

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Wednesday, 22 March 2023

**The SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** took the chair at 10:30.

**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*

### CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY COMMISSIONER BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 March 2023.)

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:31):** I rise to support the Construction Industry Commissioner Bill. I think this is a tremendously important piece of legislation for the South Australian business sector, particularly within the construction industry. I think the timing—today would be a very good day for this piece of legislation to pass. If the government were to support this legislation—which I believe they will not, but I hope they will—it would be an opportunity for them to send a message to the business sector, which I think they have betrayed over the last 12 months, that they do in fact have the business sector's interests in mind and the broader South Australian community interest in mind, as opposed to what I believe their interests are, which is in supporting the union movement in South Australia.

I do not have a problem with the idea of the Labor Party supporting the union movement. The Labor Party exists as the political arm of the union movement. Certainly, I think in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as the union movement was forming, its role in developing modern Australia was critically important, and its role in addressing some of the terrible behaviours that were underway in the 19<sup>th</sup> and parts of the 20<sup>th</sup> century were tremendously important. But the role of the modern union movement in Australian life is quite different now from what it was then.

The union movement won many of the fights that needed to be won, and, indeed, there are laws in place and protections in place for workers—the rights of labour—and indeed to protect individuals and families in a way that there were not previously when the union movement was formed. I think that the very low membership, people voluntarily choosing to join unions, in most sectors in South Australia, certainly most sectors within private industry, highlights the different approach that most Australians take to that of the union movement. I do not think that the Labor Party, in focusing on the needs of the union movement, is focusing on the needs of the South Australian people.

When fewer than one in five, and far fewer than one in five people in private sector employment in South Australia choose of their own volition to join a union, I think that sends a message that many people in negotiations with their employer, or, indeed, in their professional lives as individuals, do not feel that the union movement is either needed or does in fact represent them. And yet, since the election of the Malinauskas Labor government, I would submit that the union movement has seen one of their own in charge and has acted accordingly.

Bad behaviours by union leaders are not necessarily new, but I think that the choices that the union movement have made in recent times highlight that they feel liberated to accentuate those bad behaviours. The CFMEU is obviously critically important to this bill, but there were other unions as well that saw themselves playing a key role in the last election and now, having secured the

leadership of this state by their man in the Leader of the Government, the Premier, they are acting accordingly.

At the same time as this, we have in Canberra a federal Labor Party in government that is removing the tough cop on the beat in the construction sector and, indeed, putting this critical industry for infrastructure development in our state, and the capacity for our nation and our state to build, and to build in ways that are affordable for government and for individuals, at significant risk. It is not just a cost argument, though, the way that the construction industry unions behave and add to costs; it is actual personal safety behaviour for many people. Issues related to coercion, issues related to bullying, issues related to thuggery are writ large through the actions of people involved in the construction industry union.

In South Australia, with the tough cop on the beat being removed at a federal level, and the election of the Malinauskas Labor government, if it is coincidental it is at the very least a very unfortunate coincidence that this coincides with the takeover of the CFMEU in South Australia by the Victorian CFMEU—by John Setka and his mates, a group of people who seem to be on charges every year for bad behaviour on worksites and elsewhere. This is a union that donated \$125,000 to the ALP at the last state election.

When urged by the opposition extensively to donate that money to a domestic violence charity, a worthy cause that might reflect some of the damage that people within the CFMEU have done within our community, the ALP and the Premier did eventually form the view that they did not want to be tainted with that money anymore, so what did they do? They gave it back to the CFMEU who could then use it for whatever purposes they wanted.

One thing that the CFMEU did with their funds last year was to put massive posters on the sides of our public transport facilities, such as trams going down North Terrace, trams going down King William Street emblazoned with the larger-than-life photo of John Setka. There were extraordinary behaviours by the union movement, standing in Victoria Square chanting 'union power' or similar slogans in scenes that I do not think that most of the South Australian people would have thought even possible.

They were very unseemly, very unusual and extraordinary scenes. Groups of people in the CFMEU headquarters were chanting 'union power, union power, union power' at a time—coincidentally, I am sure—when vehicles and property of the Master Builders Association down the street were damaged. This is not an okay state of affairs. The Premier's endeavours to distance himself from the behaviours of people in the CFMEU, or apparent behaviours by people apparently in the CFMEU, would be given a lot more credence if the Labor Party would support this bill being put forward in good faith by the opposition.

The small businesses, the sole traders, the tradies, members of groups like the MBA and the MTA that members of the government have been eager to highlight their good relationships with in recent times would take a lot of comfort, a lot of reassurance that, if they have had trust in this government, that trust was not misplaced if the government were to support a bill of this nature—a bill that would provide for a construction industry commissioner who will promote the rights of building and construction industry participants, respect for the rule of law and work health and safety. We are proposing a commissioner who:

- would facilitate and encourage the fair treatment of building and construction industry participants in their commercial dealings with each other or in relation to any other matters generally relating to their workplaces;
- would act as a one-stop shop for the building and construction industry to register concerns relating to safety, industrial actions, allegations of coercion and threatening behaviour or any relevant matters;
- would facilitate the resolution of complaints through measures such as mediation and making representations on behalf of notifiers and complainants in accordance with relevant legislation, such as the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act and the Work Health and Safety Act;

- would monitor and advise the relevant minister about practices that may adversely affect building and construction industry participants;
- would provide an annual report that would have the power to compel individuals to provide information that the commissioner requires to undertake functions under the act;
- would have the power to direct matters to state authorities, such as SAPOL, and the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs following receipt of a complaint or inquiry from a building and construction industry participant if it is the opinion of the commissioner the matter should be referred; and
- would have the power to direct matters to federal authorities, such as the Commonwealth Ombudsman or the Office of the Fair Work Ombudsman, following receipt of a complaint or inquiry if it is the commissioner's opinion the matter should be referred.

They would be able to suspend work, health and safety entry permits if satisfied that the work, health and safety permit holder has contravened the Work Health and Safety Act. However, before suspending such a permit, they would need to give notice to that permit holder of the proposed suspension with a 21-day period for that person to show why the permit should not be suspended.

There are many examples where the federal commission of this nature has been able to act in worksites to prevent people from behaving in bullying, thuggish behaviours that have put people's personal safety at risk, businesses at risk of their economic future and projects at risk of their delivery.

The removal of the federal commission, I think, is a clear sign from the Labor Party that their interest is solely on supporting the interests of the union movement and the people in the union movement who are leading these behaviours, rather than the interests of the South Australian community and workers who choose not to become a member of that union or, indeed, businesses or the broader community in South Australia and Australia.

In this bill, we have an opportunity to set the balance right, at least here in South Australia, and I urge the government to support the bill. I urge them to do so today. A year after they have won an election, they could finally repay some of the faith that some members of the business community put in them. I suspect that they will not and they will stand condemned if they vote against it. I commend the bill to the house.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:41):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....22  
 Noes.....15  
 Majority .....7

AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.P.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.	Michaels, A.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.
Wortley, D.J.		

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Bell, T.S.
Cowdrey, M.J. (teller)	Ellis, F.J.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Marshall, S.S.	McBride, P.N.	Patterson, S.J.R.

Pederick, A.S.  
Teague, J.B.

Pisoni, D.G.  
Telfer, S.J.

Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

## PAIRS

Malinauskas, P.B.  
Speirs, D.J.

Pratt, P.K.  
Hutchesson, C.L.

Fulbrook, J.P.  
Hurn, A.M.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

**ELECTORAL (TELEPHONE VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November 2022.)

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:47):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....	24
Noes.....	14
Majority .....	10

## AYES

Andrews, S.E.  
Boyer, B.I.  
Clancy, N.P.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)  
Picton, C.J.  
Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brown, M.E.  
Close, S.E.  
Hood, L.P.  
Michaels, A.  
Pearce, R.K.  
Savvas, O.M.  
Thompson, E.L.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Champion, N.D.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Piccolo, A.  
Stinson, J.M.  
Wortley, D.J.

## NOES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Ellis, F.J.  
McBride, P.N.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Telfer, S.J.

Batty, J.A.  
Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)  
Patterson, S.J.R.  
Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.  
Marshall, S.S.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Teague, J.B.

## PAIRS

Malinauskas, P.B.  
Speirs, D.J.

Pratt, P.K.  
Hutchesson, C.L.

Fulbrook, J.P.  
Hurn, A.M.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUSTICE MEASURES) BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (10:51):** I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MINISTERIAL DIARIES) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:53):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....24  
 Noes..... 14  
 Majority ..... 10

**AYES**

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.P.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)	Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.

**NOES**

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.	Gardner, J.A.W.	Marshall, S.S.
McBride, P.N.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G. (teller)	Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.
Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.	

**PAIRS**

Fulbrook, J.P.	Speirs, D.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.
Hurn, A.M.	Malinauskas, P.B.	Pratt, P.K.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Motions*

**WORLD DOWN SYNDROME DAY**

**Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:00):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that 21 March 2023 is World Down Syndrome Day;
- (b) notes that World Down Syndrome Day is held each year on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of the third month to signify the triplication of the 21<sup>st</sup> chromosome, which causes Down syndrome;
- (c) notes only 8 per cent of people with Down syndrome are in open employment, with the majority working in Australian Disability Enterprises; and

- (d) applauds the work of the state and federal governments on their work with people with disability, carers, family members and stakeholders in reforming the disability employment sector.

On 21 March, we celebrate World Down Syndrome Day, a day that is dedicated to raising awareness about Down syndrome and advocating for the rights, inclusion and wellbeing of people with Down syndrome. Down syndrome is a genetic condition that occurs when there is an extra copy of chromosome 21. It is the most common genetic cause of intellectual disability, accounting for approximately 15 per cent of people with intellectual disability, and it is estimated that there are between 13,000 to 15,000 individuals with Down syndrome in Australia.

World Down Syndrome Day is celebrated on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of the third month to signify the triplication of the 21<sup>st</sup> chromosome, which causes Down syndrome. The day was first observed in 2006 in several countries around the world, and in 2012 the United Nations officially recognised World Down Syndrome Day. Since then, this day has become an opportunity to celebrate the achievements and the contributions of people with Down syndrome and to advocate for their rights and inclusion in all aspects of society.

As we celebrate World Down Syndrome Day, we need to remember that creating a kinder, more inclusive community is not just a one-day event: it is a continuous effort that requires our collective commitment and dedication. I can confidently assure the house that the Malinauskas government is fully committed to this cause.

One of the key areas where we need to do better is in disability employment. People with Down syndrome and other disabilities often face significant obstacles when it comes to finding employment, leading to feelings of isolation, low self-esteem and financial insecurity. Data from the National Disability Insurance Scheme reveals that only 34 per cent of people with Down syndrome over the age of 25 years have a paid job, compared to 76 per cent of those without Down syndrome.

Despite that, most participants are eager to work and have listed finding employment as an important goal in their NDIS plan. Of those who are employed, only 8 per cent are in open employment, with the majority working in Australian Disability Enterprises. Seventy-two per cent of all NDIS participants with Down syndrome are employed in an Australian Disability Enterprise.

As a society, we need to do better. We need to work to create more opportunities for people with Down syndrome and other disabilities to enter the workforce and to contribute to our community. We need to ensure that workplaces are accessible, inclusive and free of discrimination and we need to provide the necessary support to enable people to thrive. Beyond employment, we need to value diversity and recognise the unique contributions that people with Down syndrome can make to our community.

This year's World Down Syndrome Day theme of With Us Not For Us is a powerful reminder that supporters, community leaders and the government have to make decisions together with the community, not for the community. This message is being heard loud and clear by both state and federal governments. Our Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Nat Cook MP, recently appointed 12 people to her Disability Advisory Council, which will provide invaluable advice to government on issues that are of utmost importance to the 330,000 South Australians with a disability, to their families and to their carers.

Recently, consultation opened on the Disability Inclusion (Review Recommendations) Amendment Bill 2022, a direct result of feedback from the 2022 independent review of the act. This bill responds to the final report's proposed legislative changes. The Disability Inclusion Act is an important part of South Australia's legislative framework, designed to foster full inclusion of people with disabilities in the South Australian community and to empower them to reach their full potential as equal citizens.

The act promotes human rights in SA in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and interacts with national strategies, statewide initiatives and the NDIS. The public can have their say on this until 6 April. It is an important piece of legislation, and the review opportunities are invaluable.

People with Down syndrome have unique strengths and abilities and have so much to offer our world. They bring joy and happiness to those around them, and they remind us of the importance

of kindness, compassion and love. In the week of World Down Syndrome Day, let us celebrate the achievements and contributions of people with Down syndrome, and let us pledge to do more to ensure that they are fully included in our schools, our workplaces and our communities. Let us work together to create a world that celebrates diversity and recognises the value of every human being not just on this day but every day.

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:06):** I rise today to speak on the motion brought forward by the member for Davenport in regard to World Down Syndrome Day, held each year on 21 March. The motion reads:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that 21 March 2023 is World Down Syndrome Day;
- (b) notes that World Down Syndrome Day is held each year on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of the 3<sup>rd</sup> month to signify the triplication of the 21<sup>st</sup> chromosome which causes Down syndrome;
- (c) notes only 8 per cent of people with Down syndrome are in open employment with the majority working in Australian disability enterprises; and
- (d) applauds the work of the state and federal governments on their work with people with disability, carers, family members and stakeholders in reforming the disability employment sector.

I do have one small amendment that the opposition would like to add to the motion, namely:

- (e) that calls on all governments to work to increase the percentage of people with Down syndrome in open employment across South Australia.

I am pleased to rise to make my contribution on this important motion. This is a very important global awareness day, now in its 18<sup>th</sup> year, and of course it has been observed by the United Nations since 2012.

In Australia, it is estimated that approximately 1 in 1,100 babies will have Down syndrome. With the birth rate as it is in Australia, this means that almost 300 babies each year are born with Down syndrome. It is pleasing that the life expectancy of those with Down syndrome in Australia has significantly improved over the decades, with an average lifespan now of 60 years.

The theme for 2023 is With Us Not For Us. This theme is focused on fostering a human rights- based approach that views people with disability as having the right to be treated fairly and to have the same opportunities as everyone else, working with others to improve their lives.

As noted in the motion and referenced in the amendment I will soon make, only 8 per cent of people with Down syndrome are in open employment, and we would like to see this percentage increase. Many people with Down syndrome wish to find work but find it difficult to get a job. According to an NDIS survey, as was referenced by the member for Davenport, 62.8 per cent of people have listed a work goal in their NDIS plan but are not in paid employment. This would mean that there are more than 37,000 Australians with an intellectual disability and Down syndrome who do not have a paid job but would like one.

People with Down syndrome want to work for the same reasons as everybody else: to have their own independence, to contribute to society, to earn their own money, to learn new skills, to meet new people and to feel valued. That is the mission statement for employment of Down Syndrome Australia.

We know that the barriers to employment are often due to misplaced community beliefs, perceived low expectations and how formal employment support systems work rather than people with Down syndrome being valued and viewed as contributing members of the workforce.

While there are many ways that this issue can be addressed, we do note that Down Syndrome Australia has a number of resources to encourage the employment of people with Down syndrome, work readiness programs for adults with Down syndrome, and to support people with Down syndrome to understand expectations and to identify their skills, capabilities and strengths. They have an Employment Connection Service that is run locally in most other states and territories to connect potential employers to people with Down syndrome, but unfortunately that is something that we do not have in South Australia yet.

In the spirit of the motion, which I believe to be wholly bipartisan, and in the spirit of World Down Syndrome Day, the theme for this year being With Us Not For Us, I think together this parliament should call on all levels of government to stand with those with Down syndrome and have an ambition to increase participation. I believe that the amendment being proposed adds to and strengthens this motion

Through my life I have had the fantastic opportunity of meeting, being good friends with, to be completely honest, and competing against a range of people with intellectual disabilities, including a number of people with Down syndrome. Each and every year, the member for Hurtle Vale and I are down with Special Olympics South Australia as they celebrate their local games. In more recent years, we have obviously had the opportunity to also host the national games here in South Australia, which has been a great thrill.

That ability to interact in a sporting sense is just another one of those key fundamental things that everybody seeks to have—to have not just the opportunity to have fulfilling employment but also the opportunity to participate in sport, to build those friendships and relationships that are important to us outside a work environment. They are the safety and support networks that allow us to fall back when things are going tough.

In that vein, it would be a good thing to recognise the leadership at Special Olympics South Australia and Matt Pearson and his good work over the many years. Also, given the local context of Henley and the area, to recognise SAPOL for their clear and definitive inclusion and participation in these events each and every year. They have run the Law Enforcement Torch Run alongside the Special Olympics events for a significant number of years now and their involvement and participation is very much enjoyed by all the participants at Special Olympics South Australia. The flame at times is larger than most of us would like but it is a very special part of what they do.

Government across all levels, whether that be law enforcement agencies, the parliament here today or more broadly the Public Service, I think there is still a lot that all of us can do to ensure that we raise the level of participation in the workforce not just in the area of those with Down syndrome as we discussed today, but more broadly across all sections of the disability community. That is, of course, one of the difficulties of disability, that we are not just referencing a group of people that is singular. There are many, many subfactions and many, many differences in those with disability.

No better example of that is the fact that you can have two people with the exact same disability who have differing levels of ability based on their life experiences, their support networks, the range of supports that they have had surrounding them and opportunity, for lack of a much longer list. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to many of these matters, but we can do better, we can do more, and we should be striving to have more people with Down syndrome in our workforces contributing their vast set of abilities and their vast set of values to our wider society, so I rise to support the motion and to move a small amendment to the motion proposed by the member for Davenport.

**The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (11:15):** I, of course, want to put my wholehearted support behind this motion moved by the member for Davenport and thank her for bringing this motion to the house. It is so very important in terms of providing and amplifying a voice for people in our community not just living with Down syndrome but associated intellectual disabilities, and also to amplify and to really draw attention to the community of allies around people with Down syndrome who do such a wonderful job helping people, supporting people, and helping to educate the community and bring to light what we see is a vision for a more equitable society.

March 21 is a very special day in our community, celebrating World Down Syndrome Day, so doing this today, and having been able to host a morning tea just now with a number of people, I think we are making it the week, the festival of Down syndrome this week in South Australia. I am really pleased as well to acknowledge some of the people who are in the gallery who are part of our community living with Down syndrome, allies supporting, families supporting, and the community wrapping around and ensuring that we are striving for that equitable society.



In 2019, as shadow minister for human services, I moved a similar motion. As the member for Colton just pointed out, we often cross paths talking about, addressing, attending many events with people in them, hosting them, holding them, and competing in them through Special Olympics. People living with Down syndrome and this community—I am sure the member for Colton does not mind me saying—has taught us a lot over recent years in terms of how we provide and ensure the community is educated to amplify and escalate this equity.

When I moved the motion, going back about four years ago, I think I made those commitments around ensuring that life should be better and will be better, and I think there are certain things that are changing to ensure that that actually is the case. Through progressive and strong leadership, I think people with Down syndrome thrive. I think we are putting in place a range of measures in our community. That strong progressive leadership that demands equity and is such an important thing is here. We are doing this together.

In terms of our policies from our government point of view, we are working to create that more inclusive society and we believe that equal opportunity should not be just a token phrase. You actually need to make the commitment to set the policies to do so, and we are creating a society where people are valued, people are respected, and diversity in all its forms is not just accepted but celebrated.

As minister, I am pleased to continue the work of my parliamentary colleagues before, such as the Labor Minister for Disabilities in our previous government, the member for Reynell. Katrine Hildyard led the introduction of the first Disability Inclusion Act. There was a lot of consultation, community movement and collaboration that happened to bring that piece of legislation together. This was passed in the last parliament under the previous government, and I have now been part of the team, through Human Services, that has led a review into that act.

Currently, as part of that review, the amendment bill is out for consultation. I will be bringing that bill to the house to respond to a number of legislative changes that have been proposed, which will, again, lock us into commitments and certainty that will provide for a more equitable community throughout this year. That amendment bill is currently on YourSAy. The submission opportunity is there until Thursday 6 April, and I encourage people to have a look at that and provide their input.

I also understand that, if you are unable to participate in that process online, please reach out to us or to the department to provide verbal input. We are happy to listen to what you have to say. Sometimes completing those online things is a little challenging, and we acknowledge that. We do understand and acknowledge that people with Down syndrome have a challenging collective of things in life that they face, which is a combination of the pure intellectual disability challenges but also the medical physiological challenges that happen. We know that creates a whole other issue for people and for families.

I spoke before on this, so I will not speak at length, but being an older mum, I knew the potential of the challenges that we could face as a family given the increased likelihood and prevalence of a number of chromosomal disorders that can happen as an older parent. We were prepared to face that as a family. I know that today, with a whole range of good policy settings and really active advocates through the NDIS, we can together make sure that life for people with Down syndrome is much stronger.

In fact, today I have been given three business cards from people who have their own social enterprises, such as T-shirts and different ranges of teas that are being created. I know the member for Reynell is a tea addict, so she will gratefully receive the contact details for this beautiful social enterprise that is happening up in Nairne. We know as well, joyfully, that people with Down syndrome now live longer, healthier, better quality lives, and that is because of changes that have been made. That is because we know what interventions are needed, and I look forward to working across the governments in terms of trying to ensure that this continues.

I want to comment quickly on the member for Colton's amendment. I will not support the amendment, not because of any political reason but because we really have not had a chance to look at it and what the implications are more broadly. On the surface, I just want to guarantee that the member for Kingston, the current federal Minister for Social Services, Amanda Rishworth, is doing a piece of work around disability employment reform, and we are absolutely in lock step in that.

Jobs must be good paying, jobs must be supportive for the people who are in them, and we do not accept the current situation.

If you as an employer make a commitment to improve your workplace culture, you can look no further in mainstream employment than to employ a person with Down syndrome to your team to lift the calibre, to lift the quality of individual in your workplace and to improve your workplace generally. I make the commitment that we will ensure that dialogue happens, that that narrative is ongoing and that we do much better in terms of employing people with Down syndrome.

In fact, I just spoke to young Will this morning, who tells me that he is very excited that he thinks one of the local football clubs might be able to offer him some employment in coming years. He is already setting that in motion. He is in year 7, and he has already reached out and asked for a job. He feels that if he nags them enough he is going to get one, and he has had very good musings. I will watch that journey.

We will not support the amendment, but we will make that guarantee that we are working with the federal government now very solidly on improving workforce outcomes. We will advocate very strongly for mainstream workplaces to employ more people with Down syndrome in order to lift the quality of their workplaces. I think they can do that as a priority. I think it is a great suggestion. I am happy to work with the member for Colton on that moving forward, but I will also talk about it with our team and see where that leaves us.

On World Down Syndrome Day yesterday, and today and everyday, please let us join together, link arms and celebrate the strength, resilience and unique abilities of people with Down syndrome and show our support and our gratitude for the allies and for everybody to reach their full potential. I commend the member for Davenport for this motion and commend the motion to the house.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:25):** I stand to support the motion. I also support the very sensible amendment by the member for Colton, because what it does is take the motion above platitudes. It actually makes a statement to the Down syndrome community that there is a measure being put in place here, and it is a very open measure. It is not a hard target like 20,800 apprentices and trainees, for example. It is a message to those who this is important to, which is all of us but those of us specifically affected, that the government and the parliament itself is bipartisan on its mission to see more people with Down syndrome working in the workforce outside of what we call Disability Enterprises or, the old term, sheltered workshops.

I have seen people with Down syndrome working actively in the mainstream. I met a very entrepreneurial young lady at the Healthy Collective day, when they had a day when people with disabilities were able to display the businesses that they had started. This particularly young woman had started a business of printing T-shirts with her artwork. I was so taken by the artwork that I bought one and wear it most evenings to bed as a nightshirt. It is an amazing bit of work. This was a young woman who was running a business. I think it shows an incredible drive and an incredible ability for anybody to start their own business. This particular woman was there being supported by her family of course, who were very excited and very proud of what their daughter had achieved at a very young age.

We have also seen a large increase over the period of the Marshall government of people with disabilities working in mainstream businesses through the support that employers received for bespoke designing of support for taking on an apprentice or a trainee. There was no such thing as a disability bucket of money. There was a bucket of money available for each apprentice or trainee, which was able to be designed specifically to support that apprentice or trainee. We actually led the nation in the number of commencements of people with disabilities in apprenticeships and traineeships by doing that—people moving away from Disability Enterprises and working in the workforce, whether it be a small business or a larger business. We are seeing a lot more awareness of what value people with disabilities can bring to the workforce.

So it is disappointing that the government will not support this motion, because this is the can-do part of the motion. The motion that was moved by the member for Davenport, unamended, is a bit like ticking the Like box on Facebook. Paragraph (e) calls for action, and it is very flexible in the action that can be delivered. It sends a very strong message that, yes, we are very pleased to

talk about it on days around World Down Syndrome Day, but this is an action that will be happening every day if this amendment is accepted by the government.

Of course, the government has the numbers, the government controls the chamber. They will be the ones who will decide whether this amendment is accepted. We have heard from the minister that it will not be accepted, which is disappointing. There is nothing political in this. This is just an addition to what is a very good motion in support of World Down Syndrome Day. Proposed paragraph (e) of the motion is actually in support of people with Down syndrome and their families, so I urge the government to either postpone the vote on this motion so they can consider this in their caucus or support the motion as it was put forward by the member for Colton.

**Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:30):** I rise to close debate on this motion and thank those who have spoken to it. I thank the member for Colton for his contribution and for sharing his clear passion for ensuring a more inclusive society for people living with a disability. I thank the member for Hurtle Vale, in particular for hosting a morning tea this morning to help celebrate those in our community with Down syndrome, and their families and carers. I also thank the member for Unley for his contribution in particular regarding the value that people with Down syndrome bring to the workforce.

I thank everyone for their contributions, and thank you to those who have come to attend in the gallery today. It has been lovely to share the morning with you and celebrate some of the wonderful people in our community with Down syndrome. I commend this motion to the house.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes .....	13
Noes.....	24
Majority .....	11

#### AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Cowdrey, M.J. (teller)
Gardner, J.A.W.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, P.N.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.
Whetstone, T.J.		

#### NOES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.P.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)	Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.

#### PAIRS

Pratt, P.K.	Malinauskas, P.B.	Speirs, D.J.
Fulbrook, J.P.	Hurn, A.M.	Hutchesson, C.L.

Amendment thus negated; motion carried.

#### HINDMARSH STADIUM UPGRADE

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:36):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the excellent progress of the over \$50 million Hindmarsh Stadium upgrade;
- (b) commends the former Liberal government for its commitment to investing in the new state-of-the-art facility that will host multiple 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup matches; and
- (c) notes that this was part of an over \$400 million investment into sport from the former state Liberal government across South Australia.

It is an exciting time to be in Adelaide at the moment as we know and we all cannot wait for the women's football World Cup to start here. It will be held, of course, in July and August of this year.

It is a tremendous time to be a soccer, or football if you prefer, fan in South Australia. How could you not be excited about the progress of the over \$50 million Hindmarsh Stadium upgrade? I was there only last weekend and I had the privilege of not only watching women's football but of course also the Adelaide United men where they played against Wellington Phoenix and it was a 5:1 result. It was absolutely electric. It was a packed night and so many people were there, which was fantastic to see.

This upgrade has enabled South Australia to host multiple rounds of the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup at our new state-of-the-art soccer stadium. We should not underestimate the power of holding the Women's World Cup here in Australia and, in fact, Adelaide hosting five of those matches. Did you know that up to two billion sets of eyes will be watching Adelaide when the Women's World Cup comes here to South Australia?

This over \$50 million upgrade enables South Australia to host five matches of the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup. This is a vision realised and made possible thanks to the former Liberal government. Without this upgrade to Hindmarsh Stadium, I think that there is absolutely no way we would have held these matches here in South Australia. We know that this upgrade includes the construction of new change rooms and that has enabled the stadium to host A-league women's games and about time too.

I am proud to have been part of the government that finally enabled women to play the sports that they love at the level that they deserve. It cannot be emphasised enough just how key this upgrade was in securing that winning bid. It was fantastic to hear on 26 June 2020 that Australia would actually host the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup. This is a major win for the country and very exciting for soccer fans right across the country. What was even more exciting was Adelaide learning that it would hold and host five matches, which presents an enormous opportunity. There will be a whole array of benefits that will be deduced from having these World Cup matches here in South Australia.

As I said, up to two billion sets of eyes will be watching South Australia during these games. That is absolutely enormous. When you consider and you compare that to, say, an AFL grand final where there might be three million or four million sets of eyes, here we are talking about up to two billion people who will be watching these games, and they will be watching these games being held right here in Adelaide.

Of course, this was following a highly successful tour. FIFA officials came through. They visited Hindmarsh Stadium in 2020, and of course they loved what they saw. Adelaide will host five rounds of this fantastic world-class sporting event, much in thanks to the former state Liberal government. We know that supporting women in sport was a major focus for the former government. We know that in supporting women's soccer we did not just have a task force, what we did is we actually backed it up with money. We backed it up with money. We invested \$26 million into the State Centre of Football at Gepps Cross.

Those on the other side do not like hearing this, but the fact is, believe it or not, the Minister for Sport was not responsible for Gepps Cross, it was actually the former Liberal government. We invested several million dollars into the State Centre of Football at Gepps Cross and that will serve as the training camp for the Young Matildas soccer team, right in time for the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup.

This upgrade alone includes a 1,000-seat grandstand, show pitch, administration centre, function centre, two synthetic training pitches, and also multiple five-a-side outdoor pitches. All of these things were part of an over \$400 million investment into sport right across South Australia. This

side of the house could not be more excited about the FIFA Women's World Cup and its arrival in Adelaide, which will be played on a freshly upgraded Hindmarsh Stadium, courtesy of the former state Liberal government's investment.

It was a privilege to be able to play on this pitch recently. In fact, what I can say is that I am actually undefeated at Hindmarsh Stadium, with a whole range of my colleagues in this house. You should have seen the member for MacKillop, on this side of the house, streaming down the wing. With many of my other esteemed colleagues on the other side of the chamber, we participated in a charity football game to raise much-needed funds—I think over \$100,000 were raised, actually—for the victims of flood-affected areas.

All I can say is playing on that pitch was like playing on carpet. It was absolutely immaculate. That surface was absolutely immaculate. Unfortunately for me, I just did not get the delivery that I should have got—or the game time, in fact, that I should have got—to make sure that I scored that day. But all in all, it was played in good spirit. It was wonderful to see the fruits of the labour of all the people who were involved in putting that stadium together, that pitch together, but also that facility. It is quite a privilege to be able to play on that facility.

When you look at it now, you see a much better optimisation of the facility. It is much better for spectators. It is a better overall match-day experience. You can have corporate facilities on both sides, not just one. There are also refurbished patron facilities, much better disabled access, and, as I said, the pitch has been replaced. There are better corporate facilities, which are also essential for the longevity of the game, because we know that we have to attract those corporate sponsors to the facility as well. Overall, we are very excited to watch the Women's World Cup.

This week I attended with the Minister for Sport a reception at Government House, and all I can say is that we have done so well in this state to host these games here. We look forward to seeing the Matildas do well, and we wish them all the very best, but let's not forget that we simply could not have hosted these games if we did not upgrade this facility. We should be proud of that. We are really looking forward to the Matildas, and we wish them well in the upcoming World Cup.

As I said, up to two billion sets of eyes will be on us here watching the Matildas play in Australia. Two billion sets of eyes will be watching games that are hosted here in Adelaide. We should not underestimate that, and may it be one of many World Cup events that we continue to host. I would love to see the men playing here, maybe one day in the not-too-distant future playing here in Australia. We look forward to seeing the Matildas do well in Australia and New Zealand in July and August when the World Cup is on. I commend the motion to the house.

**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) (11:45):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraph (a) and insert:

- (a) notes the completion of the Hindmarsh Stadium upgrade;

Delete paragraph (b) and insert:

- (b) expresses its disappointment at the former Liberal government for its initial unwillingness to bid for Adelaide to become a host city for the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup; and

Delete paragraph (c) and insert:

- (c) commends the Malinauskas government for its vision and investment in sport, particularly for its work towards providing opportunities for girls and women to equally and actively participate in the sport they love.

In approximately 122 days, the FIFA Women's World Cup comes to South Australia. On Monday 24 July, Brazil will face Panama at our recently renovated Hindmarsh Stadium. When we see this match, and each of the five that we will host with the greatest footballers in the world taking to the pitch, it will be incredibly exciting.

As I have said before, it will be transformative; transformative because when we see women celebrated for being strong, physical, powerful and talented, the way women are seen changes. It will progress our collective effort toward gender equality. It will ensure that women are not seen as

people who only participate in sport through particular sorts of volunteering, but they are centre stage. This gives us unprecedented opportunities to shift the way that the roles women can play everywhere are seen and understood.

I anticipate that we will see a full stadium with many football-loving people and spectators attending to experience an opportunity that quite possibly—although we hope differently, as the shadow minister said—may not occur again in our lifetime. I can already visualise the drums being played by the Brazilian fans along Manton Street, as they march towards the stadium. Panama will be basing itself in South Australia for the entirety of its stay, and we cannot wait to welcome them here and celebrate their culture. When the game kicks off between the South American heavyweights and their Central American neighbours, I think only then will the true magnitude of this event really resonate with South Australians.

The new lights at Hindmarsh will shine bright as the clock counts down for the start of the match. The renovated media centre will be full of journalists from across the globe, covering the biggest sporting event in Australia since the Sydney Olympics. I think it is vitally important that this place note the completion of the upgrade to Hindmarsh Stadium which has, if it was ever in any doubt anyway, confirmed our stadium as the best football venue in Australia.

New light towers, big screens, food and beverage outlets, amenities and corporate seating complete a three-stage upgrade that commenced in 2021 and meets FIFA requirements to hold Women's World Cup fixtures. This is something South Australians always knew, and we are all so proud that our state, our city and our stadium will be broadcast to the world and to millions and millions of people, but it could have been very different for South Australia.

It almost seems unfathomable that a football state like ours would not be part of this global phenomenon that is the FIFA Women's World Cup. The reality is that it well and truly could have happened. How quickly those opposite forget about their conduct when Football Australia put out requests to state governments for the states to be part of the bid to be host cities. It is galling now to see the backslapping and attempts at self-congratulation. It seems rather apt to take this time to remind them about how exactly this process played out.

The previous government was on the public record as saying that it was not a good deal for South Australia, and they withdrew us from Australia's bid. Imagine contemplating turning your back on a tournament that is expected to attract a cumulative viewing audience of 1.5 billion people. Their former tourism minister was quoted as saying that Adelaide was out of the bid, following a comprehensive event analysis and stadium challenges. Hindsight is magical, of course, but how ridiculously inept does that sound now? He added that displacing hundreds of thousands of AFL fans for at least six weeks would be prohibitively costly and impractical. This is an excellent time to remind the house of an opening paragraph from an InDaily article at the time, which said:

The State Government did not contact the Crows, Port Adelaide or the AFL before ruling out Adelaide Oval as a venue for Australia's FIFA Women's World Cup bid...

Following a huge outcry from so many South Australians, and a petition signed by thousands of local football enthusiasts, they finally—finally—decided on participating in the bid. Maybe, until this point, they did not think Australia could win.

The member for Dunstan, then Premier, was paraphrased as saying in the media, 'An expanded event has ensured South Australia was able to negotiate to use Coopers Stadium as it is at the moment.' It seems they may not have even wanted to upgrade the stadium, but now they want to congratulate themselves for upgrading it. It seems those opposite have short memories and are now desperately trying to grasp onto the hope that the South Australian public has forgotten the initial disdain with which they treated this tournament.

As the shadow minister spoke about, I recently attended a FIFA Women's World Cup event, where the Chief Executive Officer of Football Australia, Mr James Johnson, spoke. I was really glad to see the member for Hartley there, and I am really glad that he now does support the event, which is great. James Johnson told the audience that the Matildas are now the fourth most recognisable national team in Australia.

I am really proud to be part of a government that recognises and values women's sport. I am proud to be part of a government that understands the significance and importance of investing in sport, whether it be at a national or at a grassroots level. I am proud to be part of a government where all members of the community, including girls and women, have an opportunity to equally and actively participate in the sport they love. We must ensure that women and girls have access to the facilities, training and equipment they need to pursue their sporting passion.

The state government has made several commitments to raise the profile and participation levels of women in sport in South Australia, including the election commitment to re-establish the Women in Sport Taskforce. Those opposite say they support women's sport and physical activity, but the truth is that it seems that the case is otherwise, and the proof is there for anyone to see. The \$24 million Female Facilities Program—cut. The program was so popular and oversubscribed, and we are now seeing the benefits. The Women in Sport Taskforce—cut. Instead of taking heed of the progress that was being made, they cut this task force and set back its progress four years. The synthetic surfaces program, a \$10 million program—cut.

The FIFA Women's World Cup is a generational moment for South Australia. The eyes of the world will be watching Australia and Adelaide. We have an opportunity to utilise the World Cup as a tool for change, not just for football but for sport and our community in general. I am deeply determined to ensure sport and recreation promotes and provides for a healthy, safe, inclusive and strong South Australia. We will not rest until we achieve this goal.

This government has committed a further \$1 million as the excitement of the FIFA Women's World Cup grows: to grow participation in football; to develop women's leadership; and to deliver programs in clubs, aimed at preventing violence against women and children. This legacy funding is aimed at ensuring we maximise the benefits of being part of the World Cup for now and the future. This funding is about ensuring our legacy makes a difference to women in sport and everywhere else for generations to come.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:54):** I rise to support the member for Hartley's motion. I want to recognise the success of what the \$53 million upgrade to Hindmarsh Stadium will mean to South Australia, not just to celebrate the world game that will host five rounds of the Women's World Cup in South Australia. It gives me an opportunity to reflect on my time as a young fellow, when I had the opportunity to go out onto the Hindmarsh Stadium pitch and compete for Woodville, before it then moved on to Woodville Birkalla. I was very honoured, back in those days, as a teenager, to go out onto that hallowed pitch and to be as proud as I was to have the opportunity to play the great game at Hindmarsh Stadium.

I am concerned that the minister will turn this into a political slinging match. It should be applauded that the former government put an investment into Hindmarsh Stadium—Coopers Stadium, as it is affectionately known—

**The Hon. K.A. Hildyard:** Look at the original motion. If you had left out that one line, we would have been fine.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** As I hear the background noise, I continue to recite that as a former shadow minister for sport the then member for Reynell used to come along to some of those sporting breakfasts. It was back then that women playing the great game were changing in the car park under a Labor government. They were changing two blocks away at the Entertainment Centre.

*The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:*

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Yes, they were, and that was under a Labor government. So what I would say—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister! Member for Newland! Member for Adelaide!

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Just hear me out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WHETSTONE:** You can gaggle on all you want; just hear me out.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Chaffey will not respond to interjections and interjections will cease.

**The Hon. K.A. Hildyard:** I love being explained to by the member for Chaffey about women's change rooms. It's excellent.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, minister! Member for Chaffey has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WHETSTONE:** The member for Reynell just cannot help herself.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Chaffey!

**Mr WHETSTONE:** She is more interested in a slinging match than she is about celebrating the great game.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WHETSTONE:** We should be here talking about South Australia's achievements. Having five rounds of a Women's World Cup qualifying in South Australia is a great achievement. It is a great stadium and it is multipurpose, not only for the great game but I have attended a number of concerts there, some of the great concerts that have come to Australia's shores. Dave Grohl and the Foo Fighters comes to mind. I think it has been one of the great venues for outdoor entertainment, apart from the great game. I do want to reflect on some of—

*The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:*

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I do not want to reflect on some of the selective commentary by the member for Reynell, because I do want to reflect on—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Reynell, come to order!

**Mr WHETSTONE:** —the five rounds of FIFA World Cup soccer this year. It is not only paving a way for future sporting opportunities in South Australia but particularly for women. We know that the world will have those two billion sets of eyes focused on Australia hosting the world game. It will be a focus on women's sport and I think it will be a generational change. It will give an opportunity for aspiring young girls and women to participate, to look at opportunities they might have.

Whether it might be a parent trying to promote sport within the family unit, or whether it might be an aspiring student or a young girl or young woman who is looking to be a part of that great game, I think that the upgrade of the Hindmarsh Stadium and hosting those five rounds of FIFA World Cup qualifiers here this year is just a game changer for sport, particularly for women. What we need to better understand is that we should be celebrating, we should be acknowledging what South Australia will be able to achieve.

We have upgraded the Hindmarsh Stadium; it is now fondly known as Coopers Stadium. But more importantly it is about a generational change. The upgrade of the stadium will also be complemented by the former Liberal government's \$400 million investment. While we have the Minister for Sport continuing to sledge that there were programs cut, she forgets to talk about the \$400 million that was put in to sport here in South Australia. That was \$400 million that accelerated sporting programs, that accelerated not only the fabric of sporting programs and facilities here in Adelaide but the opportunity for those facilities right round South Australia.

What I must say is we must understand that this is a great investment. It will boost regional economies and tourism, and it will encourage sporting development, it will encourage the opportunities for local talent, it will encourage participation and it will encourage those who are looking to excel in their chosen sport.



The increased accessibility to sporting facilities by the former government will have and has had lasting impacts, particularly in the great electorate of Chaffey. There was the Barmera Golf Club—nearly \$9,500 for installing automated irrigation and fairway upgrades. If we look at the Berri Barmera Council, it received \$142,500 for installing new air conditioning systems, insulation and cladding at the newly built Berri Sports Stadium. More than \$361,000 was provided towards the Barmera multisport change room and oval lighting. That is an outstanding outcome, just to name a few.

We cannot forget the Cobdogla Tennis Club. That is a tennis club in the very, very small community at Cobdogla that punches well above its weight. They are winning national awards. They are developing great young talent. I must say that to go out there and be a sponsor of that club warms the cockles of my heart—to see these young, aspiring sportspeople, tennis players, out there punching well above their weight. They are out there on a national circuit, and they are bringing home the accolades. They are bringing home the trophies that they are so proud of.

We also need to understand that over time we have seen the Berri Football Club receive \$150,000 to redevelop change room facilities, umpires' rooms, medical rooms, the parent change rooms underneath the memorial grandstand. In addition there is the Moorook Bowling Club. Now, there is a great little community on the banks of the River Murray, and they have done it pretty tough for a long time. They received nearly \$21,000 to install a synthetic bowling green. The synthetic bowling green has brought that club to the fore now. They are attracting people and they are attracting new membership, as well as putting up lighting there so that people can participate after hours, so that people can be attracted to what is one of the great generational sporting codes.

So I think sporting organisations by and large are contributing to the growth and prosperity of the regions, particularly in Chaffey. Promoting sport, promoting healthy activities, promoting healthy communities and lifestyles is one of the great fabrics of living in the regions. For those of us who are regional representatives, we know that attracting people to sport, attracting families to sport, is a great pastime, but it is also a great way of life. It is one of those bonding mechanisms that is a great fabric of small regional communities.

In Chaffey we have a lot of small communities, and if it was not for those sporting facility upgrades, if it was not for those upgrades to attract new entrants or to continue to be more diverse in allowing after-hours sport and not relying on daylight hours, we would not have some of that community spirit that we are currently enjoying.

I think the member for Hartley's motion was put in good spirit. I wish the world game, the women's qualifying—the five rounds that will come to South Australia—all the best. I wish the public all the very best in being able to secure tickets, to take along their family, to take along aspiring young soccer players who will be one day either representing a club, representing a zone, representing the state or even representing their country.

I have had the privilege of representing my country, I have had the privilege of representing my state and my community clubs, and it is one of the great honours of playing sport. I look forward to more contributions from a number of people in the chamber to celebrate what is one of the world's great games.

**Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (12:05):** I am incredibly happy to support the amendment put forward by the member for Reynell today. I am a fierce advocate for women's sport and also girls' sport, which I think is incredibly important, and decisions like these have a huge impact on girls' sport and the growth of girls' sport across our state.

I often tell the story of my little cousin Grace, who, like me, is a Port Adelaide supporter. I went to tuck her in a few years ago, reading her a story before bed, and she was wearing her Port Adelaide pyjamas. She asked me what number Port guernsey I had worn at Auskick as a child. This is a crucial story for me, because I had to then explain to my young cousin that I did not have the opportunity to play Auskick as a child because it did not exist.

That, to me, was a really pivotal moment and one that I think of in everything we do as women and as female leaders, because now my little cousin Grace is growing up in a world where women's

sport is not just normalised but is almost at the equal point—still a way to go—and getting towards equality, and there are female role models for little girls to look up to in sport.

I will never forget the day—and I attended alongside the member for Reynell—when I was able to attend the first Port women's game. Lining up in the line I saw my little cousin Grace. I ran over to her and she was in tears, she was so excited. We both lined up, I got her a Port women's scarf and an Erin Phillips badge, and we hugged and laughed and talked about how exciting it was for women and girls across our state to finally be at the place where our team was playing women's sport.

Her kids one day, my kids one day (I do hope I am first—she is only 14), will of course know no different, and it is the same in soccer. How exciting here that in South Australia we are able to develop infrastructure and put money into something like the Women's World Cup, not just for women playing the game but for little girls watching, knowing that they have the opportunity to one day play too.

The Hindmarsh Stadium underwent a \$53 million redevelopment in time for the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup; \$45 million of that was provided by the state government, with Adelaide Venue Management Authority contributing a further \$8 million for needed technology enhancements. While these upgrades should be celebrated, it is important to note the former government's mishandling of the World Cup bid by refusing to participate in a bid altogether at one stage. Only after community outcry did the former government see how important it was for South Australians that Adelaide was a host city.

We know very well that the previous government did not fight too hard for our state, nor does it generally fight too hard for the rights of women more broadly, but of course we are serious about backing women in sport and absolutely committed to ensuring that girls and women can equally and actively participate in the sport they love.

Our government is also investing in local sport, so not just girls but also little boys can grow up healthy in mind, in body and in community at the clubs they love. I am lucky to have not one but three soccer clubs in my electorate—two and one on the fringe; technically the third one is in King—that I am happy to support. Recently I attended with a number of local members, and members from the opposition as well, the opening of the Modbury Soccer Club upgrade. Modbury Jets are a brilliant club and last year made it as far as into the round of 16 in the Australia Cup.

I went out to Gepps Cross with the member for Wright to support the club with his three young girls, who can now, in a world they are growing up in, see female role models in sport. Two of his girls were particularly excited because twins were playing on the team, and they can see twins to look up to in sport as well.

State Labor governments have a long track record of supporting the needs and growth of football/soccer in South Australia. The State Centre of Football at Gepps Cross received \$19 million in funding from the previous state Labor government, where we watched that game. I know it was us because there is a brilliant photo of Minster Koutsantonis opening the stadium right there on the wall. I took a selfie with it and passed it on to him on the night. The Gepps Cross venue is, of course, equipped to host all levels of competition, from grassroots through to elite. It has hosted a camp with the junior Matildas, our young female sportswomen, and will be used as a training ground ahead of the FIFA Women's World Cup.

We were so proud of the efforts of one of our local clubs, the Jets, and just loved that we were able to watch them at this state-of-the-art facility. We will be continuing to back them in their progress this year. We also have a number of other really wonderful sports clubs. We have the Modbury Jets Amateur Football Club, who raise significant money for suicide awareness and mental health awareness after the loss of someone in their community a few years ago. We also have the Tea Tree Gully City Soccer Club, who are a community club that continue to give back. Just a few weeks ago, the member for Wright, the member for King and I attended their CFS Shield where they were playing soccer against the One Tree Hill Soccer Club, which raised \$6,000 for local CFS stations.

I am a huge supporter of women's sport, and women's football, the world game, is no exception. We know, of course, that you cannot be what you cannot see and now we can see more and more that women and girls, like my little cousin, have female role models to look up to in the sports that they love. Large-scale events, such as the FIFA Women's World Cup, can very much shape the career trajectories of girls in sport. It is a pivotal moment, shifting perception about women's sport here in SA. That is why it was so important for us to fight to have the event here.

That is one of the many goals of our government, to celebrate women in sport and ensure equal and active participation in the sport of their choosing. Our government has provided a million dollars to the FIFA Women's World Cup so we can fully embrace the benefits of this monumental event. This funding will be used to grow participation in football, develop women's leadership and deliver programs in clubs and communities aimed at preventing violence against women and children, another cause incredibly close to my heart. We will also host an international standard Women in Leadership Symposium to be held during the FIFA Women's World Cup, as well as a number of other initiatives.

I am pleased that the upgrades to Hindmarsh Stadium are now complete. That included new stadium lighting, a roof for the eastern grandstand and a major overhaul of the stadium's change rooms. We prioritised, through the \$24 million Female Facilities Program, what I refer to as the Katrine Hildyard change room program, the upgrade of change rooms. That was us who did that before it was then cancelled, cut by the former Liberal government, so that women could indeed play sport at local clubs. They cut the program. There is no question. I will repeat that they cut the program, that is what they did with it, after it was invested in by our government and the minister, of course, who is sitting right here, delivered that.

These facilities will welcome the Women's World Cup to our city when we play host to the five 2023 World Cup matches, including England, Brazil and a number of other countries. The upgrades will leave an enduring legacy for football in South Australia, with the new and improved features set to be enjoyed by fans and teams for years to come.

There has never been a more important time to nurture and grow female participation in sport. This is a pivotal moment not just for female football players but for all sportswomen who can see here in South Australia a tangible goal and a tangible event for them to aspire to. This provides the government and Football SA a significant opportunity to provide a lasting legacy to grow the game to encourage young women and young men to pursue playing football and indeed pursue it to the highest level.

The previous government's initial decision not to participate in the World Cup bid sent a terrible message. It sent a message about their well-known lack of regard for women's sport and was a severe blow to those hoping to see the event here in Adelaide. We campaigned with the community, with thousands of petition signatures and then, of course, in response the government agreed to be involved.

I know what this says about how the opposition view women's sport. It also shows what they think about investment in events and tourism in our great state. It also shows their view about the development of female role models for young sportswomen. We already know what they think about female role models for young women interested in politics, so it is no surprise of course to see that that is their attitude as well.

Truly backing women's sport means fighting from the outset to participate in bids, including for one of the greatest sporting contests in the world for the world game, the Women's World Cup. I am very happy to be supporting the amendment today.

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:14):** I rise to briefly support the member for Hartley's motion. Unusually, I have a family connection to Hindmarsh soccer stadium and its site. My family have been farmers in this state from the 1830s, and the first place they farmed apparently was where Hindmarsh Stadium is today. It is quite a connection for my family to that piece of land, and it may be why the pitch is so good. It goes back to those early days of farming by the Basham family. They seemed to keep the Hindmarsh tradition because from there they moved to Hindmarsh Valley, so we are very much connected to the Hindmarsh legacy of this state.

The stadium itself was built in the 1960s, and has had an interesting journey over its time. I certainly remember the discussions around the Olympics in 2000, and how it was so important that we get the Olympics here. There was an upgrade to the stadium at that stage to bring the Olympics to South Australia, so they could be played at Hindmarsh Stadium. There was also discussion on whether we would consider shifting daylight saving and the time zone to Eastern Standard Time so it would make it easier for people to understand, but that was not supported, so we continued to have that half-hour difference through the programming.

We have seen some great different sporting events held there over time. We have seen at times rugby played on the ground. We have seen many opportunities for this wonderful stadium to be used, and it is great to see the investment the previous government put into this. Over \$50 million worth of investment has brought this stadium up to a modern facility: the extra undercover areas on the eastern grandstand, new stadium lighting, super screens, new media facilities, and better corporate areas. All those are there to make sure we have great sporting events in South Australia, and it is great to see the Women's World Cup being brought here.

Also, I think it is so important that we do invest in sport in our regions as well. I am very proud to have seen the spend in my patch over the previous government's time, and there has certainly been some great investments. One that really comes to mind is the Victor Harbor Archery Club. Pat Coghlan, an Olympic archer, is very much the driver behind this club. They had a great investment and built an indoor archery range there, so they can compete indoors as well as outdoors. It is great to see that sort of investment to bring it up to a standard where the training facilities are of a standard that Olympians can train there and we can invest in their future.

We have also seen other worthy investments in the area. The Encounter Bay Football Club is an amazing club. The amount they do with the money they get for their support is amazing. They are going through right now another stage in the development of their clubrooms. We have seen the previous upgrade completed only a year or so ago with greater outside viewing areas with shade. We have seen the change rooms become much more versatile so they can have multiple teams changing in multiple changing rooms so there are no issues. It has made it very flexible. Whether women or men are there, both can be accommodated at the same time. It is very suitable for that sort of investment.

We have also seen other investment in an area that has been neglected over many years, and that was the Goolwa Oval. My father is in his early 80s. When he played football in his late teens and 20s, he considered the Goolwa Oval changing rooms the worst visitor changing rooms in the league. Interestingly, they had not been upgraded until we invested some money during our four years to bring them up to standard. The only difference between when he played and when they were finally closed for use was there were more holes in the floor where the floorboards had rotted. It is great to see that investment. The clubrooms at Goolwa that have been built are fantastic. Again, they are very versatile and very suitable to the needs of the community.

We have also seen great investments in the Back Valley Tennis Club. This is an amazing group of people. The Back Valley Tennis Club is not just a weekend club: it is a daily club. There are people out playing nearly every day of the year on those courts. There is social tennis some days, there is evening tennis and there is competitive tennis. It all occurs on those courts, and it is great to see that community very much getting behind investing in their facilities and making sure that we see great sporting events in that region.

We also have seen improvements at the Victor Harbor Oval to make sure that they have the ability at any point in time now to host AFL or SANFL games by bringing their lighting up to a standard suitable for those facilities. Bringing those facilities to that standard means that locals can also take the opportunity to play sport under lights and take that opportunity to have a wider range of options for people to be involved. People are not necessarily always available on a Saturday to play a sport like football. Giving the option for other things to be available under lights is certainly a great asset.

I very much commend the member for Hartley for bringing this motion forward because it is so important that we continue to invest in sport to make it available for those who are wanting to participate. The member for Chaffey talked about his time being able to get out onto the pitch at Hindmarsh Stadium. Unfortunately, my soccer career was not that good. I was a soccer goalie at

school. My highlight I think was in about year 9 when I first took up goalkeeping in a house game. The first 11 coach came and told me after the game I had done a fantastic job as goalie. We played a team that was slightly better than us. They had four or five first 11 players in their side, and I had only let 23 goals through, but he said I had potential. Sadly, that is where my potential ended.

It is so important to give that opportunity to people, to make sure that they have that opportunity to go and participate in sport. Sport is very much our community, and I very much commend the member for Hartley for bringing this motion.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:23):** Coming from the great soccer community of Whyalla, I thought I better get up and make a contribution. When you look at soccer in regional communities—or football, as we prefer to call it—it has been sad, especially in my region, to see the decline over the years. I do not think there is a football team left in Port Augusta. I think there is only the one in Port Pirie, but Whyalla still has five teams, which is down from the seven that it used to be in years past.

It has a great history. Years ago, Whyalla City combined team, one of the teams that has disappeared, used to play in the state league, which was the Rothmans league at the time. It was always hard for the country players having to make the journey usually down to Adelaide. Rarely would the teams come the other way up to Whyalla.

Over the years, some players have really excelled. There was 'Buddy' Newchurch—or, to give him his full name, Lancelot 'Buddy' Newchurch. I mentioned the other day in the Voice debate how, as a 16 year old, he went over to trial for Chelsea in the UK, which is not my team. That was a demonstration of the skill of that particular player. Unfortunately, that young Aboriginal lad was dead by the age of 27. Buddy was someone who epitomised the quality of Whyalla football back in those earlier years, and in those earlier years we had a massive influx of migrants.

I did say in my opening speech in parliament that there were only two rules in our household. One rule was that north of the border you go for Celtic, and south of the border you go for Manchester United. Indeed, my dad used to take us to Old Trafford before we came out to Australia. It was an amazing atmosphere. I cannot point to a female soccer player at this stage who excels in Whyalla, but I have no doubt that that will happen given the effort that some people are putting in to propagate female participation. I did have one niece playing for a short time, but she is now doing something else.

One other person worth mentioning in the context of football is Lachie Barr. Lachie Barr played with my son, who was also a very good soccer player before going off to play for Port Adelaide. Lachie went overseas and played for a number of teams in Europe and then came back to Australia and played for Adelaide City. He now plays for Adelaide United. That is another player from Whyalla who has excelled.

We clearly need to do far more to encourage female participation when it comes to sport across the board, especially in some of those sports where women have been under-represented. It is good to see in Aussie Rules a female member of the Ewings family—Hannah Ewings I think her name is—playing for Port Adelaide. She is another very good player, but we would like to see that when it comes to soccer as well.

These debates are always interesting about what government invests in what and when. I am one of those people who likes to objectively stand back and look at it with a bit of context. You look at the legacy of different governments and what they have left. I think we should always acknowledge the good that has been done by a previous government, but we should also recognise the full history. I saw a lot of facilities, especially in country areas but also in the city—and female facilities—that left a lot to be desired. You are not at the high end, but you are at that part of sport that is so important: the grassroots end.

I saw an investment by the Weatherill government into the hockey change rooms in Whyalla. Those change rooms previously were appalling, and especially appalling for women and girls who played hockey. So we should always place an emphasis on grassroots sport because that is where it all starts. The member for Chaffey had a very valid point about how important sport is as a way of knitting together communities, especially in country areas. I used to play soccer. The team that I

played for in Whyalla was more noted for its capacity to drink beer and smoke dope. Even though this was an amateur work team, we had quality players.

My brother played A grade for Westlands. I discovered as a player—I used to play on the wing—that I loved running far more than I did soccer and became quite a proficient runner, so I got something out of the soccer. I have had family members involved and my kids have been actively involved in different parts of the community when it comes to sport.

I would not call Sinead a great Aussie Rules player but what she lacked in skill and talent, she made up for in aggressiveness. She could really go for it. As I said, Ciaran ended up playing for Port Adelaide on a league contract and Liam was into archery. I would be more than confident to put an apple on my head and let him shoot it off from a distance. He is that good.

It is that involvement at a grassroots level in a community where you have kids doing this and that and the other, and then you become involved in clubs and you do this and you do that. I was an absolutely hopeless chef at the Westies football club. I said, 'Let me just do the dishes, because anyone who orders a steak is only going to get it one way. There is not going to be a bunch of variables when I'm cooking a steak: there is going to be one way.' I said, 'I am happy to do the dishes.'

Sport is incredibly important. One of the good things that is going to happen in Whyalla is the \$6 million that we have allocated to a sports hub in Whyalla, building on where hockey and tennis is at the moment and utilising, to a degree, the surplus Eyre high school site that is right in the centre of the city. That will be a good investment in that community as we work through the usual local complexities.

Sport is important and some of the big investments—whether or not it is in Hindmarsh—and we can look back to what I thought was an incredibly great job done by the Rann government and their commitment to reinvigorate the central sports facility here in Adelaide. Floating around at the time the Libs wanted to do \$1 billion plus and, as a country member, I always get a bit narky at the degree of investment in the CBD, sometimes at the expense of regional communities.

We did a fantastic job. It ended up being a little bit more than the half a billion, but a fantastic job at the oval here and of course we have had soccer playing there as well. It is a great facility that has clearly stood the test of time and saved us half a billion dollars in the construction process. As I said, we have the big stadiums and those investments, and they are worthwhile and important, but we should never forget that at the end of the day it all starts at a grassroots level.

To address the barriers that some kids have when it comes to participation in sport, we introduced a \$50 voucher, and I would acknowledge that the Liberal government increased it to \$100. I thought that was a good move because it is not easy for every family to have a child participate, and the more kids we can get to participate in sport and a range of other activities the better.

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:33):** Obviously, I oppose the amendments respectfully put by the Minister for Sport. The facts are these: there was an upgrade put in place by the former Liberal government of over \$50 million. Without the former Liberal government, it just would not have happened.

There has been some dispute about how we came to the decision around whether Adelaide participates in the FIFA Women's World Cup. I will be the first to say that there might be a bit of a journey when it comes to these things and a rigorous debate, but the fact is that the decision was made and guess who was in government when it was made? It was the Liberal Party; it was a Liberal government and we invested proudly in Hindmarsh Stadium.

We consulted far and wide, and we got it done. We got it done. The record will show that it was the former Liberal government that got this development done—not only the investment of over \$50 million in Hindmarsh Stadium but also the fact that we did invest over \$400 million in investment into sport as well.

I have spoken about other facilities. There was an investment of \$26 million, for example, into the State Centre of Football. We can talk about the various contributions—the \$19 million from the state government, of course—but that too is a fantastic facility. Do governments work together?

Absolutely, they do work together. But what we are here to do today is to put on the record that the former Liberal government has a proud record when it comes to these facilities. The FIFA World Cup will be held in Australia and New Zealand and, like I pointed out several times, there will be close to two billion sets of eyes watching football here in South Australia, here in Adelaide. We should be extremely proud of that, and the former Liberal government was a pivotal part of that.

With all respect to the Minister for Sport, who I do see regularly at events—I am not sure how she fits it all in, given her other portfolio areas as well—I will be opposing these amendments. She knows why. I look forward to seeing the results of the vote. I really do ask members to vote with their conscience when it comes to this, and may they be illuminated to side with the opposition.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes .....21  
 Noes.....13  
 Majority .....8

#### AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Champion, N.D.	Clancy, N.P.
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Hildyard, K.A.
Hood, L.P.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Pearce, R.K.	Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.

#### NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Hurn, A.M.	McBride, P.N.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Tarzia, V.A. (teller)	Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.
Whetstone, T.J.		

#### PAIRS

Malinauskas, P.B.	Pratt, P.K.	Fulbrook, J.P.
Speirs, D.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.	Marshall, S.S.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

### SOCCEEROOS

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:41):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) congratulates the Socceroos on their World Cup achievements;
- (b) notes the former state Liberal government's commitment to investing in soccer facilities for South Australians, including the over \$50 million Hindmarsh Stadium upgrade; and
- (c) calls upon the Malinauskas government to continue to uphold the standard set by the former government and commit to supporting and funding South Australian soccer institutions.

We have witnessed history here in Australia as we saw the tremendous result, the tremendous Socceroo performance that we witnessed at the FIFA World Cup. We should talk a little bit about the various games that we witnessed. On 22 November 2022, unfortunately, Australia did go down to France. I remember watching that game and how good it was to see South Australia's own Craig Goodwin actually star and kick a goal—kick a goal against the absolute football powerhouse that is France with players like Mbappé and various others. It was an absolute powerhouse of a football

team that we played against, but we saw people from South Australia take the fight up to the very best in the world, and we should be extremely proud of that result.

The next game was on 26 November 2022, when we won—one-nil against Tunisia. It was held at Al Janoub Stadium with an attendance of over 41,000 people. What an absolutely tremendous result, with us scoring in the 23<sup>rd</sup> minute. The next game was on 30 November, when we kicked a goal against Denmark, and won one-nil. It was an absolutely amazing result against, again, a very strong football nation in Denmark.

Then we come to the next one, Argentina. I declare that I am an Argentinian football fan and I have Argentinian merchandise at home. The main reason is that when I was growing up I thought that Maradona was from Naples and not from Argentina, but when I got a little bit older I realised that he was from Argentina and not Naples. Of course, he is much revered; he has much love from that part of the world.

Argentina: wow. They had an early stumbling block, you could say; I think it was against Saudi Arabia. I would have to check that, but I think they lost an early game. But the way that they rebounded was absolutely tremendous. This was a team that, going into the cup, was basically undefeated for something like over 20 games at one stage.

Look at the sorts of players the Australians had to play against: Messi and Alvarez, who are literally the best in the world, some say amongst the best to have ever played the game. For us to have performed extremely well, we can really hold our heads high—going down only 1-2 to Argentina, the team that would of course ultimately take out the World Cup. What does this say about our football (soccer) in Australia and the way that it has come?

It is particularly fantastic to see players like Craig Goodwin—following their stories and seeing their resilience. We should be really proud as South Australians and as Australians. I think it is incumbent upon us to do everything we can to make sure that we continue to invest in boys' and girls' sport, in men's and women's sport, because there is certainly enormous state pride and country pride that comes from performing so well. Of course, you also have the recreational benefits, the preventative health benefits, that link to this.

The Socceroos have made Australia proud as a result of their outstanding performance at the 2022 FIFA World Cup. I mentioned those victories against Tunisia and Denmark. Australians proudly welcomed the Socceroos home after what was a spectacular showing at the FIFA World Cup in Qatar.

During the World Cup the Socceroos actually made history for Australia many times over, beginning with, as I said, a qualifying victory against Peru, which was a dramatic penalty shootout. They went on to win against Tunisia; that was the first clean sheet in many years in a World Cup. They carried that score through to yet another historic win against the football powerhouse that is Denmark, a tremendous result. Do not forget that Denmark were actually ranked in the FIFA World Cup top 10 at the time, so do not underestimate that feat. It is an absolutely extraordinary feat.

After qualifying for that round of 16 and finally facing off against the true Titans of football that are Argentina, just the fact that we are in the same conversation—that the Socceroos are in the same conversation, all of a sudden, as Argentina—shows how far we have come in Australia. I am excited for the future of football in Australia. After qualifying, as I said, we only went down to Argentina with a loss of 1-2, but it was a spectacular performance. It was played in tremendous spirit. As I said, it would ultimately be against the 2022 FIFA World Cup champions.

So Australia should be deeply proud of the Socceroos' performance at this World Cup. This is an event that never fails to unite the nation and also gather all Australians onto the same side of the fence to cheer for our country on the global stage. They are really exciting times as we embark on the Women's World Cup. Many games will be held in South Australia, in Adelaide and, as I said, close to two billion sets of eyes will be watching the world game take shape in South Australia. I commend this motion to the house.

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:48):** I rise to move the following amendments to the motion:

Delete clause (b) and insert:



- (b) commends the Malinauskas government on its investment in soccer and its support of the FIFA Women's World Cup.

Delete clause (c).

I make note of the member for Hartley's motion as it originally stands, which says that we should uphold the former standards of the former government. That is why I stand here to make these amendments, because that is something that we on this side will not do. We will not do this because the former Liberal government set the standard pretty low. Basically pulling the pin on even seeking a FIFA Women's World Cup game here in Adelaide was embarrassing and sent such a devastating message to young women and girls in our state who love the world game.

On this side, though, we cannot wait to support the FIFA Women's World Cup games when they come here to Adelaide. Across the entire event, we are expected to draw record attendances of 1.5 million spectators plus an anticipated worldwide viewership of one billion spectators. When you hear numbers like that, it really does beggar belief that the former Marshall Liberal government could not be bothered to really fight for a great deal when it came to hosting the Women's World Cup here, and they were basically pulled inside kicking and screaming to attract FIFA Women's World Cup games here.

In regard to the motion, the government joins in congratulating firstly the Socceroos in their achievements at the 2022 FIFA World Cup and making it through to the round of 16, only the second time this has been achieved for the Socceroos. The excitement of watching our national team compete at the highest level was extraordinary and shows how much joy football brings to our community.

I know we had a chuckle last week when I visited Christian Brothers College and met with the leadership that, each night that there was a pretty exciting game on during the evening, there would be quite a few bleary-eyed football supporters rocking up to school the next day. I have to say that that did not just occur in schools but probably in workplaces across our entire state.

The Malinauskas Labor government was proud to team up with Adelaide Oval at the time to establish a free family-friendly live site event to stream the Socceroos and Argentina round of 16 match on the plaza's two big screens. I know I had very close friends there with their kids, who absolutely loved the atmosphere. The live site provided our community with the opportunity to come together to support our Socceroos, especially the South Australians in the squad: Thomas Deng, Craig Goodwin, Awer Mabil and Riley McGree.

The remarkable efforts of the Socceroos add to the excitement that is building as we get ready to host, together with New Zealand, the FIFA Women's World Cup this year. To make the most of this event coming to Adelaide, the state government has committed \$1 million to deliver a number of legacy projects that will make a lasting impact on the sport of football here in South Australia. The legacy plan will focus on creating long-lasting participation, facility and leadership opportunities in football for girls and women.

We are also committed to ensuring a strong focus on using the platform of the Women's World Cup to increase public awareness and to promote lasting change around gender equality and eradicating violence against women. These projects will complement the work of the re-established Women in Sport Taskforce, which is working to empower more South Australian women and girls to participate equally in their sporting passions.

State Labor governments have a long track record of supporting the needs and growth of football in South Australia. This includes the State Centre of Football, having received \$19 million in funding from the previous state Labor government. The Gepps Cross venue is equipped to host all levels of competition, from grassroots through to elite. It has hosted a camp with the Junior Matildas and will be used as a training ground ahead of the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup.

As demonstrated by the commitment to the State Centre and previous \$10 million synthetic surfaces fund and \$24 million female facilities fund that were cut by the previous Liberal government, Labor governments are committed to supporting football here in SA and to ensuring it has the infrastructure it needs to grow in participation and flourish.

I personally cannot wait to cheer on the Matildas in their fight to become the 2023 world champions, which I know will inspire current and future generations of women and girls to love and participate in the world game. I commend the amendments to the house.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:53):** I would also like to rise to support the member for Hartley's motion that recognises the fantastic achievements of the Socceroos at the recent World Cup. Of course, the first time Australia (the male Socceroos team) made the World Cup was back in 1974, and then there was a big gap between that and the next time, which was in 2006 in Germany when Australia, to that point in time, achieved their best result, having a win and a draw.

Since then the Socceroos have qualified for the World Cup five world cups in a row, which is no mean feat, when you think about the quality of the sides that are there. Just to put it in perspective, at the 2018 World Cup, in our group—to get out of the group stage—Australia had to play France, Denmark and also Peru, who are top sides.

Fast forward to the 2022 World Cup and Australia again had to go through the qualifying. That started back in 2019—playing matches to qualify—and then with COVID there was a big delay, which disrupted that qualification process. It was only allowed to start up again in 2021.

During that qualification process, the Socceroos played just four of their 20 qualifying matches in Australia so were massively disadvantaged with the end that they had to qualify by playing against Peru in their final qualifying match. Of course, they had lost to Peru in 2018 in the World Cup 2-0. So they came up against Peru and, in epic scenes, the game went down to a penalty shootout, and our captain was subbed off for Andrew Redmayne, who some people lovingly refer to as the Grey Wiggle and who, by dancing around, managed to ensure Australia won that penalty shootout 5-4, very dramatically.

That allowed the Socceroos to travel to Qatar for the 2022 World Cup against some very good teams. Much to the chagrin of the member for Hartley, Italy was not able to join us in the World Cup, but certainly in terms of who we did play in our group stage, again, we found ourselves up against the mighty France, the reigning 2018 World Cup champions; Denmark, who we had met in 2018; and also Tunisia. So, again, you could nearly think of that as the group of death. It seems in each World Cup in the group stage the Socceroos end up playing the eventual finalists.

We did meet France in our first game and, amazingly, South Australia's own Craig Goodwin scored at the eight-minute mark, putting Australia up 1-0 against the reigning champions. From there, the quality of France did rise to the top and they ended up winning 4-1, with fantastic games from their established stars, principally among them Mbappé, who I think just today has been announced as the French captain.

We were down at the bottom of that group stage, looking up the cliff, really having to win both our next two qualifying games against Tunisia and Denmark. The game against Tunisia took on epic proportions, because a loss there meant we were out. The great scenes occurred when Craig Goodwin crossed the ball in and Mitch Duke scored to put us up 1-0, which was the eventual score, so again a South Australian involved in the goal set-up.

That led us to the final game of the group round against Denmark, the world's number 10. Maybe people thought we could have had a draw there and got through because of the results, but fantastically the Socceroos, being Australians, always play for the win and did so, winning 1-0. Again, this was off the back of great work by a South Australian. Riley McGree passed a beautiful through-ball to Mathew Leckie, who did about five dodges and kicked between the legs of a Danish defender to score in jubilant scenes.

That put us through to the World Cup. It was the first time we had had clean sheets in a World Cup, the first time we had had two wins. We then met the powerhouse Argentina—so not only having to play France, who ended up being in the World Cup final, but then Argentina, who went on to win it. There we went down 2-1, but again, special mention to South Australia's Craig Goodwin for his strike. Yes, it was a slight deflection, but it went through to the back of the net to put the score to 2-1, with a few chances. Even up to the last minute in injury time, the Argentinian goalkeeper had to do a miraculous save to hold us out.

Bearing where we are in time, there is a lot more to say, but it was a fantastic World Cup for the Socceroos. We commend them. We wish the Matildas absolute success in the upcoming 2023 World Cup. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

*Parliamentary Committees*

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:01):** I bring up the 23<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** In accordance with the preceding report, on behalf of the member for Playford, I withdraw Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation, Notice of Motion, No. 3.

*Question Time*

**AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:01):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier mislead South Australians by promising to fix ramping and, if so, will he apologise to the South Australian people? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There's a point of order from the Leader of Government Business.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The use of the word 'mislead' in the parliament I think is in breach of standing order 97 and other standing orders as well. In the practice of the house, it can only be done by a substantive motion of the house and I ask the leader to rephrase his question.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. There's a good deal of merit in it. There is a procedure for suggesting that a member has misled the house and there are consequences, of course, that follow. I will give the leader the opportunity to recast the question.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Did the Premier promise to fix 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 now Premier said and I quote, 'Labor is determined to do what is required to fix ramping.' Yesterday, his health minister told media that Labor had never promised to fix ramping.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:02):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. It is on a really important topic. It was important in February last year, it's important in February this year and certainly important today.

The Minister for Health and I made it abundantly clear to South Australians during the course of the February/March election campaign that our number one priority is to fix the ramping crisis. When we were pressed repeatedly, whether it be by the opposition or members of the media, as they well should have, when we were pressed around what does fixing the ramping crisis mean, what does it actually constitute in a practical sense, how will that be measured, when we were asked for that detail, we were very transparent about it. We put it all on the public record.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** We were so transparent. There were key elements that we wanted to put on the public record for everyone to know and digest in the lead-up to the election. The first element is we said it would take four years. The fact that we were putting that out there was subject to ridicule from the government at the time. The Liberal Party was out there ridiculing me and the Labor Party for having a policy that was going to take four years to address. The second thing, apart from the time line, was the substantive detail around what constitutes fixing the ramping crisis. Again, every single time—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Hammond! Member for Chaffey, order! The member for Morialta! The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Every single time I was asked this question, I made the answer perfectly clear. There are oodles of media transcripts that can be referred to and recited. I am more than happy to furnish the opposition with copies, or anyone else who wants copies of those.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is warned.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** The now opposition have a responsibility that I accept, that they should uphold, to hold the government of the day to account on our commitments. But what we won't accept the opposition doing is the very thing that upsets the electorate more than anything else, and that is moving the goalposts. We put—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Chaffey! The member for Hammond is warned. The member for Schubert is warned.

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is warned for a second time. Member for Morialta, the Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** What the Liberal Party were doing in the lead-up to that election was saying, 'We're going to end ramping,' constant commitments around, 'We're going to end ramping,' and I made it clear that we believed that they were hot-air promises.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is warned for a final time, the member for Schubert for a second.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** We made a commitment to fix the ramping crisis, and we explained that fixing the ramping crisis means ambulances rolling up on time, because that is what South Australians are worried about. The very fact that at the beginning of last year when South Australians called 000 and on two out of three occasions the ambo didn't roll up on time for a life-threatening emergency had them incredibly concerned. What we have committed to do is deliver a policy that sees ambulances roll up on time. To that end, we are already delivering, because South Australians elected a Labor government and ambulance response times have substantially improved.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** We are committed to see them continue to improve throughout the course of this term in government. But South Australians can take comfort in the fact that we lead a government that is investing the resources that are already delivering results in respect

of improving ambulance response times, because today when somebody calls 000 with a life-threatening emergency it's more likely the ambo rolls up on time than what was the case 12 months under those opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide is warned. The member for Schubert is on a final warning. The member for Morialta is on a final warning. The member for Hammond is on 2½ warnings.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Mawson! Member for Florey!

#### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier run a dishonest election campaign? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** *The Advertiser* reported today, and I quote:

Labor won the election because of a dishonest campaign, aided and abetted by the compliant ambulance union. Having secured huge funding promises, the ambo union has gone to ground.

They will not attack their Labor mates over ramping.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens! The member for Chaffey! The member for Florey is warned. The Premier.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:08):** It is unfortunate the Treasurer took the words right out of my mouth before, but absolutely not.

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

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

#### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08):** My question is again to the Premier. When will the Premier fix ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** On 17 February last year, the now member for Elder promised that Labor's priority was ending ramping. On 25 February last year, the now member for Gibson promised Labor would stop the ramping of ambulances. On 25 February last year, the member for Reynell promised Labor would stop ramping of ambulances. On 8 March last year, the member for Hurtle Vale promised that Labor would stop ramping. On 11 March, the member for Badcoe promised to stop ramping.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Hurtle Vale! The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:09):** On 17 March, SALibMedia tweeted, 'Peter Malinauskas has admitted he won't end ramping. \$4 billion bill and won't end ramping!' Why? Because I was out on the public record—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Why did SALibMedia tweet this on 17 March? Because I was out on the public record making it perfectly clear what South Australian Labor's election commitment was, and that was to fix the ramping crisis so that we would start to see ambulances—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —roll up on time, which is already starting to occur under the life of this government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens and the member for Chaffey are warned.

### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier have a target for reducing the hours of ambulances ramped at South Australian hospitals and, if not, why not? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mrs HURN:** Yesterday, the health minister told the media that Labor did not have a target to reduce ramping hours despite the Premier referring to 2018 levels leading into the state election.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:10):** I repeat what we said before the election, as the Premier has already outlined, which is that our commitment is to fix the ramping crisis. We are asked repeatedly then, 'What does that mean? To what point have you fixed the ramping crisis?'

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey!

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** We answered then, as we answer now: when we can get responses of ambulances back into the community. What we saw over the four years of the member for Dunstan—who is again not here—over his government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr TARZIA:** Point of order, sir: reflecting on the presence of a member is out of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Badcoe, order!

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, order! I have the—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey! Your colleague has raised a point of order with me. I have the point of order. There is some force in it. It is contrary to the standing orders to reflect on the presence or otherwise of a member. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I withdraw that comment. What we saw under the member for Dunstan's government was ambulance response times getting worse and worse as ramping was going up and up, and to the point where we now have the worst ambulance response times in the country. That meant as a—

**Mr Pederick:** And you have doubled ramping, haven't you.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond will leave under 137A for the remainder of question time.

*The honourable member for Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned. Minister.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** That meant that people in January last year who were calling for life-threatening emergencies, priority 2 emergencies, lights-and-sirens cases that were due to get ambulances arriving within 16 minutes, were only getting them 36 per cent of the time. About two out of three times that those cases were in the community, an ambulance wasn't rolling up on time putting those members of the community at risk, and we saw noted cases that were reported in terms of deaths that had occurred. That is why we are so determined on this issue, and we have to address ramping, we have to significantly reduce ramping so that we can increase those response times.

We have a situation where the ambulances that are ramped at the hospital can't respond into the community. These things are absolutely linked, the community understands that they are linked and we have to address the ramping to improve the response times. Of course, to address the ramping, we have to address what's going on in the rest of the hospital system. In the rest of the hospital system, we have every possible bed that we can open up in the system. Every bed that we have an inherited we have opened up in the system, which means that we don't have the capacity for other patients, when there's high demand, to open additional beds in the system.

That's why we have committed as a government to prioritise health—not to prioritise a \$662 million basketball stadium but to prioritise a \$2.4 billion investment in health, with 550 additional beds going into the system. I am very delighted that as of next Monday we will be seeing 26 of those beds opening up at Flinders Medical Centre: fast-tracked work to make sure that we can increase the capacity. But there's a lot more to come. It takes time to build additional bed capacity.

You can't flick a switch and it appears overnight, but we are committed to delivering each and every one of our election commitments and going, in fact, even further with doing that. For instance, at Flinders Medical Centre we had committed before the election to open 24 more beds. Well, we are now in the process of delivering 136 more beds at that hospital. At Noarlunga Hospital we committed 24 beds. We have now increased that to 48. At Lyell McEwin Hospital we committed 24 beds. We have now increased that to 48.

We are tripling the number of beds, as you know, sir, as part of our plans at Mount Barker hospital, which is a critical need for the growing Hills community. So right across the system, investment is being made to make sure people can get out of the emergency department into beds when they need it, to make sure the ambulances can get off the ramp, responding to the community, which is exactly what we said before the election and exactly what we are delivering now.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** Before I turn to the member for Elder, I recognise the presence in the gallery of Lynette Williams and Julie Bradey, guests of the member for Colton. I also recognise the presence of the Hon. Rod Matheson AM KC, former judge of the Supreme Court of South Australia, and Professor Don Markwell AM, who was recognised in the Australia Day honours—Master of St Mark's College—guests of mine.

*Question Time*

### ELECTION COMMITMENTS

**Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:15):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister please update the house on the state government's delivery of election commitments that relate to his portfolios?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:15):** There is no more sacred promise than delivering our election commitments. Sunday marked—

**Mr Tarzia:** Forty-six per cent.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hartley is warned. The minister has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hurtle Vale is warned for a second time. Order, member for Wright!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** My young apprentice is talking about numbers again.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** It's 50 per cent plus one.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Treasurer is called to order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Vincent, I told you, don't talk about it publicly—privately. We had this discussion. Anyway, Sunday marks 12 months since the former Liberal government was decisively ejected from government and the Malinauskas state government was formed. Marking the occasion on Sunday, the Deputy Premier released a statistic highlighting one metric for the performance of government. In our first year of a four-year term, nearly half of our election commitments have been delivered. Given the substantial agenda we took to the election, this is a considerable number of commitments that have been delivered. Just in my portfolios, we have reviewed the Torrens to Darlington design, which led to the once-in-a-generation major infrastructure project having a functional design—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It's like champagne, these tears. This is unlike what was being proposed by the former government. We have made public transport free for Senior Card holders, providing convenience and saving for our seniors—hundreds of thousands of dollars they have saved since the introduction on 1 July 2022. We repealed the previous government's electric vehicle tax, which was serving as a barrier or, as the previous government would say, a handbrake on electric vehicle uptake—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Whetstone:** How's the north-south corridor going?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It's going really well.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Newland! The member for Elder is warned. Member for Wright, member for Badcoe, order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We reversed Liberal cuts and reintroduced the outer—

*The Hon. B.I. Boyer interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Wright is warned.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —vehicles registration concession on 1 July 2022, which has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars for people from Kangaroo Island, Coober Pedy, Roxby Downs and other remote areas. So much for the party of regional South Australia.

*The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson is warned for a final time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please be seated. Order! Member for Chaffey, member for Mawson, you can depart the chamber under 137A for the remainder of question time.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Minister.



**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We implemented a suite of initiatives to support South Australia's taxi industry, reintroducing government-funded managed taxi ranks, which were cut by the previous government, and reducing compulsory third-party premiums for taxis.

In contrast, after one year of the previous government's first year, they announced cuts to bus routes, the closure of Service SA centres and revealed their privatisation plans, amongst other failures. We are addressing many of the former government's failures through our commitments.

For example, we are progressing our commitments to increase our bus services around Parafield Gardens, Croydon Park and Lightsvue. We are not only keeping Service SA centres open but, as I went into detail to the house yesterday, also opening on Saturdays for key areas and of course, importantly, reversing a broken promise by the previous government, that they didn't have a privatisation agenda, by bringing our trains and trams back into public hands.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hartley! Order! Member for Elder! The member for Elder is warned.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** In addition, we are working on our world-leading hydrogen facility, which is already positioning our state and Whyalla at the forefront of a new industry, with the government's request for proposals, ending just last week, attracting 29 proposals from around the world. The on/off ramps on the Southern Expressway at Majors Road are a very popular initiative, even in the member for Bright's electorate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Newland!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Davenport!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —and of course the Aquatic Centre, a much needed upgrade in our Parklands. We will continue to deliver for the people of our state.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Schubert, I observe that the member for Elder and the member for Newland are both on two warnings. The member for Schubert.

#### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:20):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his comments made at the SA Press Club last year on 10 March? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mrs HURN:** In a final debate before the 2022 state election, the now Premier said, 'Fixing the ramping crisis is about reducing it dramatically, hopefully down to the 485 per cent level that it was, well low, 485 per cent from where it is now.'

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:20):** What the member for Schubert didn't do is read out the rest of that quote—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Colton!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —'to the extent that ambulances start rolling up on time'. This is the critical point we need to understand.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Right. The member for Schubert—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Colton is warned.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** The member for Schubert stands up here and reads quotes halfway through without completing them—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —and thinks it's clever. What I would say to the member for Schubert, as I would say to all South Australians, and as I would say to members of the commentariat or members of the public, is we are focused on delivering our election commitment, and our election commitment, as was stated on 10 March in the leaders' debate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Florey!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —that the member for Schubert refers to, our election commitment was to South Australians that we would—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is warned.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —get ambulances rolling up on time. I would like to put in a bit of context about what all this actually means, because it's easy, in all the screaming and the shouting and the wailing that occurs in this place, to forget what we are actually talking about here, because the genesis of the policy that we took to the election, which—

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** 'Labor will fix the ramping crisis'.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —wasn't just a slogan it was actually—and we are committed to fixing the ramping crisis, as the member for Morialta needs to get his head around. What we said at the time wasn't just a slogan. It was actually a considered, thoughtful policy for the biggest increase in health spending that we have seen in a generation—in a generation.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Three hundred additional beds, 300 additional nurses, over 100 additional doctors and 350 additional ambulance officers, and all the supporting infrastructure around that. We make those investments because what we are seeking to do is to impart a far better experience on those people who call 000 in their time of need.

When people call 000, when they see a loved one who has keeled over in pain, when they witness a car accident, or whatever the reason is, they want to do that knowing with confidence that their government is genuinely serious about providing the health system with all the resources they require, so that they can meet what they feel are their obligations to provide high-quality patient care, on time.

This is a difficult area of policy. We have allocated the resources, we have made the necessary investments and we go in with our eyes wide open, how substantial a task we have in front of us, particularly with an ageing population, particularly with a primary healthcare setting—

**Mr Cowdrey:** Stand by the statistic then. You set it—stand by it!

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Colton!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —a primary healthcare system that is cratering. We remain committed. We are committed to fixing the ramping crisis, with a very firm view of getting ambulances rolling up on time. That's what I said in the March press conference—

**Mr Cowdrey:** Would you stand by the statistic or not?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is warned for a final time.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —the member for Schubert read. The next time she gets up and reads quotes, can I invite her to read them to their conclusion, so as to not mislead the people of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Unley!

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:24):** My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister provide an update to the house on the state of tourism in South Australia?

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:24):** Thank you, member for Badcoe. Late last week, at the Qantas Australian Tourism Awards, our very own Adelaide Zoo took home the gold in the most prestigious category of these national awards. These Australian Tourism Awards are celebrating innovation and exceptional standards in tourism nationwide. As well as Adelaide Zoo's gold, seven South Australian tourism operators were rewarded and placed among the nation's best.

The biggest award of the night, the Major Tourist Attraction category, has recognised one of Adelaide's most iconic attractions for their unique, behind-the-scenes experiences and commitment to sustainability and conservation. We are so proud that this is the very first time that a South Australian tourism organisation has ever charted in the top three in the Major Tourist Attraction category.

I would like to list here on the record all our winners. Gold to Adelaide Zoo for Major Tourist Attraction; silver to The Cedars, Hahndorf, for Cultural Tourism; silver to Woodhouse Activity Centre for Unique Accommodation; bronze to Bendleby Ranges for Adventure Tourism; bronze to Sequoia Lodge for New Tourism Business; bronze to Redwing Farm for Hosted Accommodation; and bronze to Eos by SkyCity for Five-Star Luxury Accommodation.

Why are we seeing such incredible results in tourism? We know that the visitor economy has taken leaps and bounds in recent months, and operators are reaping the awards. That's because this government has shown, over and over again, its commitment and support for tourism and hospitality. We had our election commitment of \$40 million for major event attraction—we delivered. We have had \$45 million for marketing—delivered. There was \$1.6 million to support the Tourism Industry Council, including support for this awards program—delivered. The VALO Adelaide 500 is back and bigger than ever. Additional funding for the Fringe: the first festival in Australia to sell one million tickets, and more interstate visitors than ever before. The \$2 million for the Experience Nature Tourism fund—delivered.

We know our river regions have suffered the highest flood in decades. We have come to the fore with a \$4.6 million tourism support package for their recovery. But there is more to come. We know that Adelaide has always been famous for Mad March, but we know that this year in April, June and July the events keep coming. The Adelaide Motorsport Festival this weekend, the AFL Gather Round, LIV Golf, and the Adelaide Equestrian Festival in April. Late in April Tasting Australia, presented by RAA Travel, will start.

The excitement keeps on coming, because in July the FIFA Women's World Cup is here, and we are going to host five events here: four rounds and one of the round 16. It's an incredibly exciting time. Frida and Diego: this is an exclusive for the arts community who are going to come to see this wonderful exhibition; and let's not forget Illuminate. We continue to challenge the perception of our great state. People are drawn here to celebrate so much.

What have we got to celebrate? Our visitor economy hit a high in October 2022 for the month, reaching nearly \$1 billion just for that month. We have had record accommodation data, record WOMA Adelaide crowds and a hugely successful Adelaide Festival. We know that tourism and hospitality has done it rough over COVID, but we are here to support them, bigger and better than ever.

**AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:28):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with comments made by Dr Lawrence? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mrs HURN:** SA Health CEO, Dr Robyn Lawrence, told the Budget and Finance Committee last week that Labor's ramping election commitment was 'to return to our 2018 levels of transfer of care in three years'.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:29):** I again reiterate that the government, through the Premier and myself, were very clear before the election in terms of stating what our objective was, which was to—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta!

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** —fix the ramping crisis.

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Flinders is warned.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** When we were asked what it meant definitively, we outlined it as being to reduce ramping to the extent that we can get ambulance response times back to what they were back in 2018. There is quote after quote after quote that we have provided that outlines where the now Premier said that time and time again. To do that, we have to substantially reduce ramping times from where they are now. Dr Lawrence and the whole team, all the clinicians right the way through, are determined to do that. But we can't do that without building additional capacity because we have inherited a system that doesn't have the capacity there. We didn't see hundreds of hospital beds built over the past four years under the previous government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Colton! Member for Morphet! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** In fact, we saw, say, at Flinders Medical Centre, inpatient beds being closed under the previous government, which has now been denounced in an independent report as making the situation worse. Now, at Flinders Medical Centre, we are in the process of building 136 extra beds at that hospital because that's what is needed to get patients out of the emergency department.

Of course, there are still challenges, as the Premier has outlined, in relation to ageing of the population and in relation to primary care challenges that we face, but we are determined as a government to put those investments in place to make sure that people can get the response that they need all the way through the health system, which leads to people ultimately getting those 000 calls on time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Flinders!

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** We can only do that if we substantially reduce ramping from where it is.

**AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:31):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his comments made on FIVEaa last year, and, if so, what month in 2018 was he referring to? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mrs HURN:** Last year, on 23 December, the Premier said, and I quote:

The commitment that I made and deserve to be held to account over was to get ramping back down to 2018 levels and the objective there is so that we can start having ambulances roll up on time.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:31):** Given the member for Schubert's form about selective quoting, I am reluctant to provide a direct response to her—

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Premier, please be seated. There is a point of order from the member for Morialta, which I am bound to hear under 134. The member for Morialta.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** A reflection on members, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That may be, except the member, of course, herself doesn't raise the point of order. I will listen carefully.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** What I would say is that we have been very clear throughout the course of countless interviews, whether it be recently from Minister Picton, or, just as importantly, the remarks that I made in the lead-up to the state election, including in radio interviews, press conferences, or the leaders' debate with the member for Schubert's former boss. In each and every instance, we made it perfectly clear that we want to fix the ramping crisis. We got asked, 'What does fixing the ramping crisis mean?' and we said it means reducing ramping so that we can see ambulances start rolling up on time. That remains our commitment. We were more specific than that again.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Not only did we say we want to fix the ramping crisis, not only did we say how we are going to do that, not only did we say when we were going to do it by, not only did we describe the fact that we want ambulances rolling up on time but we put out a very specific metric, which is referring back to the 2017-18 levels—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta is on a final warning. Member for Colton!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —of ambulance response times. For those members opposite, if they would like to see where that was put on the public record time and time again, I am more than happy to furnish them with those examples.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** Who has selective quoting?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### AUKUS SUBMARINES

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:33):** My question is to the Premier. How can South Australia's regions prepare for and benefit from the recent AUKUS partnership announcement?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:33):** I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question because I think the member for Mount Gambier and myself, although coming from different political philosophies in terms of background, are in furious agreement about the virtue of work and the dignity of work and the opportunity it provides to so many people, so I appreciate the context of his question.

What I can say to the member for Mount Gambier is that we have every reason to believe that the size and the scale of the AUKUS opportunity doesn't just mean that there will be opportunities for people in regional communities, including around the Limestone Coast, but more than that, necessarily for us to be able to realise the ambitions that we have in front of us we will have to draw on the population and the skills that exist in regional South Australia, not just in the Limestone Coast but also in other critical areas such as the Upper Spencer Gulf.

We know in the Limestone Coast that there is industry and a demonstration of procuring skills that will be called upon during the course of the AUKUS agreement. That is why our investments in technical colleges aren't just orientated to metropolitan Adelaide but also orientated to regional South Australia, including in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate. As to the investment that we are making in Mount Gambier with the technical college, we of course have announced a greater degree of detail about how we are going to operate that in practice.

On the back of the member for Mount Gambier's advocacy, the government elected to no longer build the technical college attached to the high school but rather build it at TAFE, and we are now actively contemplating whether or not the government's expansion of TAFE, which is a substantial commitment to the tune of millions of dollars—I am trying to call the figure off the top of my head; I think it is \$5 million—can then be collaborated with the technical college along with the Forestry Centre for Excellence all in one single effort to try to maximise the uplift of that opportunity. But at the core of that is the development of skills, and not just skills orientated towards the forestry industry, although that is central to it, but skills that will equip young people to be able to participate in the supply chain that contributes to the AUKUS proposition.

The second element, I would say, is that all of the attention, quite understandably, around AUKUS has been around pillar 1 of the AUKUS proposition. There is also a second pillar as well which speaks to other industries such as high-tech industries, cyber and the like, which of course don't have the same requisite requirements about physical locality that the building of the submarines at the Osborne shipyards does, which will translate to yet more opportunity.

Understanding that AUKUS is more than just building submarines is a very, very important element of ensuring that we capitalise on the economic opportunity through defence and cyber industries in particular. So the core thing that state government can do to make sure that particularly young people in the Limestone Coast can get access to the AUKUS benefits is to make sure we are investing in their education, training and skills. We have a policy to do that, not just through TAFE, not just through the technical college, but the combination of the two.

#### **DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:37):** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier advise the house of defence projects at Osborne that contribute to our nation's security?

**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) (14:37):** I am delighted to talk about the activity that is happening in Osborne already, to which will be added of course this very substantial effort of building the submarines in the future.

At present, of course, we have a site that is capable of building, and has built, the Collins submarines and that work has been able to continue through the full cycle docking and the life-of-type extension work which is to come from 2026, and that's responsible for around 1,300 jobs on site in Osborne. We also have the Hunter class frigates. Although first steel is yet to be cut—it is anticipated to occur in May—in fact, the effort that is happening at the moment in what they call prototyping is essentially the building of the equivalent of a ship as they prepare the site and the machinery to be able to produce it as they also start to train up the workers.

I was last year at Govan near Glasgow to meet with BAE to look at their equivalent shipyard where they build essentially the same as the Hunter class frigates there. It was interesting that they talked about the shipyard envy that they experience when they have come over to see Osborne because they are dealing with a very, very old shipyard—decades and decades of building ships, probably over 100 years. There is a lot of heritage that they are having to manage their way around. It's a very tight shipyard and one that is really starting to bulge at the seams. When they see ours, they're extremely envious.

Once the frigates scale up, there will be around 2,800 jobs associated with that and, including those, it is anticipated there will be about 5,000 jobs in the South Australian workforce associated

with both the building and also the supply chain involvement. There are anticipated to be nine frigates and that is a \$45 billion effort.

There are, of course, now almost complete the two offshore patrol vessels. The second one is being fitted out. The first one has already been delivered. Although the Hobart-class destroyers have now been completed, from about 2024, so from next year, there are combat system upgrades that will involve around 300 jobs.

We can see that just from the current activity in Osborne there is a huge amount of manufacturing that's occurring and there's a lot of training and skilling up of workers occurring. There are some 15,000 people employed in the defence industry generally in South Australia. That includes people directly employed by defence, people employed in manufacture and importantly people who are working in the supply chain. There are about 300 companies involved in defence supply chain activity through the state.

Obviously we expect and will work towards rapidly increasing both the supply chain and the number of workers. Once we add the 4,000 workers involved in construction, ready for the Osborne North to house the building of the submarines, I anticipate that the biggest local issue I will be addressing and discussing with my good friend the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure is the transport implication along Victoria Road as we will have so many people heading to and from work. But that in many ways is a good problem to have, both locally and, of course, absolutely for the state. Subsequent to all of that construction occurring, we are anticipating around 5,000 jobs associated with the building of the submarines, and then more through the supply chain activity.

#### **AMBULANCE RAMPING TASKFORCE**

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:41):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the government's ramping taskforce still exist and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:41):** I am very happy to answer this question. What we established last year were essentially two bodies: one essentially is comprised of the chief executives and another, which I am chairing, is mainly comprised of clinicians, focusing on the ramping efforts right across the health system, engaging the clinicians, and an opportunity for me to meet directly with them and hear from all elements of the system.

The body that I am chairing continues. The other body was being chaired by an external person before we had a chief executive in place. Robyn Lawrence then took over the chair of that. Now she has brought it as part of her chief executive meetings, and it is obviously a critical element of her meetings with the chief executives. But the work that we are continuing, to meet with the clinicians, is ongoing and I am very happy to say how important I think it is that the health minister listens to clinicians right across the health system.

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

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:43):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has the government contacted all families impacted by 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:** A parent who asked to remain anonymous contacted the opposition saying, and I quote:

I have never received a letter or a phone call from the Women's and Children's Hospital or anyone despite my two girls having their mapping done there for the first few years of having their cochlear implants.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43):** I again reiterate what I said, I believe yesterday, which was that the Women's and Children's Health Network have contacted those families involved in the program and are in the process of contacting people who had already left the program. That's the advice they have provided to me. I am happy to follow up if the member wants to provide any contact details and we can make sure that they're connected to the Women's and Children's Health Network to ensure that they are appropriately followed up. I certainly don't have anything to add to that answer that I gave yesterday.

### ADELAIDE FRINGE AND ADELAIDE FESTIVAL

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:44):** My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Can the minister provide a summary of the outcomes of the Adelaide Fringe and the Adelaide Festival?

**The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:44):** I want to thank the member for Adelaide for her question. It was wonderful seeing her out and about at both Fringe and Festival events over the last four weeks, really. It's fantastic to have the member for Adelaide be so supportive of the arts community not only in her local electorate but more broadly as well.

We did see a fantastic result. We saw South Australians as well as visitors from interstate and overseas come out in droves to support our festival season. I know, with the member for Adelaide, we both were encouraging our constituents to go to our local Fringe, Prospect Fringe, which had over 25 shows and events showcased at local venues around Prospect, which our electorates border on, so it was fantastic to have that so close to home for our constituents.

The Malinauskas government was very proud to fulfil another election commitment by providing an additional \$2 million per year to the Adelaide Fringe to help it grow its impact. We know the Fringe is globally known and well regarded as the second-largest arts festival in the world, second only to Edinburgh Festival Fringe. We made this commitment to enable the Fringe to effectively market itself interstate and overseas, and significant work was done along the eastern seaboard this year. That did result in bringing many more visitors here to South Australia, spending up big in our local venues, hospitality, hotels, etc.

I am proud to report that the investment has reflected overall in the wonderful ticket sales for the Adelaide Fringe. The Fringe sold 1,000,916 tickets, and the one-millionth ticket was sold on the last Sunday night at 10.01pm, which was an extraordinary effort. That resulted in a total box office value of \$25.17 million, and about 30 per cent of those tickets were purchased by interstate buyers, so about 305,000 tickets purchased by about 45,000 visitors into the state.

Not only did that smash the Fringe's previous record that was set in 2020, it made the Fringe Festival the first-ever festival in Australia, I am advised, to ever sell over one million tickets, which is an incredible achievement for the Fringe and an almost 18 per cent increase on the 2020 record year as well. It's an extraordinary win for our state and an incredible achievement for all of those involved. Importantly, as an open access festival, it's money in the pockets of our artists and our venue owners, which is so critically important in getting over COVID.

Figures like this come as no surprise when you look at the world-class Fringe program. We had over 500 venues across the state, showcasing comedy, cabaret, theatre, circus and visual arts. There was something for everyone in this year's Fringe. We also had the showstopping headliner Electric Skies, which was partly funded by our additional investment, which was fantastically supported by Electric Fields in creating a soundtrack for it. My deep congratulations to Heather Croall and the Fringe board and the entire team on an amazing 2023 festival.

But we also had the exciting Adelaide Festival, which welcomed 893 artists from 18 countries for both ticketed and free events. It exceeded its box office target, hitting more than \$5.9 million, with more than 85,000 tickets sold, which was an incredible achievement for them as well—242,000 ticketed attendances and non-ticketed attendances across the festival, which is extraordinary. We had Messa da Requiem. We had the fantastic Spinifex Gum at Elder Park, a great, free outdoor event. We had Lorde's performance at the Entertainment Centre last Thursday. There were incredible performances throughout the festival.

I also want to congratulate Judy Potter, Kath Mainland, Ruth Mackenzie and the Adelaide Festival team on an incredible 2023 Adelaide Festival.

### AMBULANCE RAMPING

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:48):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of the Minister for Health's comments on radio this morning, and does he agree with them? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.



**Mrs HURN:** On FIVEaa radio this morning, the minister said that criticism of Labor's election commitment to fix ramping was, and I quote, 'a storm in a teacup.'

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:48):** The health minister is doing an outstanding job. The member for Schubert is quoting a—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Florey, order! The Premier has the call. The Treasurer is called to order. Member for Hartley, order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** The member for Schubert is quoting a FIVEaa radio interview, which I understand she did in her earlier question to me. I expeditiously asked my team to furnish me with the full quote that I made to the FIVEaa radio interview that she made reference to earlier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Yes—and this is an important bit of context, Mr Speaker, because—

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —it turns out that the main—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, there's a point of order from the member for Morialta, which I will hear under 134.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Standing order 98 requires the Premier to answer the substance of the question that was just asked, not to have a second go at answering the question that was asked earlier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the point of order—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Florey is warned, the member for Hartley knows better. If the point of order had been put to me on the basis that there may have been the beginning of some debate, then it might have had force. However, it was directed—

*The Hon. B.I. Boyer interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** —order, member for Wright!—at something quite separate. In any case, some context is important, and I understand the Premier is providing it. The Premier.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** I think that we have now learnt a key lesson during the course of question time that, when the member for Schubert reads out quotes, she does it rather selectively. The remainder of that quote on that FIVEaa interview was me saying, 'So what happened between the period between 2018 and 2022—

**Mrs HURN:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, there's a point of order which I will—

*Ms Savvas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Newland!

**Mrs HURN:** Section 127: I would take offence at that reflection.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for West Torrens, member for Newland, order!

*Mrs Hurn interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is unhelpful, member for Schubert, having raised a point of order in relation to personal reflection to then make one yourself. However, the Premier might choose to deal with this expeditiously. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Who knows what the full context of the quote that the member for Schubert was referring to in the FIVEaa interview, but what I can say is this: I will tell you, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We are late in question time—

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

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will hear the member for Morialta.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Sir, the opposition has great regard for the position of Speaker and, when the Speaker makes a suggestion or a direction, any member of this house is obliged to reflect on that and respond as the Speaker has requested. The Premier, in ignoring you, is getting very close to obstructing the house.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier may choose to withdraw the remark and therefore deal with the issue expeditiously.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** What the Minister for Health and I are in furious agreement about, as I suspect—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The best course would be to withdraw the personal reflection.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Yes, I am more than happy to withdraw the words 'selective quoting'—is that what offended you?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Okay, sure.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** What the health minister and I are in furious agreement about is that what is not a storm in a teacup is what matters to people. What matters to people in the state right now is getting our health system in a stronger position to be able to adequately care for people who are in their time of need. There is no greater person in a time of need than someone calling 000.

Of course, what the health minister and I are committed to is making sure that when someone calls 000 they know that the government is doing everything we can to get the ambulance to roll up on time, and that's what we are doing. Of course, to get the ambulance to roll up on time, to maximise the likelihood of that, it is an imperative to reduce ramping. It is an imperative to reduce ramping. If you can't reduce ramping, then your ability to see ambulances roll up on time is substantially hamstrung. But we are already delivering on our election commitment.

I am not just talking about the specifics of the beds and the nurses and the doctors and the ambos (although that is true), I'm actually talking about getting ambulances to roll up on time, because response times have improved as a result—

*Mr Cowdrey interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —of putting those additional resources in. But here's the thing: we've got a long, long way to go.

*Mr Cowdrey interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Colton!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Our ambition, in fact our target, is to get ambulance response times back to 2017 and 2018 levels.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** We know that we have already had some progress but there is a long way to go. Our ability to be able to deliver on that target, of course, will be very much—the target that we made clear about over and over again in the lead-up to the election, no matter how much the member for Morialta wails about this, he knows the commitment that was made, that we will fix the ramping crisis.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** We acknowledge that there is still a way to go, because we've got more improvement to be realised in ambulance response times to reach our target, and reducing ramping will go a long way to contribute to that ambition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morialta will depart under 137A and the member for Newland will join him.

*The honourable members for Morialta and Newland having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order for the remainder of question time!

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

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:55):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What does the minister say to Natalie? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mrs HURN:** Natalie has two children, Angus and Henry, with cochlear implants from the Women's and Children's Hospital, which were not giving them access to sound. Natalie said, and I quote, 'As a mum, I was gutted and felt that we had been let down by those we trusted.'

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55):** To Natalie I say this publicly, but I also said this to her privately earlier in the week when I rang her: I think we are all devastated in terms of the impact upon her family of this issue which has been running for a number of years at the Women's and Children's Hospital. I'm not going to politicise this, but this is a long-running issue that we need to properly get to the bottom of how it was able to occur over at least the last five years and make sure that we put in place processes to ensure that it doesn't happen again. I'm very happy to meet with any of the families who are involved and talk about how we can help them.

Obviously we have already announced, as per my ministerial statement yesterday, that we will be putting in place arrangements not only for an external review from an independent expert of the program generally but also for those people who have been identified as having had undermapping take place to have independent external interstate experts come and look at their situation, assess their implants and what other steps could be taken in relation to those children.

We, as a government, absolutely are committed to making sure that we put in place systems so that this doesn't happen again. To those families, I'm very happy to talk to them about what we

can do in terms of making sure that they have the best possible supports for this awful news that they have received.

### DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

**Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. How is the government increasing community awareness and action ahead of the introduction of legislation to criminalise coercive and controlling behaviours as a form of domestic violence?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**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) (14:57):** I thank the member for her question and her passion to address insidious forms of violence that our community confronts.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley and the member for Florey and the Premier will cease their exchange.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley is warned. The Premier is warned. The minister has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** Prior to the election, our government made a commitment to help prevent and end domestic violence, and to do that through working alongside brave victim survivors, service providers, women's organisations and our whole community. We want to bring to life that oft-repeated mantra that preventing domestic violence is everybody's responsibility. We are delivering on our commitments to introduce a range of legislative measures to support those experiencing violence and to deal with perpetrators—a commitment I am proud we are progressing.

An important part of our commitment is ensuring that community members can see the signs of all forms of domestic violence. Last week, I was deeply honoured to host the remarkably courageous Sue and Lloyd Clarke in Adelaide to assist in strengthening that broader public discourse and awareness about coercive control, an insidious form of domestic violence that is shockingly present in 99 per cent of domestic violence-related homicides. Hannah Clarke and her three children—Sue and Lloyd's daughter and grandchildren—were killed by her former partner in a horrifying attack in 2020, following a relationship in which she was a victim of this form of domestic violence.

I am so incredibly grateful to Sue and Lloyd Clarke, who, having experienced this most tragic of losses, so generously and with such strength continue to use their voices and their story to encourage communities across the country to understand and prevent disrespect and violence towards women. Their openness and empowerment of other organisations and people to make change is an extraordinary gift.

All who were present at last week's forum can attest to their strength, power and kindness. Criminalising coercive controlling patterns of behaviour is the right thing to do, and engaging in community awareness raising around it could save lives. Current legislative measures generally deal with incidents of domestic violence. Criminalising coercive control will ensure we deal with patterns of controlling coercive behaviours. It represents an enormous step forward in the legislative

frameworks that deal with perpetrators and in improving community understanding of all that constitutes domestic violence.

Community awareness grew from last week's forum and will continue to grow as we work to shift understanding in the lead-up to and beyond the introduction of the bill. For new legislation to be effective, and for us to robustly tackle this horrific behaviour, more people need to understand what coercive control is. That is why our government has spent time consulting with particular groups of people to seek their views in the lead-up to introducing legislation, and this is why we previewed at the forum an important campaign to help victims, survivors, their friends, families and the broader South Australian community to see the signs of coercive control.

Targeted at young people, to encourage them to see the red flags of coercive control, the first round of the campaign will include outdoor advertising and videos across Instagram, Facebook, TikTok, YouTube and Snapchat. The campaign sits alongside a suite of initiatives aimed at addressing domestic violence. I thank again Sue and Lloyd Clarke for so powerfully starting our South Australian community conversation and for generously sharing their wisdom. I feel blessed to know them and will honour them and their precious daughter and grandchildren as we set our course to make change.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:02):** There are thousands of people who work tirelessly in our health system, looking after us and our loved ones when we need help, good people who work so hard each and every day in what are really mentally and physically challenging roles. These are the people who deserve a health system and a government that supports them, but the unfortunate reality is that this government is absolutely letting down the health workers in South Australia and the people of South Australia.

Just 12 months after the state election, when an ironclad commitment was made by those opposite to fix ramping in this state, Labor are trying to run from this as fast as they possibly can, so much so that you might think that they are in a race with Olympic gold medallist Usain Bolt. To rub salt into the wound, guess what the government is trying to tell the South Australian public? That it was the voters who got it wrong. Apparently, this confusion was all South Australians' fault. It was us who misunderstood Labor's promise, that we did not ask enough questions, that we did not seek out that fine print, that we were not invited to those invite-only press conferences.

It does seem that ramping is just no longer a priority for this government and that is, I think, quite convenient, because for the last 10 months those opposite have governed over the worst ramping results in South Australia's history, where our patients and our paramedics have spent more time out on the ramp than ever before in history—37,370 hours stuck outside on the ramp. That is 1,557 days and the equivalent of more than four years' worth of time.

What does this government do? With a straight face, they tell us that they never promised to fix ramping. They promised that they would fix and improve the response times, which is so funny, because I just do not remember seeing the posters up hill and down dale saying, 'We will fix ambulance response times'. It is funny because they have barely mentioned ambulance response times since the election, but now, after they have presided over the 10 worst months of ramping in South Australia's history, Labor is doing what Labor does.

After 16 years of Labor government, you are absolutely protecting your own political skin, as if spinning out of problems was essentially an Olympic sport. Why would we expect anything different from those opposite? It is just the same old Labor weasel words and dishonesty that South Australians absolutely detest. It brings me no pleasure to say this but, after 12 months of Labor, their commitments to fix health and their commitments to deliver for the people of South Australia are unequivocally on life support. So much so, that the very people who were propelled into office on the back of the wave of Labor's central promise to fix ramping do not want to talk about it anymore, they do not want to hear about it.

This was made extraordinarily clear when Labor rolled out their 12-month self-congratulatory video, where they gave themselves a big old pat on the back for all the things that they had apparently done, except they forgot to mention one thing—

**An honourable member:** The key pillar.

**Mrs HURN:** —the key pillar. It was not even mentioned once. Guess what it was?

**An honourable member:** Ramping.

**Mrs HURN:** Fixing ramping. It got me thinking. I thought, 'Why haven't they mentioned it?' Is it because the backbench are worried about talking about ramping now that the election is over and now that they are governing over the worst ramping results in our state's history? Perhaps those opposite can tell their constituents that actually it was them that got it wrong and they misunderstood their very clear promise. Or is it because they do not quite know how to explain record ramping to those families and loved ones who have seen their loved ones die waiting for an ambulance? I think that unfortunately it is all of those things.

Labor has made a decision that it is no longer in their political interests to talk about ramping, now that it has never been worse. What is so galling is that they expect South Australians to believe this farcical rewrite of history. They have such arrogance that they reckon they are going to get away with this. Labor campaigned every day on a very clear promise to fix ramping in this state, exploiting absolute heartache for their own political gain. Labor sat with paramedics and told them that they would fix it. Labor door-knocked, and they looked their constituents in the eye and told them that they would fix it. Now they need to sit with all those people again, because it is time that those opposite apologise. I think I have the start of a script, and it goes like this: 'Sorry that 12 months on—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown):** The member's time has expired.

#### **MULTIPLE BIRTH AWARENESS WEEK**

**Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:07):** I rise today to speak about Multiple Birth Awareness Week, which runs between 19 and 26 March each year. During that week, on 24 March, it is actually my twin sisters' birthday. My identical twin sisters turn 23 this Friday, and, in acknowledging multiple births in the house, I would also like to wish them a happy birthday and a happy Multiple Birth Awareness Week.

As I have mentioned already, there are a number of multiple births in my family, both fraternal and identical. My great-grandmother Mary was a twin to her brother Ted, and, in a family tree I received at a reunion last week, I found that there are at least another two sets of twins, making four sets of twins just on my dad's side.

It is important to recognise twins when talking about multiple births and multiple-birth awareness, and that is because often, in the eyes of the law and in the eyes of governments around the world, twins are discounted as multiple births, despite accounting for about 90 per cent of multiple-birth pregnancies. In fact, twins occur in one in 80 pregnancies in Australia; they are incredibly common. I know that on the government side alone we have two sets of parents of twins. There may be others on the opposition side that I am not aware of.

Of course, as of last year, we actually have a parent of triplets as part of our team in the newly elected federal member for Boothby. Triplets are much less common, with an even higher degree of risk, as are higher order multiple births as well.

Today, I would like to specifically acknowledge the plight of multiple-birth mums, both financially and emotionally. In addition to the twins in my family and the twins in my broader Labor family, two of my dear friends have young sets of identical twin girls, and I have been very privileged to watch, to varying degrees, those little girls grow up and their fierce mums battle the challenges that come with raising young twins and also other toddlers at home at the same time.

However, I have also seen the difference for multiple mums in particular. My friends Samantha and Sarah are absolute powerhouses, both well accustomed to the question, 'How do you do it?' As I mentioned before, my sisters were born on the 24<sup>th</sup>. My dad used to joke that on

the 24<sup>th</sup> we had received 'two for the price of one', referring to double the love and the joy that comes with a twin birth. Twins, however, are two for the price of two, and often treated for the price of one.

I take a minute to mention, as some may be amused, or those with young kids might know, *The Twins Song*, made famous by the Wiggles in the last few years, after Lachie Wiggle had twin girls of his own. The lyrics 'Double happy, double nappy' are familiar to multiple families everywhere, noting that in addition to the joy, there is the physical, emotional and financial toll of double the care and responsibilities and further for higher order multiple births.

Recently, the Multiple Birth Association of Australia released a report investigating the support needs of multiple families, acknowledging that by Centrelink standards, twins are not considered to be multiples, despite the fact that twins are five times more expensive than a singleton birth and triplets 13 times more expensive. I do use the term 'singleton'. Many are not aware of that; that is the name for a singular birth and is the nickname that my twin sisters still give me—they call me their singleton big sister.

Australia is very much falling behind when it comes to support for multiple families. Although these changes are federal and very much beyond our scope here, I would like to acknowledge the cost to multiple parents at varying levels. Again, I know that the Multiple Birth Association has met in the federal parliament this week, and I know that the federal government is listening to those concerns.

I would like to single out federal Minister Anika Wells, who, exactly a year ago today, gave a speech to the federal parliament holding in arms her twin boys—an historic occasion for twin parents, really highlighting the challenges faced by multiple mums. I know we have a fierce advocate in the federal parliament in Minister Wells and also, as a triplet mum, as I mentioned before, the newly elected member for Boothby.

Here in SA, we are supported by the Multiple Birth Association of SA, which, alongside the City of Unley, and Rotary Club of Unley, are putting on the SA Multiple Birth Festival in a few weeks' time. I remember in years gone by, my sisters flying to Melbourne for the twin festival and just how excited they were.

The Multiple Birth Association is a great support to multiple parents in SA and in recent years the Women's and Children's Health Network has funded the Home Help Service, which provides professional assistance at home to eligible multiple birth families. I would just like to quickly acknowledge the role that those multiple birth mums play. I value you, I see the toll that you take and I am happy to support your cause in the house today.

### MARDEN SPORTS COMPLEX

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:13):** Today, I rise to speak about a dire situation involving the Marden Sports Complex. This has been quite an unfortunate development in recent times concerning this Marden Sports Complex. Yesterday, we heard that many users of the Marden Sports Complex have been told that they must find another location to practise, to play and to perform.

We heard yesterday, via an exclusive Channel 7 report, that users of this venue have been given a deadline of next Wednesday to find a different facility. This, of course, is very unfortunate for the clubs that use this facility, the schools that use this facility, but also the other organisations that are now in limbo—after-school trainings, potentially gone; tournaments, gone. Up to 4,000 players are said to use these courts each and every week. Players, parents, coaches, referees: these are all now in limbo. Full-time staff face job cuts, casual staff certainly face job cuts; these are now in limbo.

As one coach, Gary, put it, 'This is the only stadium that looks after east Adelaide schools,' and there are a lot of east Adelaide schools in various seats represented in this very chamber. He went on to say, 'All of these kids are now going to miss out on after school basketball.' One of the students was quoted as saying, 'It is depressing.' We are talking about up to 40 junior school teams that may have to now find another location, as well as close to 190 senior teams; that is a lot of teams. We understand that there were 58 students registered to play winter basketball alone who will now have to look elsewhere for a suitable court with not very much notice at all.

We also know that there certainly will be a loss of significant jobs. We know that there are a whole range of referees who are casually employed at this Marden Sports Complex. They will not necessarily be able to work there, and these referees often come through the ranks as players and move on to being a coach and then support as referees. Many of these referees offer their services more out of passion for the game than the actual financial incentive.

Many schools and out of hours school care groups also use and rely on this facility, and now they may be required to attend a separate sports facility or complex that is definitely going to be further away. It is my understanding that a lot of these out of school hours care groups, particularly during the holidays, will actually plan recreational outings to keep kids active and entertained. Of course, many adults also use the facility in the holidays as well. We know that kids will now miss out on this as a result of this decision.

We, on this side of the house, cannot advocate enough for keeping our kids healthy. We know that there are enormous preventative health benefits when you can keep kids healthy and active. As the former state Liberal government, we have shown this time and time again such as when we doubled the Sports Vouchers program to make sure that we can do what we can to keep kids active and incentivise adults to keep their kids active as well.

There is a high chance that many of these kids and adults will not be able to practise and play the sports that they love because of this decision. The state government, in my opinion, needs to come in now and step up to come up with some sort of bridging facility so that our kids and adults in our local area can stay active so that these thousands of users will not be left in limbo and so that the employees, referees, coaches and volunteers can continue sharing their skills and knowledge to the great benefit of our local community.

Today, what I will be doing is writing to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing and I will be asking her and her government to intervene so that these players, these volunteers, these clubs, these schools and these organisations have a home ground to play at after next week as well.

### **HYDROGEN POWER PLANT**

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:17):** One of the big promises that Labor committed to in the lead-up to the election was the building of a hydrogen power plant in Whyalla along with storage and a 250 megawatt electrolyser. If we pull this off, and I have every confidence that we will, it will be the first time in the world that a project of this size uses renewable-based hydrogen to drive a power station; the first time in the world that it has been done.

So it is no surprise that in the expression of interest process we have had 29 companies express an interest formally in being part of this project. It is a project that is dear to my heart, as is hydrogen, given that there were some failed attempts in Whyalla to generate some interest in hydrogen some years back to generate interest from the private sector when I did some work with the Melbourne institute.

At that time, back in 2014-2015, we wrote to 50-odd companies to see if they would part-fund a study looking at Whyalla as a potential hydrogen hub. At the time, even though some of the companies expressed an interest, none of them were willing to come to the party with what was not a great deal of money, approximately \$100,000, as part of a partnership with Whyalla to have a look at this direction. The world has significantly changed. I know that the Premier and the Minister for Energy and Mining are incredibly passionate about this project. It is a really big election commitment and it is potentially a game changer.

One of the reasons that I was very interested in hydrogen was not so much about electricity production at the time, it was that if you were looking at greening the steel industry you had to replace coking coal as the reductant in the metallic ironmaking process, and you have very few options when it comes to that. You can use natural gas, syngas or you can use hydrogen and if you source the hydrogen from renewable-driven electrolysers it means you are well on the way to production of green iron and green steel. This is an industry that contributes around 7 per cent of global emissions so it would be a real step forward.

The thing about the proposal for the hydrogen power plant in Whyalla is that I have absolutely no doubt that some of these companies will want to build on the particular state commitment to



storage, to the electrolyser, to the power station and look at a range of other opportunities and potentially piggyback off that project.

I hope in one way or the other that one of those opportunities is going to involve the steel industry in Whyalla. I know that Sanjeev Gupta has been on the record about green steel. I know that the Swedes are well down the path with their hybrid project in Sweden. This will be the way to go. This is all about vision, somewhat similar to the vision that Playford had that initiated, with strong bipartisan support, integrated steelmaking in Whyalla with the coke ovens, the blast furnace, the BOS and the mill. That was a strong Playford initiative.

We have another opportunity here and that is the combination of hydrogen and the massive amount of magnetite, which is particularly suited to use with hydrogen for iron and steelmaking, in the Middleback Ranges. There is a JORC reserve of over 650 million tonnes but that might well go up in the future to over a billion tonnes of magnetite on our doorstep, which will give us the opportunity to produce green steel for generations to come.

### NARUNGA ELECTORATE

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:22):** I rise today in follow-up of a previous grievance I made celebrating the visit of the government and the cabinet to my electorate. I think I speak on behalf of the community when I say that it is a really uplifting feeling that we have a number of things moving in the right direction and the receptive ear that we received upon their visit.

However, on this occasion I want to raise a few things that, as the budget takes place, as it is formed behind the scenes, I hope the government are considering for Narungga. These are things that may have been considered at country cabinet but also things we might not have had the opportunity in the course of those two days to touch on properly and that I want to get on the record as priorities for the electorate of Narungga.

First and foremost is the provision of a new rescue vessel at Point Turton. I have reached out to the minister about this and he has leant a wonderful receptive ear about it. In the course of his investigations, he has discovered that the Volunteer Marine Rescue Vessel Replacement Program, which is administered by the VMR Council, has not included a new vessel for Point Turton within its current program, which is incredibly disappointing.

In the course of my five years as the member for Narungga it has been an issue. It just so happens that the vessel currently in use at Point Turton is limited to, if memory serves, two nautical miles off shore, which is, of course, not where boats tend to break down and need rescuing from. With that boat limited to that distance off shore, it means there is a gap between Port Victoria all the way around to Edithburgh in terms of sea rescue. I have written to the government expressing this, and I will certainly be following it up with Volunteer Marine Rescue to make sure that the Point Turton flotilla have their need prioritised a bit higher and that they find themselves on that program for a new vessel sooner rather than later.

Another thing that came up quite frequently at country cabinet, at the community forum we held, was the need to accelerate the replacement of an outdoor swimming pool for the community in Wallaroo. It was actually quite extraordinary; if I had placed a bet on what would come up most often at that country cabinet, I am not sure that pool would have reached the top of the list, but reach the top of the list it did. It came up on a number of occasions.

It has been some years now since the previous iteration was destroyed by a storm. We have not yet seen any progress made on replacing it. It is such a wonderful community asset. So many kids do so much of their swimming training and Royal Life Saving at that pool—or they used to, anyhow. Its replacement needs to be accelerated and prioritised. Council need to be empowered to replace that facility as soon as possible. Again, I have written to the government, imploring them to include some sort of funding for that in this upcoming budget.

As well as that, and this was touched on at country cabinet as well, the Yorke Peninsula Field Days, which are being held again this year—every second year—have a desperate need for a replacement admin building. A number of years ago, perhaps five years ago, there was an arson attack which burnt down their admin building along with all their records and memorabilia and a whole lot of valuable stuff. To date, that has yet to be replaced.

We were very close in a grant program, which was unfortunately then altered to suit other needs. Unfortunately, we have not been able to find one since. They have a plan drawn up to build a new admin building in the shape of grain silos, which will be a wonderful addition to the field days, which draw in a huge crowd every other year to our community and which is being run out of a tent, basically, at the moment. That is very much on the list for YP as well.

Another really important thing, which I was disappointed not to have the opportunity to show the relevant ministers when they came and visited recently, is there is a unique opportunity for a tourism promotion venture at Port Wakefield. As we all know in this place, Port Wakefield has just completed a huge redevelopment, which has left the town looking a treat but has also provided an opportunity in terms of space and more parking and stopping opportunities for those travelling through to have a tourism promotion venture.

Wakefield council have drawn up plans to have an interactive digital precinct, which would promote all those council areas and all those tourism areas to the west and north of Port Wakefield. I think that would be a wonderful addition to our tourism landscape. I would love for the government to help with the capital costs of installing those digital tourism advertisements, and I think it would be a real asset to our tourism ventures at large.

Once again, in conclusion, we are very thankful for the government visiting over country cabinet recently. As the budget is built over the coming weeks and months, I hope those things get due consideration by those who have the power to make decisions.

#### **PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:27):** Today I would just like to make some comments and follow up on some issues I raised back in a grievance in this chamber on 8 February, when I talked about some issues regarding the Planning and Design Code of South Australia. I note in today's InDaily that the minister has made some comments regarding that and the role councils play. I think the minister's comments are important in the context of what I wish to raise today.

At that time, I raised concerns about the lack of engagement by the local council, namely the Gawler Council, with the community over a proposed code amendment at Evanston Park. The code amendment was to rezone a local neighbourhood zone, which is essentially just a residential area, to a local employment zone, which is essentially commercial.

It is a proponent-driven code amendment. That in itself is not the problem. The problem arose when the council asserted that it had no role in this process, and it was up to the community to be heard. Further, the council would express no opinion about the code amendment itself.

The council asserted that the position it adopted was based on legal advice to the council, namely that the council had no role, but the advice went even further, as I understand it. It meant that local councillors, elected members, had no role to play to communicate with their communities or engage their communities over this very important and controversial code amendment.

As a result of that, I did raise those matters in this place on 8 February, and I appreciate the action taken by the minister since then. The minister responded to my grievance and advised that the council did have a role to play and outlined the role it could play. Since then, council has adopted a new position, and I congratulate the council for doing so. But this matter does raise some serious issues because the council asserts that their original position was based on legal advice.

Legal advice was given to council and it was considered in camera. We do not know as a community what the legal advice was to the council. One issue that arose was that the legal advice was in camera so we actually do not know whether the advice was appropriate or not. Was the advice to the council faulty in some way, and was the council misled by the legal advice? That is something that we do not know. Or the alternative: was the advice actually misrepresented by the council or misinterpreted by the council in this matter?

The second issue is that the advice is said to have said that councillors were not able to engage with the community. I think it is a sad day when we have a situation where local councillors, or any elected official, whether state, local or federal, is unable to engage with their communities on issues of importance to them. This was actually attached with a legal threat. The councils were told

that should they engage with the community they could be subject to legal action. So they actually were gagged by the council.

Given that the minister has now corrected that, I think the issue regarding legal advice has to be explored, because how can either the council get it so wrong or the lawyers giving the advice get it so wrong? Secondly, I think that advice needs to be made public, because this is a code amendment. It should be an open and transparent process. The process itself should be subject to accountability, and part of that process should be that any legal advice given to the council should also be made public so that the community can have confidence in what the council is doing. I will follow that up and we will see how the council goes.

Very quickly in the time left, I would just like to put on the record my congratulations to the Gawler Relay For Life Committee. The committee has raised over \$1 million since 2009 through the events they have annually. The event this year had 300 participants and 23 teams. It has added to the vast amount of money it has raised. Congratulations to the Gawler Relay For Life Committee for raising funds for cancer prevention and cancer research.

### *Bills*

## **FAIR WORK (FAMILY AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LEAVE) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 5, page 5, after line 35 [inserted Schedule 3B, clause 5]—After subclause (3) insert:

- (4) A pay slip provided by an employer to an employee must not include any of the following information:
- (a) information indicating that leave taken by the employee was family and domestic violence leave;
  - (b) information indicating that an amount paid to the employee was payment in respect of family and domestic violence leave;
  - (c) information relating to the balance of the employee's entitlement to family and domestic violence leave.

Note—

For example, a pay slip may, in respect of an amount paid to an employee for any family and domestic violence leave taken, describe the leave taken as 'special leave', 'miscellaneous leave' or 'other leave'.

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

As has been noted, the Fair Work (Family and Domestic Violence Leave) Amendment Bill 2022 has been considered by the Legislative Council and returned to this house, incorporating a single government amendment. The amendment inserts an additional confidentiality provision in schedule 3B, clause 5(4). This amendment requires that payslips must not expressly identify that an employee has accessed family and domestic violence leave. This leave may, for example, instead be described as special leave, miscellaneous leave or other leave. This amendment addresses concerns that an employee may be put in a dangerous situation if a perpetrator of domestic violence became aware that an employee was accessing those entitlements.

This amendment is consistent with recent commonwealth legislation, and reflects section 536(2)(c) of the Fair Work Act 2009 and regulation 3.47 of the Fair Work Regulations 2009. This is an issue which, from memory, was raised in several briefings between the houses and which I understand both the member for MacKillop and the member for Colton indicated the opposition would support during the previous committee stage. I thank them for that.

I understand this amendment had unanimous support in the Legislative Council and, again, I am grateful to all members for providing that support. I also thank all members who contributed to the debate on this bill, across both houses. I am incredibly proud to stand here as this bill passes all stages. This is a crucial part of the comprehensive women's and domestic violence prevention policy we took to the election—a policy which speaks to our steadfast and strong commitment to work to advance gender equality and increase community effort to prevent and end the horrific scourge of domestic violence.

I again, in closing, put on record my gratitude to all who have championed this right for many decades: unions (and particularly the Australian Services Union), the Working Women's Centre, those courageous workers who were the first to collectively bargain for these provisions to be secured in their enterprise agreements, women's and domestic violence organisations, and brave victim survivors.

I also again thank Hilary Wigg, Sanjugta Vas Dev, Sandy Pitcher, Angus Oehme and other staff in the Attorney-General's office. All of their work, and the voices of brave victim survivors, has culminated in this moment and continues as we progress a range of other legislation and policy in the area of preventing violence against women and children.

No person should ever have to choose between their safety and economic security. With the provision of this paid leave, I am very proud that we are taking an important step to ensure that they do not ever have to make that devastating choice.

Motion carried.

## FIRST NATIONS VOICE BILL

### *Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 21 March 2023.)

Clauses 35 to 37 passed.

Clause 38.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Teague-1]—

Page 18, line 31 to page 20, line 36—Delete Part 4 and substitute:

Part 4—Interaction with Parliament of South Australia

38—Interpretation

In this Part—

*First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee* means the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee established under the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991*.

39—Purpose and application of Part

- (1) The purpose of this Part is to provide a mechanism for the State First Nations Voice to make its views, submissions and recommendations heard by the Parliament.
- (2) Nothing in this Part affects the privileges, immunities or powers of the Legislative Council or House of Assembly or their committees or members.
- (3) Nothing in this Part creates legally enforceable rights or entitlements on the part of the State First Nations Voice or any other person or body.

40—State First Nations Voice to meet with First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee

- (1) The State First Nations Voice and the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee must meet at least 4 times in each calendar year.
- (2) Despite subsection (1), the State First Nations Voice and the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee may meet less than 4 times in a calendar year if—

- (a) the presiding members of the State First Nations Voice and the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee agree that it is not reasonably practicable for a particular meeting to take place; and
- (b) it is not reasonably practicable to reschedule the meeting to take place in the relevant year.
- (3) The procedures for meetings between the State First Nations Voice and the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee will be as determined by the State First Nations Voice and presiding member of the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee.

41—State First Nations Voice may refer matter to First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee

- (1) Without limiting section 16 of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991*, the State First Nations Voice may, by notice in the Gazette, refer a matter that is relevant to the functions of the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee to that Committee.
- (2) To avoid doubt, section 17 of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991* applies in relation to a matter referred to the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee under this section.

Note—

Section 17 of that Act requires the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee to inquire into and report to Parliament on matters referred to the Committee.

42—State First Nations Voice may present report to Parliament through First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee

- (1) The State First Nations Voice may, in accordance with any requirements in the regulations, prepare and provide to the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee for presentation to Parliament reports on any matter relating to the functions of the State First Nations Voice under this or any other Act.
- (2) The presiding member of the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee must, within 6 sitting days after the Committee receives a report under subsection (1), cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

42A—First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee to report annually to Parliament

- (1) Without limiting a provision of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991*, the First Nations Affairs and Representation Committee must, on or before 31 December in each year, report on the operation of this Act to its appointing Houses during the preceding 12 months.
- (2) Without limiting the matters that may be the subject of a report under this section, the report must include—
  - (a) information setting out the extent to which, in the opinion of the Committee, the purposes of this Act have been achieved or furthered during the relevant period; and
  - (b) information setting out any initiatives affecting First Nations persons implemented during the relevant period that should, in the opinion of the Committee, be promoted or celebrated; and
  - (c) any recommendations the Committee wishes to make in relation to how the Act could be improved to achieve better outcomes for First Nations persons; and
  - (d) any other information required by the regulations.

The amendment would delete part 4 and substitute a new part 4 in relation to interaction with the parliament. That will be familiar to the committee in that it is the contents of part 5 of the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill as it was in 2021 and 2022. Apart from, I think, being one clause out, we are able to read along by reference to that bill. I again recognise the work of parliamentary counsel in that respect.

The replacement of the part really draws the distinction between the model as proposed, the subject of the government's bill, and the form of engagement with the parliament that is the subject of the 2021 bill. I will not say anything more, for fear of otherwise traversing the contents of another bill that is on the *Notice Paper*, but rather address the particular contents.

I had a bit to say yesterday about the important role of the longstanding South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council on the one hand and its proposed replacement with the representative body on the other, together with the establishment under statute of the role of Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, both the subject of the previous bill, and the means by which those replacements then provided for a coherent means of engagement with the parliament.

I say it is well familiar to the committee. That is not only because it is there on the face of the 2021 bill, but it was the subject of some consideration in the course of the second reading debate in 2021. Insofar as the substance was adverted to, it was perhaps on more than one occasion criticised by the characterisation of being not so much a Voice to the Parliament as a voice to a committee.

In moving the amendment to substitute the part, I take on board that characterisation but embrace it as a virtue and urge the committee's consideration of that model of engagement, thoroughgoing and coherent as it is, in relation to the capacity for parliament to be accountable for the work and engagement of a body that is seeking to engage with issues of importance to it, as opposed to what we see in the government's bill in part 4, which is a form of engagement that is limited—and for those who followed the committee process and read the bill, we are talking about a body that is meeting on those four, or up to six, occasions each year, engaging with the parliament only in relation to the subject matter of the *Notice Paper*.

We have gone from a draft government bill that again was oriented around the analysis of the *Notice Paper*. At draft stage, the government bill proposed a model that said that the Clerk will have a look over the *Notice Paper* and the Clerk will consider what might be of relevance or interest to Aboriginal people and perhaps put a highlight or a tick on those items and then hand it over and say, 'If you would like to have something to say about these bills, then you are free to do so.'

By the time we get to the final version of the bill that is before the house, the government at least had seen the error of its ways insofar as that gatekeeper model was concerned, the problematic nature of the Clerk somehow determining what is and is not of relevance to Aboriginal people. It is a positive outcome to the extent that the government bill now says that all matters on the *Notice Paper* are potentially of interest to Aboriginal people.

The defect in all of that, of course, is that the engagement of parliament is confined, in that sense, to the subject matter of the *Notice Paper*, leaving aside the fact there is a positive contemplation or expectation that there will be no coherence between the debate in the house on any particular matter that is on the *Notice Paper* and the point in time that anyone from the Voice might seek to take the opportunity to engage. That is let alone the criticisms that this inevitably will punctuate the course of debate, and the references to the third chamber and so on.

The point that I am focusing on in moving the amendment is very much the substance of what it would permit in terms of improved engagement. It has been thought through. It is not my bright idea and I do not take credit for it; it is a matter to be acknowledged in terms of those who have done the work over several recent years. I will quote only briefly again from the report of Dr Roger Thomas in terms of his engagement between July 2018 and November 2020, at page 24, where, in referring to the nature of the representative body and its engagement, he is saying that that body will embody one of the key tenets of the Uluru Statement, the statement that many have referred to in the course of this debate. It will, on this model of parliamentary engagement via a committee, be a Voice of the Aboriginal community to the Parliament of South Australia.

I endorse and amplify those observations because, in the very short period of time I have been a member of this place, having seen the way that committees function vis-a-vis the parliament, it is clear to me that access to committee work and engagement with a parliament via those members of a committee—a committee geared towards the reception of, and the inquiry into, matters that are raised by that body—is a particularly productive way of developing from the ground up matters of importance to Aboriginal people.

By comparison, being confined to cherrypicking a *Notice Paper* that has arisen because of the whole variety of reasons why business comes before this parliament in the usual course is hardly a ground-up approach and hardly provides what I would suggest is capable of satisfying a Voice definition, leaving aside the problems of the nature of that interaction with the chamber itself.

That has been the subject of observation in the national debate, and I would refer to the article on 28 February in *The Australian* newspaper in circumstances where, at the federal level, they are still steps away from seeing legislation. But the committee engagement model there has been praised and recognised for its capacity to do good work. I will quote from that article:

Committees provide an opportunity for organisations and individuals to participate in policymaking and to have their views placed on the public record and considered as part of the decision-making process.

Further:

...irrespective of changes of government or policy priorities, the mechanism remains focused on hearing voices of local and regional [communities]...

That is a model that has been spoken up for on the national stage, and I note the engagement of the opposition shadow attorney and shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs, Julian Leeser, in this regard. But it is not only him: former Indigenous minister Ken Wyatt also spoke very much about the merits of that form of engagement.

I have said it plenty of times; in fact, I think the member for Light kindly quoted me in the course of my second reading debate, emphasising that we ought to approach policy and legislative reform in this area with humility and with diligence. Providing a mechanism, a meat and potatoes mechanism, for engagement via a committee—as I said, it has been damned or lampooned or characterised as voice to a committee—on the contrary, is a means of engagement that we ought to embrace and it is a means by which this parliament can actually do some service to those who would engage from the Aboriginal community side.

Just to underscore again those voices that are not mine in this regard, I refer, in the second round of feedback (it would be remiss of me not to) to the sentiment that is expressed by a number of respondents, including among them the South Australian Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisation Network in their submission dated 9 January 2023—that is submission number 30. I think this is an observation that ought to be borne squarely in mind. At page 10, at about point 7 on the page, the convenor says:

We propose that a model is developed with a starting point from Parliament and looking out. This places the onus on Parliament, not on Aboriginal peoples, to ensure that Voice representation is guaranteed.

It goes on, and there are further observations in that regard. Let me just give one second reference to a similar sentiment, and in the context of the nature of consultation and engagement. The author of submission 31, who is described as an individual (and the details are redacted so I will simply describe it as submission 31), in a thoughtful submission ranging over aspects of the bill, makes the observation that:

...the legislation is geared towards the State Government extending an invitation to Aboriginal peoples to have their say on matters of interest to them; this is placing the onus upon Aboriginal people to identify matters that may be in their interests.

The capacity to have a direct engagement with a purpose-built committee means that there is much more than that that is possible and the capacity for that engagement, therefore, to have the capacity to bear fruit in terms of real improved outcomes. One more—I said that there were only those two. I referred yesterday to aspects of the Public Law and Policy Research Unit's submission, which is submission 35.

In this regard, the authors make the observation at page 20 of their submission that at present, that is the subject of this bill, there is no provision for the State First Nations Voice to address either house on a matter other than a bill. Putting aside the merits of addressing the house to the extent that this is a question that puts the focus on that limitation, they make the pretty obvious observation there:

It is foreseeable that a matter raising issues of importance to Aboriginal people could arise after the annual address had been given. There may be no Bill in Parliament relating to that issue. Under current provisions of the Bill, State First Nations Voice could provide a report to Parliament but could not make an address. The visibility and power of an address to Parliament may be quite different from the impact of providing a written report.

They are then not going so far as to traverse what might be the means in the alternative, and they might be forgiven for doing that because they are there commenting on what has been proposed.

But I hope the point is made loud and clear. Standing here I am really wanting to emphasise that, far from tiptoeing into the field with a somewhat less than fully informed capacity of engagement via a Voice to committee, it should be understood loud and clear that an engagement model via a committee has a great deal more capacity to do real work to be unifying and coherent in terms of taking the debate forward. So with those short words of explanation, I urge the adoption of the amendment in terms of that substitution of part 4.

**The CHAIR:** Just to clarify, and this is just a procedural matter, as the member for Heysen's amendment No. 1 replaces the whole of part 4 of the bill concerning addresses to parliament—being five clauses, 38 to 42—it is my intention to put only the part of the amendment concerning clause 38 first, but I will let members ask questions on 38 to 42 in the first part because they are related.

**Mr TEAGUE:** So as to be clear about my understanding, the amendment is a single amendment, Chair, and the consequences of its carriage or not might play on where we go next. Of course, I am happy to take questions on any one of the clauses within the single amendment.

**The CHAIR:** Essentially, because of the interrelationships between those clauses, I will allow for questions from 38 to 42. We will then deal with clause 38, as you said. If that is carried, then we will take it from there; if it fails, we will take it from there. Then we will go to the other clauses individually. All I am saying in effect is that I will open it up for questions for the whole lot. I will allow questions on the whole lot because of their interrelationship and there are things you might want to say that go to questions asked.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I would perhaps counsel against that in that, and I do not want to be too pessimistic, in the perhaps unfortunate event that my amendment is not carried then there will be work to do in terms of part 4 as it then stands. So I am happy to take questions on my proposed amendment and that ranges over several clauses but it is in one go.

**The CHAIR:** That is what I was trying to say.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Alright, if that is what you are trying to say, then we can deal with the consequences of that one way or the other.

**The CHAIR:** Yes. Clearly, I do not have legal training to put that into the words you wanted, but that is what I was trying to say.

*The Hon. S.E. Close interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Yes, you may, minister, in response and then I will take questions.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I am aware that there are likely to be questions from people other than myself but I would like to give a government response initially. I understand the nature of these amendments, but characterised in this first amendment, is to essentially say, 'We don't want to have an elected Aboriginal Voice to Parliament that is able to come and address parliament directly on bills. We want to create between the Voice to Parliament and parliament a committee to which the Voice would be able to give views on bills but also traverse other issues.'

There appear to be a couple of arguments in favour that the member has put. One being an assertion that the Voice is somehow limited to what happens to be on the *Notice Paper*. Another being that it is in some ways more meritorious for an elected Voice to Parliament to speak to a committee rather than to parliament. And a third question of whether this was a model derived by Professor Roger Thomas that had more support from the Aboriginal community via that exercise than does this proposition. I would argue that each of those three points does not have sufficient substance to warrant supporting this amendment.

I have a piece that I will read out because it has been carefully considered about why it is that it is important that the Voice be able to come directly to parliament. Before I turn to that I would point out that, although the member has acknowledged the existence of it, he has not given sufficient weight to clause 41, which talks about the presentation of a report to parliament on any matter.

I think the member has characterised that as being, 'Well, it's only a report, it's not the same as going to a committee.' I would say a report to all of parliament can have considerably more weight



than going via a committee. But, in any case, what it does do is deal with the argument that somehow the Voice is being limited to what happens to be on the *Notice Paper*.

There is also, of course, the reality that, while this legislation creates a formal mechanism by which the Voice to Parliament is able to address parliament on bills, it, by its very existence, encourages the reaching out of people who are drafting bills and considering policy issues to seek advice on any matter that they wish to, whereas I suspect the existence of a committee might suggest that it is the work of the committee to do such reaching out. It creates a layer of parliamentary bureaucracy that I think would be misleading because it would suggest that that is properly the business of a committee of parliament rather than of parliament itself.

I would also say that I think we should be wary about over-characterising the position that was placed by Professor Roger Thomas in his report that was quoted. This document does not in fact talk about the creation of a committee. That did become the model that was the piece of legislation that emerged from the work that Roger undertook, and I believe there was something like nine days consultation on, which was one of the many concerns that we raised when in opposition.

The quote on page 24 that the member quotes from is not specifically in the context of a parliamentary committee. In fact, it is importantly that the body will embody one of the key tenets of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, Voice, that it will be a voice of the Aboriginal community to the parliament of South Australia. I think it is important that we do not miss the import of those words. It is important that we are talking about a Voice to Parliament, which brings me to the overall concern that has been raised by my colleague in the other place about this proposition.

We had been informed that there would be a number of amendments but the opposition chose not to put any in the upper house and that it would wait for this chamber and it would seek to improve this bill. It has been to me notable that the only amendments relate to removing the capacity for the Voice to speak directly to parliament, that it is simply to create a committee.

That is a source of disappointment to me, that in choosing not to support this piece of legislation will be a lasting source of disappointment to me. The opposition has simultaneously also not sought to address other issues that have been raised in this discussion, in this committee stage, but instead has just sought to deprive the Voice of the opportunity to do what it promises, which is to speak directly to parliament.

The piece that has been prepared for me on this is that the government opposes these amendments because they fatally undermine the bill; they stop it being a Voice to Parliament. The effect of the opposition's amendments are to remove the entire part of the bill which enables a state's First Nations Voice to interact directly with the parliament. Instead, the proposition is the establishment of a new parliamentary committee.

The commitment we made to the people of South Australia was for a Voice to Parliament, not a voice to a committee. I know the member does not appreciate that characterisation of his amendments. More than just being an election commitment by the government, it was a clear and unambiguous message that we received from Aboriginal communities across the state. During the six months of consultation undertaken by the Commissioner for First Nations Voice, community members told us loud and clear that they wanted the Voice to engage directly with parliament and directly with government. To quote the commissioner's first Engagement Report:

The response to this question was clear and near unanimous across all conversations, and this was reflected in the survey responses. All attendees want The Voice to speak directly to Parliament. They do not want their message diluted by another body or committee.

The report also quotes a Koonibba community member, who said at one of the consultation sessions:

You should go straight to the top. That's the only way we're going to be heard. You go through other people and they have their own agendas.

Even if the opposition does not agree with the government's policy on this matter, even if they do not support the unambiguous call from the Uluru Statement from the Heart, why do they insist on these amendments, knowing that they are contrary to the clear and express wishes of First Nations South Australians?

This house should pass a bill which reflects the extensive feedback received from Aboriginal communities and which meets the objectives set out in the Uluru Statement from the Heart. For these reasons, the government does not support this amendment. With that, I will yield to those backbenchers who may have some specific questions on this matter before we vote.

**Ms HOOD:** My question is to the member for Heysen. Why does the member for Heysen's proposed committee, as part of his amendments, not ensure crossbench representation from the House of Assembly?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I am not sure we are there yet. We are at amendment No. 1. With your indulgence, Chair, I am happy to address it. I think really the member for Adelaide's question is going to the subject of amendment No. 2, which is consequential.

**The CHAIR:** This is actually a bit later, in a sense. I might allow it, only to the extent that it is consequential so it actually informs the first bit, so I will allow the question. Are you happy to answer it?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I am happy to. As I understand it, the question just asked is why there is not specific provision for members of the crossbench in the House of Assembly; is that the question?

**The CHAIR:** Yes.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I note that we have a committee of six members. Those three appointed in the Legislative Council clearly contemplate a member of the crossbench and, if no such member exists, then a member nominated by the Leader of the Opposition. We do not have that equivalent provision in the House of Assembly. Although it is there contemplating that one member will be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition and two nominated by the minister, it does not preclude a nomination from a member of the crossbench. In the usual way in which members of committees are nominated in this place, there is the possibility for that to be facilitated should a member of the crossbench seek to be a member of the committee.

I just foreshadow that if we get to that point, and it is sufficient to get us over the line, I would be quite open to contemplating such more specific provision. Let's see if we get there.

**Ms THOMPSON:** Who did the member for Heysen consult with prior to introducing these amendments?

**Mr TEAGUE:** Thank you for that question. Firstly, it is not just me but, as I said in the course of my second reading contribution and in the course of the committee, this is directly in line with the work that has been done in the lead-up to the preparation and introduction of the bill of which this forms a part in 2021 and the bill that I introduced in May of last year in this place and that sits on the *Notice Paper*. It is the subject of extensive consultation, together with the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, over the period of years leading up to its introduction.

The Deputy Premier has referred to this oft-cited number of days of consultation prior to which the bill was introduced in 2021. It is a rather insufficient form of characterisation. If we are going to adopt the same test, I would perhaps highlight that I saw this bill about a day or two or three before its introduction. If the member for Davenport is looking then to the medium-term history, I would commend the summary of the range in nature of engagement that is referred to by Professor Thomas at page 23 of his report.

I have addressed perhaps a broader-ranging response on the question of engagement which was very thorough in terms of the establishment of the body itself. I otherwise refer to the body of work that led up to the 2021 bill, which is replicated in the bill in my name in 2022.

**Ms THOMPSON:** How many stakeholder groups were consulted prior to these amendments being placed on the file?

**Mr TEAGUE:** Again, I go back to the long history of this matter, and again I have cited the table at page 23 of Professor Roger Thomas's report. What I have sought to do is to bring to the house a model and a form of engagement that is not only well known, because it has been sitting on the *Notice Paper* throughout the course of this parliament, but was there in the previous parliament; and, in terms of the engagement in the lead-up to the establishment of the body that would engage

in such engagement with the parliament, has been the subject of a report, the result of many years' work of Professor Roger Thomas.

**Ms THOMPSON:** Can you clarify if any Aboriginal organisations or community leaders provided feedback on the amendments prior to them being filed?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I think I have already answered that. If you are looking for a fresh round of engagement as it were between 7 February and 8 March, there has been an occasion to address discrete subject matter that is already of longstanding. I do not know if that is your focal point, that is, the month between February and March. I engaged in the usual course of interaction, I suppose, in response to the government bill during that period of time, including reflecting on and promoting what, in my view, remains a more meritorious form of engagement to the parliament that is the subject of part 4 of the previous bill—so, if you like, going over that old ground with all of those with whom I am engaging in the usual way, but this is subject matter that is well familiar for now getting on a year and a half.

**S.E. ANDREWS:** How would the proposed committee's views, submissions and recommendations be heard by parliament?

**Mr TEAGUE:** The part provides for that, insofar as the committee would be obliged to come in in the usual way and report the outcome of work that the committee has done. We see that in the course of each parliamentary sitting week on a Thursday.

It has that advantage in that, just like a committee that meets for the purposes of engaging with subject matter that is the subject of standing committee business, one of the distinct advantages of the structure—and the question from the member for Gibson gives me the opportunity to reflect upon—is that not only would it provide that regular opportunity, including on a Thursday in routine business, for there to be engagement with the house about the progress of committee work, but there would be the occasion with the regularity of a parliamentary committee to be engaged in the day-to-day work of the parliament.

So it would have the effect of both promoting the ordinariness of incorporation of the routines of parliament with this body—as has been said, as I think I have observed already, it would allow for the meat and potatoes, ground-up work to be developed by the representative body/Voice with the committee—and in turn would provide the occasion, in a coherent way, for the results of that work to be engaged with in terms of the parliament in its day-to-day work.

**S.E. ANDREWS:** Thank you. What are the provisions for electing the Presiding Member of the committee, and which chamber would they come from?

**Mr TEAGUE:** Again, I think we are into amendment No. 2. In the usual way, the committee when it first meets elects the Chair of the committee and business proceeds henceforth. So, as a committee, replacing as it would (and I think that is the subject of amendment Nos 3 or 4) the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, we would see the reform of that process. We would otherwise have the establishment of a committee in the usual way, constituted in terms of the provisions in amendment No. 2, and a Chair elected in the usual way in terms of parliamentary committees.

**Ms HOOD:** How would the member for Heysen summarise the feedback received from First Nations South Australians on his proposal to create a Voice to a committee rather than a Voice to Parliament?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I am particularly grateful for that question from the member for Adelaide. I might have confined myself to circumstances in which we might find ourselves traversing part 4 as it is proposed, but I might just perhaps go there in response to that question. There might be occasion to revisit it subsequently.

We see in the Second Engagement Note of the Commissioner for First Nations Voice to the South Australian Parliament, November 2022 to January 2023, at page 20 an observation that:

Most submissions were supportive of mechanisms in the draft Bill enabling the State Voice to engage with Parliament...

It is not the occasion to ask the government for evidence that might underpin that statement, but in response to it I will ask the government, if I have the occasion to, in relation to the government's version of part 4. In response to the question, I can just indicate that I have found no such evidence. Of the 42 submissions that must be the subject of this report, only one of them speaks up in favour of the model that is proposed for part 4 in the government's bill, and that is the submission of the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement.

I only address this body of submissions, because it is what is referred to in the Second Engagement Note. The bulk of these are anti the whole project, so put that to one side. Those that are otherwise ambivalent or pro in the main do not address the minutiae of the model. They just do not go there. Those that do address the minutiae of the model thoughtfully argue against it—and I have given a couple of examples—for the reason that it limits the nature and rather renders incoherent the nature of the engagement to the parliament, and hence the argument for something that does not quite so clearly put the onus on Aboriginal people as opposed to the onus on the parliament to do the running, do the real work of engagement.

I think the best answer I can give to the member for Adelaide is that the model that is the subject of the 2021 bill, the 2022 bill that is on the *Notice Paper* and the subject of my amendment No. 1 is not there simply by accident, and it is not there simply as a faint reference to the possibility of some form of engagement. It is a thought-through model that has the prospects of real outcome and it is to be set against what, without more, is an incorrect observation in the Second Engagement Note that most submissions were somehow supportive of mechanisms in the government bill in relation to the State Voice engaging with parliament. It is a better, more robust working model, and although I have the cart before the horse the alternative is not spoken up for in terms of submission response.

**Ms CLANCY:** Is it correct that the former Liberal government gave just over a week to provide feedback on the draft Aboriginal Representative Body Bill prior to its introduction to parliament?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I am glad to focus on it—again, I have said this a few times in the course of the committee—because as recently as 7 February 2023, as recently as about six weeks ago, the Premier told ABC Radio Adelaide that there was no bill before the last parliament. I do not know whether he is aware of the fact that there was, and that there is also a bill before the current parliament—there has been for a year—but I guess the best I can say about the notion that somehow there were so many days of exposure of a draft bill before it was introduced and then debate commenced is it only rises so high in the context of the circumstances of late 2021.

The only thing I would add is that the debate on the second reading of that bill in 2021 ensued over the course of two months: October and November 2021. There were numerous thoughtful contributions to the debate, and the criticism of the model rose only so high as what the member for Elder has just recited: the criticism about so many days prior to introduction and so on. I would just say that I saw the government bill in a time frame similar to that, if you want to characterise it in the same way. Meanwhile, the criticism of substance was confined—and I welcome those who would add more—to the characterisation of the model in terms of being a Voice to a committee and 'Oh, what a shame; it is only a Voice to a committee'.

So I will embrace the characterisation, if you like, and then say that we have had a full year-and-a-half to think about it, to work through what stacks up and what works. What is the national debate, and what are we going to anticipate in terms of a legislative model federally in the event that matters progress? On any measure, it stacks up. It stacked up in 2021, it stacked up last year and it still stacks up now, otherwise I would not advance the amendment.

**Ms CLANCY:** Just to clarify, you have obviously said that these amendments seek to replicate the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill that was previously introduced. Does the member for Heysen consider that the consultation on that bill was adequate?

**Mr TEAGUE:** For present purposes, yes. I would just add the context in which we come here to debate the merits of this bill: I was anticipating the Premier leading the committee. But there is nothing turning on it. I have been criticised by the Premier personally for turning up to an event to which I was invited—which I accepted and participated in. This is with due respect; I have a great

respect for all engaged in the debate. I was criticised for somehow celebrating an occasion on the one hand and then changing my position on the other. Nothing could be further from the truth.

There is a model of engagement, the subject of a bill that was introduced in the last parliament, whether the Premier realises that or not. That model was again put forward—more or less on day one; not quite but almost—and it sat on the *Notice Paper* throughout the period of time. As I have said previously, at estimates in June last year, by serendipity it was the member for Dunstan, in circumstances where I was double-booked elsewhere, who had the opportunity. So the former Minister for Aboriginal Affairs engaged directly with the current Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about, 'What are you going to do to carry on the work of Professor Thomas and the work that has been elucidated in terms of the 2021 bill and the 2022 bill, just fresh as it was then?'

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs said, 'We will do our own work. We will start from scratch.' So he did, even to the point of saying, 'We are going to move away from a Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement and instead we are going to have an inaugural Commissioner for First Nations Voice in South Australia. We are going to engage in a process of engagement,' and all the rest of it.

The interesting thing about that, apart from what I have described over the course of last year as being a risk of a re-run, is that what you have underpinning all of that is one set of parliamentary counsel work. This makes it abundantly clear that the underpinning is there, and there is a conscious decision then to depart from that 'Voice to a committee' and to move to the model that is the subject of part 4 of the government's bill.

I say that is defective, I say that is incoherent, and I say it will not work. I will add to that that it is unambitious. I will cop, on behalf of the former government, notions of however many days prior to introduction that something might have been circulated, but here we are in March 2023 and everyone has had plenty of time to take on board these different alternatives. It is now brought forward, once again, in terms of the merits and it is a model that I, again, commend to the house.

**Ms CLANCY:** Given that under the Liberal government the current incarnation of this committee did not provide the parliament with a report for three years, what safeguards will ensure that this committee will actually report to parliament?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I think I adverted to this in my second reading contribution as well. Here, I defer to but I certainly endorse the observations of the member for Giles, who has, for some time, made I guess maybe three observations: first, that it is a bit of a unique committee that is focused in name and in remit on Aboriginal lands—it is kind of a late 20<sup>th</sup> century kind of model; and secondly, he has made the observation that it is, in those circumstances, somewhat odd that there is a group from parliament that from time to time might go on visits or engage in particular subject matter.

If he has not expressly, then I might add a third, and that is that the range and scope of its productive work had been confined to matters of governance and heritage and lands and so on, and it has been active in its engagement—and I have witnessed that as I have been on the committee from time to time in recent years—and it has certainly provided some de facto capacity for engagement and better understanding with Aboriginal groups. But it is in need of reform.

The doing away with that committee is not terribly controversial. The replacement with a committee that is specifically having as its sole purpose in life, as it were, to ensure that it is accountable to a body of credibility that is engaging with it and vice versa, has a great deal to recommend it by contrast and comparison.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I appreciate we are talking about the amendments, not the substance of the bill at this stage, but a number of matters have been raised in answering those questions and I feel it might be useful just to give some summary, as we are effectively comparing and contrasting the two models and also the two processes.

For the sake of people who may in the future be reading this in *Hansard*, or those who are listening now, essentially what happened under the previous government—and with Professor Roger Thomas, who, as I have said in this place before, I have enormous respect for and have known for many years since we worked together at the University of Adelaide when he came and took over Wirltu Yarlur from my very brief management of that institution while we were between Mercy

Glastonbury and himself, while we were looking for an Aboriginal leader for that lovely organisation. His work was to undertake consultation on a model and then after that model had been consulted on for some period of time, a report was produced and then a draft piece of legislation went out for a very brief period of time.

That is why we have this question of the nine days of consultation on what the model then actually looked like in a piece of legislation; whereas with the work that was undertaken by Dale Agius, who is also a splendid human and South Australian, he took a piece of draft legislation out for a long period of time and consulted on that piece of legislation that then has been modified slightly as a result of that. So that is a degree of understanding why these questions of the length of time legislation was looked at is being discussed.

When we look at the report on the model that Professor Thomas came up with, the detail that is now residing in these amendments obviously was not there because it was not a legislative instrument that was being consulted on and nor was it reported in that way. I think it is probably a long bow to suggest that, because that bill went into parliament prior to the last election and because it was reintroduced, somehow the Aboriginal community has had this opportunity to continue engaging with that and giving feedback. I think that ignores that there was an election in which a new government was formed. The Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs clearly ran the election commitment that we would fulfil the obligations or the request of the Uluru Statement from the Heart for Voice, Treaty, Truth and that the focus of the Aboriginal communities' feedback then shifted to that piece of legislation.

But just to briefly close off on the work that Professor Thomas undertook, this report, the 'Draft guiding principles for an Aboriginal representative body for South Australia', includes at number seven:

Direct and reciprocal engagement with government—formal relationship with government agencies, Cabinet and/or Parliament with mutual responsibilities.

Short of a piece of legislation, which can be given feedback on precise wording, the idea of direct engagement including to parliament does rather suggest that one would not go through a committee, even though that is then where that draft legislation ended up. We ought to be wary of putting too much weight on the feedback on that model then translating it into any kind of support specifically for amendments that are before us today.

But then in contrast, the member has suggested that there is some form of inaccuracy perhaps in the Second Engagement Note from Commissioner Agius in suggesting that submissions were overwhelmingly supportive of the draft legislation that was aired extensively across South Australia within Aboriginal communities. It was available to people who were interested.

The overwhelming majority of feedback that was given was done in face-to-face sessions with Commissioner Agius and the summary gives us an opportunity to understand what happened there. Written submissions are one form of feedback and, as it has been pointed out, I think some of those written submissions were opposed to all of the ideas of a Voice. But if we go to page 8 of that second note:

Overwhelmingly, people who attended face-to-face sessions supported the proposed Voice to Parliament model. There was particular support for the provisions that enabled the Voice to engage with Parliament, the Cabinet [and so on].

But the point being that Commissioner Agius was equipped with a piece of legislation that said the Voice will be fully elected and will be able to come to parliament and give direct feedback on legislation. The overwhelming feedback from the Aboriginal community was, 'Yes, that is what we want.'

So in terms of what raises the bar to then cling to a view that a committee is sufficient and in fact supported I think runs counter to the work that was done by Commissioner Agius. I will not go so far as to say it is disrespectful to that work but it ignores the considerable feedback that was given through this process and, in fact, seeks to overlook that the process existed. To maintain that because this piece of legislation was reintroduced in private member's business that there was sufficient time for more feedback on that bill that is then translated into this amendment does not

meet the test that I would set for being able to listen to the voice of Aboriginal people in constructing this Voice to Parliament.

**Mr TEAGUE:** At the risk of paraphrasing a cliché, I might take that as a question.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** You can take it as a statement.

**Mr TEAGUE:** But anyway I would be glad to respond. Firstly, and I go back to June last year, it is a pity that the government chose, in the words of the minister, 'to do our own work' and to put aside what had gone before, because otherwise we would be in a much better position to actually have an even-handed assessment. I was not present at every face-to-face consultation and I do not profess, therefore, to be a fly on the wall in respect of all of those matters.

What I can confidently say is that it is of no surprise, of course, that Commissioner Agius went out at any stage with a form of draft bill. He had the benefit of parliamentary counsel's work towards the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill. What is surprising to me is that he was not armed with two versions or three or a number of different proposals. He had it all there but the government chose not to do that. We saw what I would describe in my background as a bunch of leading questions including those put on placards saying, 'Are you in favour of this particular proposition?' We had a kind of a leading approach to a particular model of engagement.

What I have been at pains to describe is the ambivalent through to not on-point subject matter of responses in terms of the submissions. In doing so I do not overlook page 8 for a second. What the second note must be talking about is submissions in response to the draft. That is the very purpose of the Second Engagement Note. It is talking about submissions. Again, no need to make too much of a fine point of it, but at page 8 we talk about face-to-face sessions. The assertion, for what it is worth, at page 20 is that the submissions were overwhelmingly in favour of the model, and they just weren't. There are the submissions.

If the point is that 'submissions' includes face-to-face consultation or there was somehow a survey response or whatever, then let's hear about it. If it rises no higher than what is expressed at page 8, alright, that is on the public record. I do not make any more of it than that but I do highlight that those who have taken the step of committing their views on this topic to writing for the purposes of this exercise and who have been described in this Second Engagement Note are not seen to be supportive of the mechanisms in the draft bill.

We do see grounds in those submissions. We do see the seeds of what has then been taken up from draft to final in some other respects, and we have addressed that in terms of clause 7 changes, in terms of the Clerk vetting changes, and in other ways. You can go through the submissions and see indications of views, I might say largely going to the caution that there not be ground overlapped or overtaken by this body in terms of existing organisations. But what we do not see is really any—and I said the ALRM is the exception. The ALRM submission does not really give it much more than a line or two and says, 'Well, it's okay.' They add, 'Well, you ought to be able to roll in by right to address both.' They say that in about a sentence.

But there is no actual evidence for the proposition at page 20 on the face of the submissions. It might be the subject of thoughtful argument and all the rest of it. To go back to one example, in the member for West Torrens' contribution to the debate on the last sitting Thursday, where the member for West Torrens kind of carved out some ground to say, 'Well, this might not be perfect first time round but, you know, you might learn things along the way,' what has been learned along the way, I submit, is not some form of described endorsement of this form of engagement to the parliament.

What does engagement to parliament mean? You can express general positivity about engagement to parliament—we can all do that—but what we have not seen is evidence of the merits of this particular model. Those who have thoughtfully contributed or focused on it have highlighted, rather, the defects, the limitations, the lack of ambition associated with this form of engagement.

In terms then of the question of, 'Well, it's a bit thin for the member for Heysen to say that somehow, just because of the fact that this has been on the public record for a period of time, everybody could have given some thought to it or it amounts to consultation,' and so on, alright, fair cop, but I will refer to the merits. I will just come back to the merits of the point, as I have already,

including advertising to the paper that was released by the group Uphold & Recognise as recently as late February talking to the merits of committee engagement.

I have already quoted from the report. I will perhaps just add a further passage, where it says, by reference to foreshadowed federal legislation:

The national voice for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people could draw upon some of the operating principles used by parliamentary committees—providing advice to the government and relevant departments—etc., and we see a studious consideration.

Bottom line, I will uphold that model of engagement as a voice to the parliament, if you want to call it that way, that will do more in terms of providing meat and potatoes engagement with a view to improved outcomes than, as it were—maybe there is room for substance—a ceremonial capacity to come along having had a look at the *Notice Paper* and, before, during or after the event, say, 'Alright, I might have something to say about the Rail Safety National Law,' and at some stage in between the four meetings a year or up to six we might learn that the Rail Safety National Law was in the course of debate in the house during the last week, maybe fortuitously, or earlier in the year, or it might be coming on later so you might want to get in and have something to say, let alone the limitations that that provides in terms of the range and scope of the subject matter of engagement.

Of course, there are other means of engagement—and there are. Insofar as it relates to the part 4 mechanisms, contrary to what the member for West Torrens had to say last sitting week and contrary to notions of a number of days of consultation in the lead-up to 2021, I really come back to the bottom-line argument: that it is there for all to see, it is a meritorious model, it provides more promise and, dare I say, in a more humble and diligent way than the structure that we see the subject of clause 4 of the government's bill. I do not reflect any more at this point about the way in which part 4 of the government's bill in fact operates but just by way of response to the Deputy Premier's question just now.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** If I may have my third contribution on this.

**The CHAIR:** I assume we are going to cover some new ground.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** We are going to have some clarifying moments. Although I am not being asked questions, essentially a question was raised about why it was that the original version that was presented to this parliament when the previous parliament was in place was not presented to members of the Aboriginal community to ask what their views would be with the new government. Of course, that is actually exactly the sequence of events.

Previously, we were talking about the Second Engagement Note, which was as a result of having had a piece of legislation written and taken out extensively for feedback. We have had a slight disagreement about the narrow definition of the word 'submission', and I think that it ought to be accepted that 'submission' is information provided to a commissioner in response to consultation and is not confined exclusively to written submissions.

Importantly, there was the previous Engagement Report, where I can reassure the member that, effectively, exactly what he wished might have happened did happen, in the sense that initially it was not the piece of legislation that has ultimately ended up here that was taken out, but an open question of how one would do a First Nations Voice to the South Australian parliament. I refer to that Engagement Report, page 23:

At engagements, I asked communities to consider where they want their voice to be heard—whether they want to speak directly to the South Australian Parliament, or whether they wanted their views heard by another body or committee. Additionally, I asked whether communities want to speak to key government leaders and decision-makers, as well as Parliament.

The response to this question was clear and near unanimous across all conversations, and this was reflected in the survey responses. All attendees want the Voice to speak directly to Parliament. They do not want their message diluted by another body or committee.

Here we come to the question of merit. The member has suggested that, irrespective of our disagreements about the nature and contents of the feedback, his proposition has merit. We are talking about giving voice to the First Nations people in South Australia. That cannot just be as



expressed in this legislation when it occurs, when it comes into practice, but it must also be in the construction of this legislation.

If we do not see that merit lies in the feedback we have from First Nations people in constructing it, it is difficult for me to believe that we will be listening to the Voice of First Nations people when they talk about legislation, when they give that feedback. And they have given feedback. The Aboriginal people of South Australia have said, 'We want the Voice to go straight to parliament, not via a committee.' We have had Dale Agius, who is highly respected, go out, ask the question and receive the answer, in fact not inconsistent with the way in which the model was expressed by Professor Roger Thomas, although not ultimately appearing in the piece of legislation that was very briefly consulted on.

So, merit to me is process as much as outcome. We can argue, and reasonable people can disagree, about whether a committee would provide more and better input than a person coming and addressing parliament. We can have that debate. It is really beside the point. We have asked the Aboriginal communities how they wish to have their voice heard, and they have given feedback. This government has listened to that, and has constructed a piece of legislation, and then gone out with that piece of legislation and checked again what people think about that, and minor modifications but not to this point, and here it is.

We now have that opportunity as legislators to make a decision about whether we accept that, and I am proud to be in a government that said we will. I wish I was part of a parliament that unanimously said that, but I appreciate that that is not possible and will not happen. It is important when we debate this that we go back to the principles of why we are doing this. Without reiterating my second reading contribution, we are doing this to right wrongs in part—a small part—but importantly we are doing this because the only culture that is unique to Australia ought to have more weight in our considerations than it currently has. That ought to be recognised in the construction of how we create the Voice as well as then how the Voice operates once it is in existence.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I will again take that as a question and, indeed, respond. Of course, I endorse everything in the last couple of sentences of the Deputy Premier's observations: that is exactly why we are here. Let that be clearly understood. Contributions to the debate ought to be characterised, if by nothing else, by precisely what the Deputy Premier has had to say.

I am certainly conscious of page 23 of the Engagement Report, August to October, and the observation of the author in terms of the observation: 'They do not want their message diluted by another body or committee.' I just make the observation that those are the words of the author, and that is all well and good, bearing in mind this is a process at this stage, August to October, where the author is embarking upon a process with the benefit of a model in mind. It is hardly surprising that we would see an observation of the author of that nature. I have gone to the Second Engagement Note in the course of my contribution more broadly, but particularly in relation to this matter, because it is where the rubber hits the road in light of the draft bill and observations on it.

I make the further observation that so far as characterisation of submissions—or let's call them page 8: attendance at face-to-face sessions—what is on the cover of the bundle that I have been provided with is a cover note that summarises submissions 1 through 42, and the heading of the document is 'Submissions received during second engagement round November 2022 to January 2023'. So the Second Engagement Note is November 2022 to January 2023. These are the submissions received during the second engagement round, and at page 20 we see an observation of the commissioner: 'Most submissions were supportive of mechanisms in the draft Bill enabling the State Voice.' They are not; they are just not. It is what it is. They are not.

We have an observation of the author in the Engagement Report about this characterisation of dilution via committee. I do not adopt that observation, and I do not concede that that reflects more than the author's observation, sincere as it is. I again reiterate my respect for the author, but we are without evidence in terms of either submission or other description about what we might find in terms of how part 4 in the government's formulation is, firstly, finding support and, secondly, providing any evidence in advance of its capacity to be effective and coherent.

**The CHAIR:** Does anybody wish to ask any other questions or make any other contribution on clauses 38 to 42 at this point in time? I am just trying to give everybody a chance to have their say. I think we have reached a point where we are not going to agree—just agree to disagree, I think.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Chair, I am very optimistic. We are dealing with the amendment. I am moving it and I certainly commend it to the house.

*The Hon. S.E. Close interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Yes, I accept that. I am just saying—

*The Hon. S.E. Close interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Are you happy to put the whole lot?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I have addressed questions across the board and I am content to deal with it in one go.

**The CHAIR:** So, members are happy with that, both sides? Excellent. So we are putting the first amendment by the member for Heysen, which deals with the whole of part 4.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 39.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I stand to be corrected, but I think clause 39 is the result of draft to final consultation, in terms of the Clerk as kind of gatekeeper or filter of the *Notice Paper*, on the draft that was circulated in about November to now a model of notice of the introduction to each and every bill before the Legislative Council or the House of Assembly, as the case requires, and so the question is how that is supposed to occur. I have used the analogy of, 'Alright, we will just provide a copy of the *Notice Paper* and on you go,' but is there a particular mechanism that is contemplated, or is that something that is in the realm of what presiding officers of each house are going to need to consider?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Clearly, the bill does not prescribe how that will occur. It will be a matter for parliament to determine.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Or a matter for the presiding officers to determine, presumably. One convenient kind of practice might be, I guess, for the *Notice Paper* of the parliament to be provided and available and updated and so on from day to day. In terms of the machinery of doing so, given that the Voice is meeting when it does, four to six times a year but not as frequently as parliament, presumably the notice of the introduction of each bill would need to happen both out of session and perhaps to the secretariat, somehow. Is there really anything more to say about how clause 39(1) might be satisfied, so that you are not contemplating a clause 39(2) situation?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** As I said, the way in which this will occur is not prescribed by the legislation, but of course a diligent parliament and government will make sure that this is done in the most respectful way possible to facilitate input. The secretariat, one would expect, would be notified. I imagine that once we have an elected Voice, the first Voice, they will determine the method that best suits that group in how to interact. I would also point out that, while there is the prescription to enable the Voice to come to speak to parliament on a particular bill at that point, a diligent government will be seeking to interact with the Voice leading up to pieces of legislation, particularly those that are clearly going to be of interest to the Voice.

Indeed, a mechanism would exist regardless, I would expect, to enable that to work in a way that is respectful of the time commitment for the Voice and in wanting to make sure that in fact the views are heard in enough time to make a difference.

**Mr TEAGUE:** That is new news. It is all new news, in a way. Again, a natural observation that might be made is that for a group that is statutorily limited to meeting four times a year, and not more than six times without ministerial approval, there is to be contemplated—and this goes well beyond the scope of clause 39(1)—the notion that a diligent government would organise the introduction of bills in such a way as would accommodate the meeting schedule of this body.

I guess I would just flag and ask the question of how that could possibly occur in a meaningful, universal way, especially when one has progressed from the notion in draft, namely, that

the Clerk be a form of gatekeeper of subject matter? If the Deputy Premier's observation of just now holds, there is a sense then in which the government might operate as a kind of predictor or gatekeeper of what might be of greater or of lesser relevance. I am just exploring the machinery.

Clause 39(1) simply provides for notice to be given of the introduction of a bill. That can be understood and there are some routine mechanics about it, but it is then a significantly further developed proposition that, in a meeting-constrained environment—see clause 16 and clause 29; clause 29 relevantly because it is a matter of provision to the State Voice—it would be the mark of a diligent government that it would somehow both select relevant subject matter and accommodate the best capacity of the Voice.

That is to be contrasted with the usual diligence that might be applied in terms of engagement with interested parties, as happens all the time on bills. The distinctively different thing here, of course, is that if that diligence in terms of government scheduling and provision of bills was concerned to meet that meeting routine of the Voice, then would it not inevitably result in a changing of the seasonal pattern of legislating across the board, for better or worse?

Otherwise, you would have to sort of take the reins off the meeting schedule and say, 'Alright, Voice, there is parliament meeting. Here is the sitting calendar. Expect that there will be bills introduced more or less each week of that sitting calendar. Why are you not meeting, as a parliamentary committee meets, at least once each sitting week?' I just put all that, as it were, testing the proposition about just how diligent can a government be in terms of seeking to provide what might be regarded as respect to a committee that is established in that way.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** There were several sentences that were sort of questioning, I guess, but I am not sure of the precise question that is being asked. The legislation here is to enable the Voice to make representation to parliament on legislation it chooses and makes sure that the Clerk is the person who is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the Voice is aware of what legislation is coming up. That is all we are doing in this clause. The questions that are being asked are perhaps—

*Mr Teague interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Introduced. The question that is being asked is about my comments that I would expect a good government to be aware that there is now this new form of potential stakeholder interaction, in addition to all the stakeholder interaction that occurs in any case in preparing legislation, and would pay attention to the existence of this new institution and benefit from the advice it can be given. That is my view of how a good government would operate.

A different government simply has this piece of legislation before it. So it probably is not particularly useful for me to canvass how I would, say, when I prepare a biodiversity bill, choose to engage with the Voice because that is my choice, as opposed to the piece of legislation that is being put before us.

This piece of legislation is simply saying we are going to create a Voice, it is an elected body, we are going to make sure that they are aware of the legislation that is to be given notice of the introduction of each bill, that they are aware of that, and that they are able to come and give comment on that. That is what we are seeking the support of parliament for.

**Mr TEAGUE:** In light of that—and I think it is a creative endeavour—it has been referred already in the context of clause 34 that there might be the occasion for the establishment of subject matter committees from time to time in relation to material that might come before the parliament.

Take, for example, the subject matter of the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence's observations in response to a question towards the end of question time today, a body of work leading towards proposed legislation in relation to coercive control. I had the honour and privilege to attend the occasion the minister referred to last Wednesday evening and it was an occasion of significance in relation to the development of that debate. There were certain matters of foreshadowing of both the public campaign and the foreshadowing of legislation in the context of that occasion.

The most significant single part of it, of course, was the sharing of Hannah Clarke's parents, Lloyd and Sue, and I, again, recognise and endorse the minister's description and appreciation of their extraordinary generosity in engaging in the public space about those terrible events.

If we take that as an example of the genesis of a public debate about an issue, and whether or not the Deputy Premier might wish to talk to the possibility of a clause 34 subject matter-based committee being established, I would suggest it would be particularly diligent—one might say you are performing a highwire act as a government—to be able in circumstances, even of that nature, where there is a long foreshadowing of what might come because there is subject matter of wideranging interest and complexity, even in those circumstances to somehow, as it were, accommodate the processes of a time-constrained, meeting-constrained body to permit it to then be responsive to a bill ultimately that it is given notice of once it has been introduced into the parliament just renders the process almost necessarily incoherent.

They would have to hear about it by the other usual means in the same way as you would do consultation normally. I resist the urge to rehearse all of the material about the merits of committee engagement in that context. So it is more by way of response. But to say how exactly, even if you—and there is a view that there is advice involved in all of that too if you are holding up the parliament or if you are having to twist and turn the business of the parliament in order to meet. How do you practically do it? Don't you at the very least have to say this Voice is actually going to have to accept that it is a bit more onerous than the clause 29 environment and they are going to have to be prepared almost to be here every sitting week?

**The CHAIR:** While the minister is contemplating her response, I will just let the member know that was his fourth question on this topic. That was your fourth, I allowed you an extra one; and the member for MacKillop would like to ask some questions.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I am hesitating to answer because I think the member is straying beyond the terms of the bill that we have before us. We have already passed the clause that talks about the number of times that the Voice is expected to meet, noting that it is contemplated there will be out-of-session engagement and work, noting also that in addition to and separate from those meetings it is contemplated in part 5 that meetings with chief executives and cabinet members will enable further and deeper engagement on the matters that are of concern and interest to the Voice and that will help guide policy as well as legislation.

I think the member is perhaps seeking to suggest that the Voice as contemplated in this piece of legislation would not be workable. My response would simply be that it is the considered view of the government, and through the extensive consultation undertaken the considered view of the community, that this is workable, that it will be through the exercise of effort by government to benefit from the existence of the Voice in improving the quality of legislation and the quality of policy, that it will be made to work.

I have great comfort in thinking that, as complex as this is and as new as this is, and we are in territory necessarily that has not been traversed before, the people who will be elected to the first Voice will be of great assistance in guiding the form in which this will operate. This legislation enables that. There will be a review. The review occurs between the third and fourth year, so after the election of the Voice that will coincide with the next state election. That period of time, I think, will give us all an opportunity, but particularly the Voice, to determine whether there are some elements of this legislation that require some refinement, having tested out the way in which it will work.

The question really before us is: does this give us the appropriate basis on which to start this process? Our view is that it will. It has sufficient flexibility in the clauses that it gives us that opportunity. It will then be tested through application and should there be refinements as a result of experience, then I have no doubt that a future parliament will be wise enough to embrace that.

**Mr McBRIDE:** Still on clause 39, deputy leader, do you think the public outside the walls of this parliament believe that parliament operates with speed, haste, efficiency and in timeliness with all its legislation and regulatory type processes? With a slight reference to the clause, this is a clause that is saying that the Voice will be notified of the introduction of bills. That is the first part of my question.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The member is asking me for an opinion about what 1.8 million people think about what we do here. As the representative of 28,000 people, I can tell you they have a diversity of views about what we do here, not all of it for polite company. There have been occasions when they have thought we have gone too fast and other occasions when they thought we have gone too slowly.

But guess what? We get elected every four years. That is when we are tested. This piece of legislation is giving effect to a commitment that was made at the last election by this side of politics. We are putting it forward and the success of our government generally will be tested at the next election, as will the success of the Voice, because it is a democratic institution also.

**Mr McBRIDE:** I start my question by saying there is a meme I saw where there was a picture of politicians looking down a tunnel and if the politicians could see the end of the tunnel they build the tunnel longer.

With the point about the Voice being notified, and as already hinted by the member for Heysen, about its meeting structure being between four and six—four minimum and six max but with permission of the minister can have as many more, based on approval—think about the process here, that every Monday before the week of sitting we as MPs go through our committees, go through legislation and regulations so that hopefully we can understand at least some of it, if not all of it.

Then you bring this type of clause to parliament and try to capture—and rightly so, may I say—a population base out there that perhaps has not been caught as well as it could have. It would be a lot better if they were able to be part of a process in this place; however, it is my concern that these types of layers, processes and instructions of the Clerk, which clause 39 talks about, is another impediment for the speed and process of bills.

I will give a classic example. If we have a health bill going through this place, upper house and lower house, obviously it affects South Australians, so then straight away it can affect Indigenous South Australians. We know that health would be one of their priority concerns because we know that it has not worked as well for them as it has for a lot of other South Australians. This whole process can be perhaps hindered or slowed down again, even though the answer and the outcome might be of benefit to 100 per cent of all South Australians. Its speed and process through this place every day or week or month that it takes to move through might hinder the good outcomes this legislation or regulation might have.

My question to you, deputy leader, is: will this process become part of a more bureaucratic and slow process that some South Australians may already see and add to that, making it even harder and slower for progression?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** My view, for what it is worth, is that what South Australians overwhelmingly want is quality rather than pace. In fact, in the last parliament there was a bill that we all voted for—every single one of us—that went through quite quickly, and it is the only bill I have ever had significant feedback on, including at the doors, during the election campaign that we went too fast.

While we can defend how that process occurred, and I do not want to relitigate that one in any way, I would say that this is not aimed at either hastening or slowing down; this is aimed at improving quality. The member's own question contemplated the contribution might make it better, if slower. I do not necessarily accept that it will make it slower, but I think the contemplation that it might make it better is exactly why we are doing this.

**Mr TELFER:** Just to quickly continue on this clause, Deputy Premier, I am interested in the way that the language is used. In the first part it says that the Clerk must cause the Voice to be given notice of the introduction, and then it says that a failure to comply with this section does not affect the validity of the bill or any proceedings. With the use of the word 'must', it talks about obligation, but then the second part says, if it does not happen, so be it. I wonder if they are in contrast to each other, or is the notification the important part, not the failure to comply—it is just an interesting juxtaposition.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I appreciate the way in which the member has put that, and I can understand that on the first reading it might appear to be in at least juxtaposition, if not in

contradiction. The fact is that we are creating an obligation on the Clerk to provide that information to the Voice. What we are being clear about—and for the sake of the abundance of clarity the second clause is in there—is that this does not interfere with the right of parliament to operate.

The best example would be in the event that we are in another pandemic or another version of the current pandemic that requires extremely hasty legislation, or another form of emergency, that we want to be explicit that the lawfulness of a bill that had to operate that quickly could not be placed in question because of the workings of this piece of legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 40.

**Mr McBRIDE:** Clause 40(1) refers to the First Nations Voice being entitled to address the houses of parliament in relation to any bill. I understand that for a bill that may have solutions and benefit for the Voice and Indigenous South Australians it is obviously important they be part of that process, but the fact is that clause 40(1) says 'any bill'. Say we were discussing a drainage system for the South-East, and I know that there is a massive lack of funds for the infrastructure and upgrade and maintenance, and we needed to talk about further funds to clean the drainage system in the Lower Limestone Coast, unless it was affecting their activity or their grounds—the drains had been built 50 to 100 years ago—it is a maintenance thing, yet they could possibly just come in and be part of that bill as well. I do not know why we have 'any bill'.

Can the deputy leader please tell me why we do not have something in there that is either representative of what Indigenous South Australians are having issue with or living with, or is part of their life? We know that, if you want to go beyond this, we do not go out to other nationalities, other groups and other parts of our society. They are not allowed to come into this place on 'any bill' and perhaps add positive feedback or perhaps negative feedback.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The second part of that really gets to the heart of whether we have an Aboriginal Voice to Parliament or not, so I will not go into detail about that other than that we on this side of parliament agreed with the proposition that we do want to hear specifically from Aboriginal people.

The first part is, essentially, why would we not create a list of acts perhaps that are relevant and only invite comment on those or alternatively set some form of test that must be passed prior to the Voice contributing that demonstrates a legitimate interest? We have decided to go down neither path on the basis that it is not for us to say what bill might attract the attention of the Voice. If we start to constrain, then we are presupposing an interest.

The member talks specifically about the movement of water in the South-East and why would the Aboriginal Voice to Parliament want to say anything about that. They may not—they may well choose not to—but the idea that the movement of water through a passage of land is of no interest to First Nations people I would disagree with. That is why it is hard for us to, from here, try to define those issues that we regard as being relevant and those that we regard as not being relevant. It is better, given that this Voice is not going to change the legislation, it has no vote, it has no amendment-making capacity, it only has the capacity to express a view, that we would not constrain the list nor set a test.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I think we have the benefit of the debate in relation to my amendment that preceded this, so I will not reiterate all of those matters. I have made it very clear that I embrace the merits of the alternative model.

In making observations on clause 40, I would perhaps just confine myself to making that clear observation that, regardless of how one might characterise—and I do—submissions for the purposes of the Second Engagement Note, there clearly is no support of any substance for the model that is more particularly the subject of clause 40. I highlight in that regard again the observations of the Public Law and Policy Research Unit at the University of Adelaide. It is a good example because it is a very thoughtful submission that covers really the whole bill, and fairly thoroughly.

Insofar as this topic is concerned, it is making the reasonable and ordinary observation that it is foreseeable that a matter raising issues of importance to Aboriginal people could arise after an

annual address has been given and in circumstances where there is no bill relevantly in the parliament. So whether you couch it in terms that submission 35 does, the unit does, in terms of the inadequacy of the bill model (if you want to call it that) or if one focuses on the kind of incoherence and almost inevitable disruptive nature of a bill model of engagement (if that is what you are limited to), we see clear warnings about the futility of this particular form of engagement.

So perhaps if I could put it in the form of a question. I do not suggest that there is a clear answer, so I am happy to leave it as a rhetorical question. What, if any, means are there really to provide coherence between matters of interest to the State Voice from time to time and their engagement on those matters of interest via the opportunity to address the parliament on a bill pursuant to clause 40 and, related to that, how can they possibly do that routinely in a way that is connected to the debate that is going on in the parliament?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I think I will largely take that as a rhetorical question, because I think we have traversed for some time now this question of the next level of detail once this legislation is through and how it actually operates. I think we have probably exhausted each other's views: on the one hand the suggestion it might be unworkable, and on the other that good intent will make this work. So I will leave that otherwise as a rhetorical question.

**Mr TELFER:** Deputy Premier, I cast your attention to clause 40(6) in noting the subclauses which come before it. It reads:

(6) Nothing in this section prevents the State First Nations Voice or the joint presiding members of the State First Nations Voice from doing any other thing with the permission of the relevant House.

There is a little bit of ambiguity from my perspective in that statement, 'from doing any other thing with the permission of the relevant house.' I am just interested, knowing that a lot of the uncertainty that is created through this really is around the process for the involvement of the Voice on the floor in parliament, especially in relation to this clause in particular. It gives a lot of detail in the previous clauses, and then subclause 6 talks about 'any other thing'. Can you perhaps give me some examples of what is envisaged by the words 'any other thing'? Although the stipulations have set it out previously, I think 'any other thing' then just opens it up to any other thing.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Before we start contemplating the range of things that might be contemplated, I would start by answering that we are nonetheless within a section that is entitled 'State First Nations Voice entitled to address Parliament in relation to Bills'. The idea of 'any other thing' refers to—examples have been asked for so, for example, a house may decide that they want to hear from more than one member of the Voice rather than just one. That would be open under that clause, with the permission of the joint presiding members and the permission of the relevant house, to enable that to occur.

**Mr TELFER:** So for clarity, that would simply need a majority vote from the floor of whichever house to give that capacity for any other thing, such as the example that you have given?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I presume so, although we are just contemplating what standing orders restrictions there might be also that would need to be contemplated. Within the functioning of the way the parliament works, so not creating by this piece of legislation any other form of the way the parliament works, then that is a reasonable proposition.

**Mr TEAGUE:** There might be a bit more back and forth, otherwise I would have something to say about it, I think.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Just to be clear, this is making sure that we are not fettering the normal functioning of parliament. If there is a constraint on the appearance of a stranger on the floor, that is held within standing orders and is not affected by this.

**Mr TEAGUE:** On that again, just to make clear, I am grateful to the member for Flinders in that line. I just do not agree that that clause contemplates the possibility or the example that the Deputy Premier has given. Subclause (5) is an avoidance of doubt clause, so we have an avoidance of doubt that indicates that there is only going to be one address. I guess it is an important point, but it seems to me, at least on the face of it, that the purpose of subclause (6) was any other thing. I am at a loss as to what the example might be, but it seems that the clause clearly contemplates that

there is to be an entitlement to one address and that subclause (6) must be doing some other work. What that is precisely is a mystery to me as well.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The advice I am receiving is that this bill gives an entitlement to have one address. That clause recognises that parliament, however, is capable of making its own decisions and could choose to ask for a second address, and this legislation does not take away the power of parliament to do that.

**Mr TELFER:** I will ask that you, Deputy Premier, cast your eyes to subclauses (2) and (3) for a bit of context for me in trying to work out how this is actually going to be practically possible. I worry because there are examples of ambiguity from my perspective as a layperson reading this piece of legislation. Subclause (2) provides:

The State First Nations Voice must give to the presiding officer of the relevant House at least 7 days' written notice of the intention of the State First Nations Voice to address the House.

So the stipulation is very clear that there is a seven-day period, but then subclause (3) starts with 'However'—it is a bit of a rider. There is clarity in subclause (2) but subclause (3) introduces a bit of ambiguity:

However, the State First Nations Voice need not give notice in accordance with subsection (2) if, in the case where a Bill is to be debated or otherwise progressed urgently through the relevant House, it is not reasonably practicable to do so.

Regarding the ambiguity that is also caused by having the word 'reasonably', I worry about the practicality of how this legislation would actually be done. Who is a 'reasonable' person? It is often a debate that has happened in legal circles, I am sure. I am not one to wax lyrical about those potentials, like some of my learned colleagues, but the statement 'reasonably practicable to do so' really brings up a level of ambiguity that I have concerns about, so I seek some clarity from the Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** It is difficult to contemplate how this would work without having both of those clauses, if I can just do the counterfactual. In the ordinary course of events, to make this work, it would be good to have seven days' notice, but we know that there is occasionally legislation that comes up quickly. Therefore, it has to be recognised that, if we are to give the Voice an opportunity, there needs to be a test of reasonableness. 'Reasonable', as you have pointed out, honourable member, is a legal term that is used commonly. Clause 7 states:

Nothing in this section prevents the relevant House from conducting its business (including, to avoid doubt, the consideration or passing of Bills about which the State First Nations Voice wishes to address the House) prior to being addressed by the State First Nations Voice under this section.

In the end, if legislation needs to go so quickly that it is not possible for the Voice to give comment, then that is in the power of the parliament. What this legislation seeks to do is create the mechanism by which we could reasonably hear from the Voice, ideally with notice; and in the event that it is moving too fast for that, then to allow provision for that notice to be waived, but accepting that there will be such occasions.

I can see the concern of this not being precise enough or codified enough, but I return to my initial question, which is: what would be the alternative? How would we construct this Voice to Parliament in a way that reasonably allows the Voice to be heard, other than by this form of construction of clauses?

**Mr TEAGUE:** For me, this might just wrap up observations about the whole structure of clause 40. Again, this might be rhetorical, but I seek the Deputy Premier's confirmation about it with the benefit of advice; I would be grateful.

It is the case, is it not, that all the provisions of clause 40 are matters that are justiciable; they are not matters within the remit of the standing orders or the power of the Presiding Officer to determine, including questions such as the practicability of steps or the requisite urgency or, indeed, notice of urgency or any of these process matters?

It might be conceded that there is work to be done on standing orders in relation to how this is dealt with within the parliament once you get here, but in terms of interpreting these provisions, perhaps to give an example, where notice has not been given and there is a dispute about whether



it was reasonably practicable to give notice or not, that is a question that is going to be determined by a court.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I fear we will end up in a circular argument about this. The court is not going to determine what parliament is able to do in its own business. What we need to do is operate in the best way possible to give life to the Voice and also it is likely, but without foreshadowing government action, that there would be a contemplation of standing orders. But the court is not going to make a judgement on whether the Voice was able to waive notice or not because, in the end, parliament is able to do what parliament is able to do.

**Mr TELFER:** Can I double-back, Deputy Premier, on subclause (6), as it is ruminating in my own mind, the 'from doing any other thing' statement. This clause sets out the parameters for the Voice to have their voice heard on the floor of parliament and the stipulation being one house, one person, one representative. Does subclause (6) basically say that if either house decides, with the permission of the relevant house, multiple representatives from the Voice can be heard and the Voice can be heard in either house, with the permission of the relevant house?

So you could have a situation where the relevant house might want to hear from each representative of the Voice on a subject matter, and either house could potentially, on an individual bill, make the decision that despite the parameters of this clause, we do have the capacity with subclause (6) to invite that to be broadened out. Is that the natural progression, that the parameters that are set out in the first two thirds of the clause can be overridden with a decision operationally of the parliament around the number of presiding members who can be admitted, and the two different relevant houses that could potentially hear from the Voice directly on an individual bill?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I do not think 'overridden' is necessarily quite the right term. It may be that the Voice decides it wants to be expressed in the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly might decide that, although that entitlement has been fulfilled, this chamber would also like to hear directly, and we would be entitled to do that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 41 to 46 passed.

Clause 47.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I indicate that my questions in this regard might be wrapped up and concern part 6 as a whole. I am happy to step them out one by one. Is it possible for the Deputy Premier to give an indication of the number of full-time equivalents engaged in the secretariat and other resources. Will they be led by a chief executive or equivalent? Will they, as I understand, operate separately from the department for Aboriginal Affairs or indeed any other existing department and, if so, what structure will they adopt? That is the thrust of the questions. They might all be dealt with in one go, if that is convenient.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Recognising that there is a whole implementation process that is being worked on and also that this will be a matter for governments over time, rather than being constrained by this piece of legislation, but with those two caveats, at present it is being contemplated that the secretariat would sit within Aboriginal Affairs and that secretarial support has been estimated at being approximately \$700,000 with resourcing reflecting six FTE.

*Mr Teague interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** That level of detail has not yet been determined.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Heysen, are you finished with this clause?

**Mr TEAGUE:** Not necessarily. I might reflect on that.

*Sitting suspended from 17:59 to 19:30*

**The CHAIR:** We are on clause 47. Member for Heysen, you have the floor.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I do not know if there is anything to add in terms of the answer earlier. If not, I note the Deputy Premier's observation that the secretariat will come from within the Aboriginal Affairs department. If there is more to add on that, I will be interested. That is, as I recall, contrary to

earlier indications about it standing alone and separate from the department. As I understand the Deputy Premier's answer in terms of leadership of that secretariat, it is not yet clear what, if any, designated leadership there might be as such. Perhaps the question might be: is it possible then that leadership will be by extension within the department?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** As I indicated previously, there is the caveat that the implementation plan is still being worked on and also the additional caveat that future governments may choose to establish a secretariat in the way in which they choose. What I indicated was not that the secretariat would come from within the department but that at present it is likely to be located in the department and the structure of that and the leadership of that is yet to be determined. I have nothing else to add on those matters.

**Mr TEAGUE:** In light of that, might I just ask whether it is the deliberate intent, in case it is something that is a matter of resourcing from within the department, that there be some form of Chinese Wall or separation that is a part of the virtue of the independence of the body or whether it might be embraced that it is just a matter of resourcing and if there is a bit of intermingling then so be it?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I have nothing else to add on what is being contemplated in the structure of the secretariat.

Clause passed.

Clause 48.

**Mr TEAGUE:** In relation to clause 48, there is a fairly discursive narrative about the nature of the engagement with the minister in relation to both the Local First Nations Voices and the State First Nations Voice in terms of resourcing. Is there any indication, apart from what appears to be contemplated, that there might be varying amounts of resourcing according to need, how that assessment might be undertaken and on what grounds are there examples of reasons for differential resourcing of different Local Voices?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I think it is reasonably clear that this comes as a matter of the minister's opinion and the minister's opinion about the reasonableness of what is required and I have nothing else to add on the way in which he would reach that conclusion.

Clause passed.

Clause 49 passed.

Clause 50.

**Mr TEAGUE:** We are at part 7—Review of Act. We have an indication there that the process of review has been referred to in the course of the committee. The timing of the review is set out in clause 50(3). In terms of particularly the first review, I relay the focus of a number of respondents to me on this topic in terms of the importance of its independence, thoroughness, capacity to cover the field and so forth. The nature of the review otherwise than as it relates to timing and whatever might be specified by the minister in subclause (4) is not terribly specific. Is there anything that the Deputy Premier can indicate in terms of capacity, independence, probity, thoroughness and so on about the review as might be contemplated now, knowing that the first review in particular will be a matter of importance?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The first review will occur after the next state election. That is the timing, so there will have been essentially two elections of the First Nations Voice in that period, so I am not sure that any answer I give now is likely to have any particular weight by the time the review occurs. Rather than speculating about what might be in the mind, or even conveying what I might know might be in the mind, of the current minister, it is probably better that we take this clause to do the job into the future, given that we do not know which government will be in fact undertaking that review.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I take from that, then, there is no plan of attack, if you like, at the outset in terms of how that is contemplated to operate or indeed a series of criteria that are anticipated to be borne in mind in advance. It is simply saying that, alright, there is a review to be done after the time

that is specified in the clause. Again, I think the answer was pretty comprehensive, so I might have asked whether the clause is contemplating that it might be, for example, the commissioner who is likely or unlikely to be the one undertaking the review, or whether or not there is anything in terms of the structure of clause 50 that gives a clue as to the thinking behind how that might be initiated.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I think it is pretty clear that the structure of the clause does not give that indication. Rather than allow my answer to be characterised quite in the way you have done it—I accept the member is not trying to put words in my mouth, but just to be clear—I am reluctant to be drawn too much on a review that is going to occur after the next state election, but that is not to suggest that the current minister and the process of preparing the implementation of this act will not be contemplating what kind of information will be gathered, say, post the first election, information about how that went, in order to not only improve along the way but also be useful for a future review.

It is not that I am suggesting that this government is saying, 'Well, it's after the next election, so we are not interested'—not at all. What I am saying is I am not sure in a parliamentary debate about the way in which this clause will be used that it is particularly useful for me to canvass ideas that are currently being contemplated in that initial stage, given that it will come into effect after the next state election.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I have given an example of some possible pre-contemplation of perhaps the commissioner being the person to do the review, or not—at least I stand to be corrected. There is no provision that might either recommend or stand in the way of a member of one of the Local Voices or the State Voice conducting the review. Is there anything to add about that, bearing in mind the importance of independence and so on?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** While the member is correct, that there is nothing that precludes the idea that someone on the First Nations Voice would undertake the review, I cannot imagine a government making that decision. But that is my view. The minister will receive recommendations from the First Nations Voice on who would undertake the review, but the minister would need to make his or her known decision at that time.

As the member states, there are no restrictions that sit within this act, but I think it would not be a fair characterisation to say, 'Therefore, it will be people who are already involved in the Voice who will do their own review'. I do not think that is a fair characterisation of what is likely to happen, and nor are you explicitly making that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 51 to 54 passed.

Schedule 1.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I refer to schedule 1, part 3, clause 7. I am not sure how many bites of the cherry I get here.

**The CHAIR:** You get three.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Three on the schedule or three on the clause? That is the question, I suppose.

**The CHAIR:** You can have three questions.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I think it is a moot point.

**The Hon. S.E. Close:** You get three per schedule.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, that is correct. You get three per schedule.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I will have to bring in the lieutenants. I am at, indeed, schedule 1, part 3, clause 7—Eligibility to vote in elections. This got a run at clause 4 earlier—yesterday, I think. We see the interaction of clause 4 and eligibility, and I have tested the endeavour in clause 4 to set out a form of the tripartite test. I recognise that the words there will need to speak for themselves in terms of the way that they set out termination of eligibility.

In terms of clause 7(1)(b), this might be the issue primarily for the first time round, and less so subsequently, in that they will run together with state elections. In terms of clause 7(1)(b), and the

declaration of eligibility, perhaps I need to withdraw that about each election in that we would certainly be able to navigate both (a) and (b) together in the future when it is coinciding with a state election. But in terms of (b), how is it anticipated that that declaration process will be undertaken? Is it something that is done there and then at the polling booth, and how is that then received?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I am going to keep a close eye on my adviser in case I stray in answering the question and relaying this detail. First of all, this will be a matter, of course, for the Electoral Commissioner to determine finally how to manage, but the expectation is that for the first vote there will be a mixture of in-person and postal voting.

In person, when you turn up and vote you will be signing a declaration of eligibility at that point. If you are voting postal, clearly you would have to have applied for that. There will be a process of advertising or informing people that, if they fulfil the criteria, they are able to participate in that election and can apply for a postal vote. In the application process, whether that is on the web or whether that is by writing in, there will be the opportunity to indicate a declaration of eligibility. But as I say, the fine detail of that will be determined by the Electoral Commissioner.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I am grateful for that elucidation. I am advised, I am given to understand from the minister in the course of navigating this particular space, that the declaration is to have the force of a statutory declaration. Is it to be witnessed and to take on the form, therefore, of a statutory declaration and, if so, how is that to be done, both in the postal form and at-the-polling-booth form?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** It is not a statutory declaration. It will not be in that form. The analogy with a statutory declaration is that the penalty will be the same for making a false declaration.

*Mr Teague interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Just a supplementary, maybe.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Perhaps as a way around it, because there might be two. Am I to take it from that answer—and thanks, I was not necessarily meaning to presume that it would take on the form of a statutory declaration, but it has that level of seriousness. Does that mean, therefore, that it might not necessarily be witnessed, including by an authorised person for those purposes, and therefore it might be able to operate on the force of the signature of the person declaring eligibility?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** That is right, it will not have a witness signing it. It will not take that form, no.

**Mr TEAGUE:** So, then, to the final substantive question that might deal with this. In circumstances of clause 4 and in circumstances of this clause 7 schedule 1, we are navigating territory that is relatively novel in the electoral process, at least for this state—I stand to be corrected in case there is a good analogy. Again, I just indicate that this has been the subject of some conversation between me and the minister in the lead-up.

We have a history in South Australia of a high degree of integrity in the voting process and so on. Bearing in mind the relative novelty of the process, both in terms of the eligibility criteria, the fulfilling of them, and then the process of administering the declaration of eligibility, to what extent is there any process in contemplation for the capacity to ensure the integrity of both aspects of that process?

To what extent is there any machinery already in place, and in what way will it be that relative documents are able to be identified and so on, given that normally you would tick yourself off the list and put your vote anonymously in the ballot box? Given that there is this interplay and there is work to be done in terms of the consequences of declarations of eligibility being made falsely and so on, how is that going to be navigated as contemplated?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Our understanding is that the Court of Disputed Returns could be a vehicle for someone to say, 'I saw that person vote and I don't believe that they are eligible.' That would be a way for that to be aerated, but in terms of the integrity of the process the Electoral Commissioner may well have some subtlety with some ways in which that institution chooses to operate this. Our understanding is that it is likely to be the double envelope system, so that the outer envelope that has the details and the declaration on it is able to be kept for testing integrity at a later date.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I think I might have done my dash.

**The CHAIR:** No, you can have one.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Alright. It might be convenient, because I could probably shoehorn it into clause 8 if necessary. I think my purpose here is only to advert once again to submission 9. Just to make clear, it is not simply me scratching around in the dark here. In submission 9, to remind the committee, the identity is redacted for the reason that it is an individual making the submission, but I think it illustrates the point.

To the extent that the author might be glad for having been referred to in this context, I again indicate that it is a submission of a person who describes himself as a 60-year-old Aboriginal man whose main objection to the legislation and voting processes centres on who can nominate to vote and to participate. He expresses concern: 'Self-identifying nominators and voters are very problematic, because this is an open gateway for fraudsters.'

The author proceeds to observe that 'Warnings should be made that anyone falsely claiming for voting purposes carries heavy penalties as it is a federal offence' and that this is the only protection currently in place. I highlight the expression of concern, as it were, in the voice of that particular author of one of those 42 submissions on the second round, and I am otherwise grateful to the Deputy Premier for those indications.

Schedule passed.

Schedule 2.

**Mr TEAGUE:** My next point of interest and inquiry is at schedule 2, part 1, clause 1. I might say that I think in the process, and I make it clear that my proposed amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4 are all consequential on the passage of amendment No. 1, so to the extent that we have skated over those, I just note that it is not unconsciously. The fact that amendment No. 1 did not quite make it means that the others do not proceed, so here we are.

Schedule 2, part 1, clause 1 repeals the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act and thereby the committee. I think I have made some observations in response to government members' questions in relation to my amendment No. 1 about the need for reform as perceived by at least me and the member for Giles, but I think that is a fairly wideranging view.

Is there any contemplation—maybe this is sort of going into bat again for the merits of committees—of a committee that might replace the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee that might provide a means in a committee context within the parliament for members of parliament to be particularly engaged with those initiatives that might flow in a range of different ways from particularly the State Voice?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I am not aware of any contemplation of an additional committee in parliament relating to Aboriginal matters.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I think it might be worthwhile putting on the record: I think it has been characterised by the minister that the expectation might be that the State Voice might kind of do that work, might be the replacement body or be the future of such a committee.

In that context, I just make the observation that—drawing a comparison to the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill and the model there and the model of engagement for that body with the parliamentary committee—if that were the case then it rather augurs towards circumstances in which the body might be permitted to meet at least so many times, as opposed to having a core meeting function, and then supported by a full-time secretariat of whatever kind. I do not think that probably amounts to more than an observation at this point in the committee.

**The CHAIR:** Did you wish to make any other observations?

**Mr TEAGUE:** Perhaps this by way of bookend for the committee, and I hope this might be a useful way to conclude the committee process: in part 2 of schedule 2 we see discrete amendments to the Constitution Act 1934. That has been something that has arisen in the course of the second round of the debate, and it is adverted to at page 21 of the commissioner's Second Engagement

Note, where reference is made at least to including alignments with the Constitution Act 1934 as well as the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Is there anything that the Deputy Premier might be able to indicate in terms of, therefore, the source and context of those amendments, given that they have been raised and they are the subject of a Second Engagement Note? They are said to reflect the desire of those providing feedback for the purposes of the Second Engagement Note, and I just indicate I did not see a lot of further elucidation in the written submissions and, beyond that, how does the proposed amendment to the act better reflect the Uluru Statement?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I gather that I am being given the opportunity to extol the virtues of this clause in the context of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, the decision to include in the Constitution Act a recognition of First Nations Voices, the importance of them, and also acknowledging that there will be a First Nations Voice Act in 2023.

I think what is important about the inclusion in the Constitution Act is that it captures at least some of the sentiment and intent and content that is within the Uluru Statement from the Heart. Our constitution already recognises Aboriginal people and also acknowledges and repeats the apology that was given on 28 May 1997, and in that sense has some weight that our Australian Constitution has yet to have, despite the reforms that occurred in 1967 after the referendum in 1968.

I think part of the importance of this 3(1) is to not only refer to the importance of Voice but to talk about a truthful relationship. The Uluru Statement from the Heart is, of course, three parts: Voice, Treaty, Truth. While we focus very much in Australia and South Australia on Voice and we have started to contemplate in South Australia previously what Treaty might look like and we return to that as a task as a nation as well as a state, the last of those three statements—the appeal for Truth—I think is one that we tend not to talk about as much in a common discussion of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, but is extremely important, which is the importance of acknowledging not only the truth of the presence of Aboriginal people but also the many truths of the experience of Aboriginal people in the process of colonisation and settlement by Europeans.

This opportunity—although already we have a constitution that recognises the importance of Aboriginal people—nonetheless, I think, adds to the constitution by recognising the importance of voices of a truthful relationship and also acknowledging the existence of this instrument by which parliament can hear from Aboriginal people.

**The CHAIR:** Any further questions?

**Mr TEAGUE:** No, except perhaps to make the observation for the benefit of those following along and for those who have been kept in the building: I did give an indication fairly clearly prior to 6pm that I would contain myself to within a relatively short period of time, so here we are.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

At 20:07 the house adjourned until Thursday 23 March 2023 at 11:00.