEAGUE: It is here that once again we see an opportunity to compare the operations of the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council and the provisions of the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill against what appears to be a clear change of approach in relation to the prescription of meeting occasions, in this case for the Local Voice and the equivalent coming up in clause 29 for the State Voice as well.

We see in clause 16(2) a prescription that I think I have described in my second reading contribution as a prescription to meet rarely, that is, the Local First Nations Voice must meet four times but not more than six times each year. That is to be contrasted with the equivalent provision in the ARB that says 'meet at least so many times a year and go your hardest; be a body that engages'. Of course, in the ARB model there is a mode of engagement that is auguring towards perhaps much more frequent meeting in that the body would be engaging with a committee of the parliament. As we know, committees of the parliament meet as frequently as the parliament does. There is real meat and potatoes there. There is a real capacity to get on with it.

It has been described to me in terms of a rationale for this limitation approach as opposed to a minimum number approach as being about not making the obligation of a member appear to be more onerous than it ought to. Again, that might be characterised as a virtue or it might be something going to the real capacity for a body to be effective and productive. I wonder whether the Deputy Premier might agree or otherwise with that characterisation in terms of it appearing not too terribly onerous by constraining the number of meetings and whether or not there is any other rationale for constraining the meetings of the body.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Indeed, the rationale that was given by the Attorney in the other place, I think, is exactly as it has been characterised, that when people are considering whether they are going to stand for a Local Voice they need to have some sense of what the obligations are likely to be. It does not preclude Local First Nations Voices to meet out of session or in more informal circumstances but it does give a sense of what the obligations are like.

Although perhaps not prescribed by legislation, it is something that is pretty clear in government boards, for example. When I have approached people to see if they are interested in being on a government board one of their questions is usually, 'How many meetings are there?' to see if they are able to fit that into their schedule and their busy lives. The motivating factor is exactly to give that sense of this is the kind of obligation that is likely to be expected.

I have noted already that there may well be out-of-session informal meetings held, also noting that the minister is able to say that they can meet formally more if that is something that is asked for and there might be particular circumstances where that makes sense.

I will not say necessarily that Aboriginal people who are likely to stand are more busy than non-Aboriginal Australians standing for boards but I will say that my experience is that people who are in positions of leadership in the Aboriginal community are often asked to do a lot. There are a lot of appearances, and a lot of requests for advice. That often happens with minority groups where those people who become recognised leaders are often expected to be on a lot of committees and to provide a lot of advice. In order to not create an unending potential additional set of obligations for people who are likely to already be very much in demand, these clauses were regarded as being sensible to give some sense of expectation.

Mr TEAGUE: Again, I am grateful for the Deputy Premier's response in that matter and I hope that the Deputy Premier is right about that. If I might provide an alternative, it is that there is a risk in terms of a constraining of this kind that you head into territory where the body is actually meeting so rarely that there is not the capacity to form the sort of corporate momentum that one might expect of a—however you want to characterise it: momentous, significant, new, reforming—step. If I might put it in an even more jaundiced view, the risk that there is a titular or ceremonial aspect to the role if they are meeting only so rarely as that many times, and so the stress is therefore to have the opportunity to prove up the capacity to do the work.

It is not only me and it is not only the drafting of the ARB bill that is providing the model for an alternative. We see in the University of Adelaide's Public Law and Policy Research Unit's rather comprehensive submission and response to the second round, submission 35, saying, 'Well, if you are going to put a limit'—they are saying, effectively, read between the lines, why would you limit it? But if you are going to, then surely you ought to have the capacity to meet at least a dozen times a year before you start having to knock on the minister's door and say, 'Can we meet a bit more so that we can do some more work?'

I note that example of advocacy outside of my voice, and just express that concern that the body as it presently stands, if it is constrained to those four or not more than six meetings a year, it has that limited capacity to get on with it. I note in raising this to the minister that there has been some expression of willingness, should the body take a view that it wants to meet more often, but again it goes to the characterisation of the body and what in fact it is going to be doing and its purpose for operation. So I wonder: has the Deputy Premier considered the Public Law and Policy Research Unit's submission insofar as it goes to the frequency of meetings?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: All of the submissions were, of course, considered. I note that we have no amendment before us to do anything other than allow for the provisions as in the bill.

Mr McBRIDE: Regarding clause 16(2), 'Subject to this section, a Local First Nations Voice must meet not less than 4', what are the consequences of any Voice that does not meet four times, and what does the minister or the government do in regard to this outcome?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: There is no penalty attached to this clause, but we live in a world where we are voted for periodically, our positions; we are up to see if people will choose to have us again. It may well be that, in the event that a Local Voice did not meet and the membership were not doing that, they might have electoral consequences.

Mr McBRIDE: On that same clause, I have another question on clause 16(2). It may not be the fault of the committee. It may not be the fault of even the government if these four meetings are not adhered to or met. As I said, the difficulty can be capturing and gathering all the committee, the First Nations Voice committee, together. If they have come from far and wide, this can be a really difficult challenge and obviously, like all of us here, we would like to see the best representation, the best process to work through this. There being no penalties, I really do perhaps ask the Deputy Premier to again highlight, without going down the stick approach, what is the carrot here to make sure that four meetings are held, and if they are not, what other alternatives are there?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The main carrot is that, as for us, when you put yourself forward to be elected to do a job you tend to do it, because you get feedback from your constituency if you do

not do it. Probably an alternative way of answering your question is to talk about the resourcing that is implicit in having this clause and this institution, or this series of institutions. There will be laptops provided, there will be technological facilities for people to be able to beam in if they are not able to be physically present. I am struggling to think of a serious scenario where a government board, as an equivalent, simply does not meet because people are not interested.

What we have is an institution that is being established, a mechanism for meeting that is being established. People have to go to some effort to be voted on. They will be resourced to meet a minimum number of times and perhaps a maximum, depending on subclause (3), and we should have a reasonable expectation that that will simply occur, without need for penalty and without need for explicitly talking about incentives.

Mr McBRIDE: Clause 16(9) states, 'A Local First Nations Voice must have accurate minutes kept of its meetings.' The resources towards these minutes, is it going to be a Voice representative? Is it going to be a government representative? If it is a government representative, are we accepting that the Voice and the committee, and the representatives who are on these Voices, First Nations committees, are going to have a full trust and belief that these minutes will be accurate?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: There will be a secretariat to support these Local First Nations Voices. The Voice will make its own determination on the way in which it wants to take its minutes, but there will be resources available to support that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 and 18 passed.

Clause 19.

Mr McBRIDE: I refer to clause 19—Duty to act honestly. Could the Deputy Premier please inform the committee what the consequences are if this act is not adhered to?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: To answer the second part first, one can be removed from office if found not to be complying with this. The reason for having this clause is that Voice members are not public sector members, who are otherwise governed by a code of conduct, so it therefore essentially exists in this clause.

Mr McBRIDE: In regard to the duty to act honestly—and obviously the representatives are on the Voice and in these committees and in these regional groups—I am just wondering how the government will action all the evidence, information and data that is gathered, and perhaps the intel from local constituents that are giving feedback, in relation to opportunities and changes and for the betterment of life for Indigenous South Australians. What happens if the information coming from the Voice committees is found not to be representative? And we need to recognise that it will be really hard for these representatives to balance and formulate ideas and policy of a collective, from the beginning of this whole process.

One of the things that I think we could perhaps see—and it may come to media, it may come as a public demonstration—is a community feeling that they are not being represented fairly. I just wonder how the government, or any government, can work through this duty to act honestly. If information is seen to be not representative of a community's will, is this the sort of process that could clear the slate and start again, for example?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I would just draw a little distinction here between a member of a Local Voice acting honestly and not agreeing with the views that are being put by the community that has elected them, which election we do occasionally. This clause is about acting honestly in the legal sense. The Voices will be covered by ICAC, by the Ombudsman, by police, but if a member of the Voice is not representing, in the opinion of the community, the community's views, the same as what happens with us, they are up for election, and that might mean that they are not re-elected. There is a democratic element of this, which is a hygiene mechanism, as it is for us, but separate to the legal meaning of 'acting honestly'.

Clause passed.

Clause 20 passed.

Clause 21.

Mr McBRIDE: I really do want a success here, and this will be one of those markers of success for the Voice, if you are going to represent Indigenous South Australians. Minister, I have probably already asked a question earlier on this, but I am now going to ask a second one: what does the minister see as a successful election process and number turnout amongst the Indigenous populations in this process of electing the members?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The main test of success is likely to be that there are sufficient people standing to fill the positions, or to more than fill the positions. If it is a question of voter turnout—the number of people voting—unlike for us, for local government it is not compulsory. It will be very interesting to see what happens. We are in new territory. Other than the analogy with local government, we are in new territory.

We will see what happens at the first election, we will see what happens when we are up to the fifth election what voter turnout is like. As I say, the main criteria for success in my view—and I am unable to speak entirely for the Attorney who may have additional views—would be simply that there are enough people willing to stand to be part of this process.

Mr McBRIDE: I know that I have asked you this question, and you perhaps cannot answer, but I have to just try it to find out what the government's expectations might be of the success with voter turnout. May I say, I am actually pleased that it is not compulsory for Indigenous South Australians to have to vote. But if I was running this, and if I was pushing this type of voice process to represent the Indigenous populations, groups and communities, I would be aiming for above 50 per cent turnout or better. That would be a marker that we have the community engaged, they are giving due consideration to this process and they would have respect for the elected members to represent them through these communities.

I think South Australians, if we are going to bring this new process into parliament, and perhaps it is going to get legs—in other words, it is going to become valid, and it is going to become important to the solutions and the answers for Indigenous South Australians—obviously, the greater the turnout the better. It would have been just nice to hear perhaps even a stab in the dark of what the voter turnout percentage looked like that was good and one that was disappointing, and perhaps maybe there are other ways of doing this.

The CHAIR: Given the question you have just asked, the prior question, and given the way you structured that discussion, I will take that as a statement. If you want to rephrase that as a question, you will need to phrase it as a question.

Mr McBRIDE: Sure.

The CHAIR: If you phrase it as a question, it will be your third, okay?

Mr McBRIDE: Thank you, Mr Chairman. My question is to the Deputy Premier: what percentage of voter turnout is success for the government?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am not going to give a statistic on that for a number of reasons not least of which is that I am representing the Attorney-General in this chamber, rather than being the Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, and I will not speak on his behalf in particular, but also because we are in new territory. Even though the opposition has indicated a lack of support for the bill in this form, I believe that once it is through, all of us want to see it work. To set a criterion—that it may on its first occasion on one or more of the Local Voices not meet that criterion—would be a pretty disappointing way to start.

I would rather characterise it as: we would like to see as much voter turnout as possible, as much participation as possible, and we will do what is required to facilitate that to make it known to people that this is happening, to make it easy to engage, to provide the kinds of materials that would mean that it would be more likely that people would feel confident and knowledgeable to participate. I think that is a fair ask of the government in having put this up, that we do all that we can do to make it successful, rather than the reverse, where a measure is set that might be difficult in some instances to succeed at.

Clause passed.

Clauses 22 to 28 passed.

Clause 29.

Mr TEAGUE: It is here that I again make reference to submission 35, and the observation counts perhaps all the more with the Public Law and Policy Research Unit. They are there reflecting on the draft, so at this point there has been a clause change to the final. But they are clearly making the observation that for both Local and State First Nations Voices to meet as rarely as four times and not more than six times a year is inadequate and proposing that, should there be a limit, then it be a minimum of 12. The further suggestion is that consideration be given to removing the limit at all, as was the structure of the ARB. Unless the Deputy Premier has anything to add, I just note that for the purposes of completeness that submission 35 applied very much to both Local and State First Nations Voice.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I will also note that there are no amendments before the house on that but that there is the provision for the minister to approve more meetings and could do so in advance if that is something that begins to be feedback, and further that we have the reassurance of the review of the legislation, because we are in new territory, brand new, because we are the first state to do this, which is a matter of some pride. But that review I think will be very important in exactly this kind of matter where having experienced what the Voice is like and the workload and the expectations of members, there will be an opportunity to potentially recalibrate the number of meetings that are set as expectations.

Clause passed.

Clause 30.

Mr TEAGUE: We here come to another example of where there has been a change from draft to final, as it were. I might take the opportunity at clause 30 to address an issue that is in common to clauses 30 through 33, and then in turn to what has become a bit of an emphasis clause rather than a foundation clause in 34. From draft to final we saw a reflection on the structure that was the subject of the ARB in terms of who comes along and participates, and the representative body, the bill in 2021 as reintroduced by me last year, provides for the composition of the body to be diverse in a whole range of ways.

Feedback from draft to final on this bill was that there is a desire to have a range of different particular viewpoints but we are going to stick with a gender-only model for the purposes of funnelling up from Local Voices to State Voice but a response from that draft round feedback was that there be these statutory committees that are the subject of clauses 30 through 33.

The question perhaps then goes to one of autonomy and along the same lines as the stipulation about the number of times meeting. Why the need to stipulate the particular committees the subject of 30 through 33? I will confine myself to 30 if the Chair would prefer, but I can deal with a whole body in one go. As has been, as I understand, without reflecting on the debate elsewhere, I think a reasonable observation is: if you are going down the path of shoehorning in these subject matters and expertise and areas of subject matter focus committees in 30 through 33, why do you need 34 as well?

From an overall point of view, why not just stick with clause 34 and let the body decide for itself? If it needs to establish a subcommittee then, alright, it can do that and it can do it on the merits. Is this not an unnecessary round of, as it were, front-loaded bureaucracy whether it is needed or not on the one hand, and then retaining an unnecessary structure in terms of clause 34 once you have gone down that path?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am going to make reference to clause 34 as well as part of the answer.

The CHAIR: I am happy for you to answer if you need to go to clause 34.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I note again no amendment has been put forward by any other member of parliament to change this—

Mr Teague: Not in this place.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —in this place. The proposition here is that these advisory committees exist in order to recognise the diversity of experience of Aboriginal people in a way that is difficult to do when we are creating elected bodies, where people are chosen by a constituency. It is bringing together that combination of people's experience and the validity of making sure that the stolen generations are heard from, that youth are heard from, that elders are heard from and, importantly, that native title bodies are heard from. That is of relevance to being heard but is not able to easily be accommodated in a body that is elected. This is the proposition that has been put forward as a way in which to manage all of that.

The reason I want to make reference to clause 34 as well is that these are not subject matter experts; these are people of lived experience in each of those categories. Subject matter expertise is contemplated really for clause 34, where, as an example that has just been put to me which I think is excellent, should there be a piece of legislation on child protection, it might well be that the Voice would wish to establish a committee with expertise in child protection in order to assist them in contributing. That is where subject matter expertise might well be legitimate, whereas as the others, as I say, are a legitimate approach to recognise the full richness of experience, all of which is valid in creating a Voice to Parliament for the first time.

Mr McBRIDE: On clause 31—First Nations Youth Advisory Committee—

The CHAIR: I am happy to deal with clauses 30 to 34.

Mr McBRIDE: That is what I thought I heard; thank you, Mr Chairman. Deputy Premier, clause 31—I may have overseen this—talks about a Youth Advisory Committee, and there is no mention of age. Could you inform the parliament what the age is going to be of this Youth Advisory Committee?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: 'Youth' and 'elder', these are cultural definitions that we have. Just as an aside, it was always felt that being 18 was the moment, more generally, when you stopped being a youth and became an adult. I do not know about other people's experience with their children but I think that age is shifting culturally in our nation generally and that indeed 26 is one proposition. It is not that there is a biological determinant of what constitutes a young person or constitutes an old person, it is a cultural decision that we collectively make.

In order to recognise that general truth in the creation of these advisory committees, the proposition is that the Local First Nations Voice gets to determine what constitutes a youth for their purposes.

Mr McBRIDE: Moving on to clause 32—Stolen Generation Advisory Committee, we all understand that there have been a number of matters and relations regarding that type of process. I did hear the Deputy Premier talk about child protection in her previous answer to the member for Heysen and that was that they may need child protection expertise on this committee.

Obviously, there were a lot of bad experiences out there that we heard about regarding the stolen generation and the consequences that happened but there were also a lot of good ones. I was wondering whether those positive outcomes would be allowed to be on this committee so they could advocate for the good things that may turn out for these types of processes so that it is not just something that is considered an evil process or something that was really bad yet had mixed results.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Again, I think this is an almost philosophical discussion for us to have in the members' bar rather than seeking to make any amendments here, of which there are none before us. The experience of stolen generations I am reluctant to speak too much to because I have no cultural authority or lived experience other than learning from those who have had that experience and have talked to me. With that caveat, I say that every childhood is a unique experience that one would hesitate to call either good or bad because, like the curate's egg, it is usually made up of different parts.

That is still more true for someone who has been removed from their parents for whatever reason—and I speak as someone who was child protection minister for three years—their experience of that removal will be characterised by themselves as they experience it and as they look back on it as adults. It is not for us to put a label on that.

Still more complex: when the removal was, in very, very many cases, based exclusively on skin colour and culture, to say that a child who was removed was loved by people they were then sent to is a truth in some cases. To say that there could therefore be no pain would be impossible. I will trust the State First Nations Voice in identifying people to be part of this advisory committee, that they will seek to be advised by the full experience of that time in our history.

The CHAIR: Are there any other questions or comments on clauses 30 to 34 inclusive?

Mr TEAGUE: Just while we are in en bloc mode, in terms of clause 33, bearing in mind it is draft to final and we have the benefit of submission 41—that is the letter to the commissioner and to the minister from the 28, I think, chairpersons and leaders of the South Australian native title groups and First Nations—is there a view expressed by Native Title Services about how their participation or otherwise might be facilitated by clause 33, given it has come after the letter?

Again, in circumstances where Native Title Services might be chief, if not leading, among those advocates that might have led to the change of tack in clause 7, have they expressed a view expressly about clause 33 and is it anticipated that there be some expectation that Native Title Services and the authors of submission 41, for example, might be expected to be likely candidates for participation on that committee?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I have no official record of an official position post this drafting, and I would therefore not in any way seek to speak for that organisation. I do, however, note the participation of the native title bodies in the selection of people, or in the identification of people.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, do you wish—

Mr TEAGUE: Well, I might do, but I see the member for Elizabeth is on his feet.

The CHAIR: I will allow one more question. I would be keen to finish this block off.

Mr ODENWALDER: I yield, sir.

The CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I would like to finish this block off. Since I have opened up the floor for questions, I think that we should finish the floor. Member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you for your—no, I think I have addressed the relevant submissions along the way, so thanks very much for dealing with that en bloc. No further questions on that.

Clauses 30 to 34 passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (WOMBAT BURROWS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. N.J. Centofanti to the committee in place of the Hon. L.A. Henderson (resigned).

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. B.R. Hood to the committee in place of the Hon. N.J. Centofanti (resigned).

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LEGALISATION OF MEDICINAL CANNABIS

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. B.R. Hood to the committee in place of the Hon. L.A. Henderson (resigned).

Bills

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (DOMESTIC ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:34 the house adjourned until Wednesday 22 March 2023 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION FUND**

In reply to **Mr PEDERICK (Hammond)** (9 February 2023).

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs):

Seven ex-service organisations and community groups from across South Australia have secured funding from the 2022-23 grant round for a range of projects across the state.

Organisation	Grant Amount	Grant funding purpose
Veterans MC Mid-North Chapter Inc.	\$11,875	Upgrade/enhancement of facilities at existing memorial
District Council of Kimba	\$5,995	Creation and installation of ANZAC memorial display in the Kimba Memorial Garden
Barossa Light Horse Historical Association Inc.	\$12,860	Replacement of trailer to transport and store historical displays for commemorative events
West Croydon and Kilkenny RSL	\$12,820	Upgrade lighting to RSL premises
RSL SA	\$4,750	Replacement of plaques on post World War II conflicts memorial to add additional names
SA Boer War Association	\$1,184	Publication and distribution of 'Boer War Dispatches'
Goodwood Saints Football Club	\$2,000	Anzac Day commemorative service and football match in partnership with the Unley RSL highlighting the significance of the Goodwood Oval cork trees

The total allocation has been updated to reflect the amount of \$51,484 which was incorrectly stated as \$48,300 in the Anzac Day Commemoration Fund Guidelines for round 2 of the 2022-23 fund. This changes the funds remaining total to \$48,516.