

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 2 June 2022

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers and questions without notice to be taken into consideration at 2:15pm.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Bills

BURIAL AND CREMATION (INTERMENT RIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:02): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Burial and Cremation Act 2013. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to introduce the Burial and Cremation (Interment Rights) Bill 2022. This bill amends the Burial and Cremation Act 2013 (the act) to strengthen the ability to enforce interment rights. The government has moved to reintroduce amendments proposed by the Burial and Cremation (Interment Rights) Amendment Bill 2021, which was introduced last year but lapsed at the end of sittings—another bill that was not completed in time and followed through by the government towards the end of the last term.

The new government has taken the step to push this bill through within the first weeks of sitting. It recognises the importance of clarifying the legal status of interment rights and preventing future conflicts such as the situation at the former St Philips and St James Church Cemetery at Old Noarlunga, discussed last year during the debate on the lapsed bill.

While the urgency of this bill has dissipated, the government believes that interment right holders and their families should be better protected and any failure to meet obligations should be the subject of tough penalties. When the 2020-21 bill was being debated last year, I had questions as to whether there should be a central register or some other way for cemeteries and interment rights to be recorded on certificates of title. This is a larger body of work and I have asked the Attorney-General's Department to investigate the plausibility of such reform, noting that there is no immediate urgency for establishing this recording platform given there is already a means to determine whether interment rights exist. If further legislative amendments are appropriate, it will be progressed separately in a subsequent bill.

The bill amends section 13 of the act to provide added protections around cremated remains that have been interred in an interment site in a cemetery or natural burial ground. New section 13(1a) makes it an offence to remove cremated remains from an interment site or re-inter cremated remains that have been removed from an interment site without the consent of the interment right holder or, if the interment right holder has died, their representative or other persons prescribed by the regulations.

A maximum penalty for the offences is \$10,000. The offences in new section 13(1a) would not apply where cremated remains have been interred directly into the earth. The offences also do not apply where a relevant authority for a cemetery or natural burial ground removes and re-inter remains to enable the improvement or embellishment of the cemetery or natural burial ground or for maintenance work or repair to be undertaken in respect of the cemetery or natural burial ground.

The bill inserts a new subsection (3) in section 35 of the act to express that any interment right can be enforced against the relevant authority for the cemetery or natural burial ground in respect of which the interment right was issued. The new obligation applies to the person or body responsible for administering the cemetery or natural burial ground, regardless of when the interment right was issued and regardless of whether it was issued by the person or body or some other personal body, i.e. a previous owner.

Failure to comply with the obligation will result in a maximum penalty of \$10,000 for an individual or \$20,000 for a body corporate. New section 35(6) makes it clear that it is not a defence that the defendant was not aware of the existence of the interment right when they assumed administration of the cemetery or natural burial ground unless the defendant proves that they took reasonable steps to identify interment rights in existence at the time that the defendant assumed the administration of the cemetery or natural burial ground.

The bill also makes a number of technical changes to the act. The bill contains a clarifying amendment to section 38(3)(b) of the act to clarify that the former holder of the interment right has the right to reclaim a memorial from the relevant cemetery authority. The bill makes a minor technical amendment to section 39(1) of the act, which deals with the ownership of memorials, to remove an unnecessary reference to the other place of interment. Interment rights are issued only in respect of interment sites in cemeteries and natural burial grounds, therefore the words 'or other place of interment' are unnecessary.

There is also an amendment to section 42(1)(a)(i) to remove an incorrect reference to an interment site that should be replaced with a reference to an interment right in respect of an interment site. This bill will clarify the legality and enforceability of interment rights so that families can feel protected when they secure interment rights in a cemetery or natural burial ground. Further, the new offences will operate as a deterrent to those who might seek to wilfully ignore or refuse to honour these obligations. I commend the bill to members and seek to insert the explanation of clauses without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Burial and Cremation Act 2013*

3—Amendment of section 13—Offences

This clause amends section 13 to create a new offence of removing cremated remains from an interment site in a cemetery or natural burial ground, or re-interring in a cemetery or natural burial ground cremated remains that have been removed from an interment site (or causing, suffering or permitting such acts) while an interment right is in force in relation to the interment site unless authorised to do so by the interment right holder, or if the interment right holder has died, a person referred to in section 35(1).

The proposed maximum penalty for the offence is \$10,000. The offence will not apply to cremated remains interred directly in the ground. It will also not apply to the removal or re-interment of cremated remains by a relevant

authority for a cemetery or natural burial ground if it is done to enable the carrying out of improvement or embellishment works in the cemetery or natural burial ground, or maintenance or repairs in the cemetery or natural burial ground.

4—Amendment of section 35—Exercise and enforcement of interment rights

This clause amends section 35 to make it clear that an interment right may be enforced against the relevant authority for the cemetery or natural burial ground in respect of which the interment right was issued.

It also makes it an offence for the relevant authority for a cemetery or natural burial ground to fail to comply with its obligations under an interment right issued in respect of the cemetery or natural burial ground. The proposed maximum penalty is \$10,000 if the offender is a natural person and \$20,000 if the offender is a body corporate.

It will not be a defence to a charge of an offence that the defendant was not aware of the existence of the interment right when the defendant assumed the administration of the cemetery or natural burial ground unless the defendant proves that the defendant took reasonable steps to identify interment rights in existence at the time that the defendant assumed the administration of the cemetery or natural burial ground.

A further provision makes it clear that section 35 applies to the person or body for the time being responsible for the administration of the cemetery or natural burial ground regardless of when the interment right was issued, and regardless of whether the interment right was issued by that person or body or by some other person or body.

5—Amendment of section 38—Re-use of interment sites

This clause amends section 38 so that it refers to the former holder of an interment right where an interment right has expired.

6—Amendment of section 39—Ownership of memorial

This clause makes a minor technical amendment to section 39.

7—Amendment of section 42—Power of relevant authority to dispose of unclaimed memorial

This clause amends section 42 to correct a reference in subsection (1)(a)(i).

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti.

RETURN TO WORK (PERMANENT IMPAIRMENT ASSESSMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:08): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Return to Work Act 2014. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:08): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Return to Work Act 2014 (the act) to clarify an issue of statutory construction arising from the decision of the Full Court in the Supreme Court in the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia v Summerfield. The Return to Work scheme which governs the support provided to workers who suffer a work injury was designed to encourage a focus on achieving better health outcomes through a timely return to work. The benefits the scheme provided to injured workers were balanced by the inclusion of clear boundaries to ensure the sustainability of the scheme.

The Return to Work Act was critical in ensuring the financial sustainability of workers compensation in South Australia. Up until the passage of the act there was very little time under the previous legislation where the scheme maintained sufficient assets to cover liabilities owed to injured workers. In comparison, the scheme has been fully funded almost every year since the passage of the act in 2014.

The recent decision in Summerfield has undermined the boundaries that allow the scheme to remain financially sustainable in the long term and continue to support injured workers. The decision affects the combination of impairments under section 22(8)(c) of the act for the purpose of determining a worker's whole person impairment (WPI). The decision makes it easier to combine impairments from different injuries, even if those injuries occur in different circumstances, even months or years apart.

This significantly increases the amount of lump sum compensation a worker may be entitled to for their injuries. Most importantly, it allows significantly more workers to reach the 30 per cent WPI threshold to be taken as seriously injured, which entitles a worker to weekly income support payments until retirement age and medical expenses for life.

When the scheme was first introduced it was designed and costed to support around 60 new seriously injured workers every year. This has proven to be an underestimate and the scheme is currently forecast to support around 105 new seriously injured workers in the 2022-23 financial year.

The decision in Summerfield is projected to double that number to around 200 new seriously injured workers every year. Each of those claims costs the scheme an average of \$1.3 million; however, there is a very wide distribution and some will cost the scheme significantly more over the life of the claim.

As a direct result of the Summerfield decision, the scheme is no longer fully funded, with a funding ratio of 89 per cent assets to liabilities as of December 2021 and a \$1 billion funding black hole due to insufficient premiums being collected to cover past claims affected by the decision. The scheme is expected to require an additional \$100 million in premiums every year going forward.

Without legislative change, it is projected the scheme's average premium rate will be forced to increase from the current 1.7 per cent to 2.2 per cent or higher to cover the costs of the Summerfield decision. This would leave South Australia with the highest average premium rate of any Australian mainland state on an ongoing basis. These premiums would ultimately need to be paid by South Australian employers, many of them small businesses.

The first Summerfield decision was handed down in May 2019. Since then, the former Treasurer Rob Lucas and the then Liberal government had three years to address issues raised by this decision and provide certainty to South Australian businesses and workers. Instead, they stuck their heads in the sand and allowed a billion-dollar funding black hole to develop on their watch.

The Malinauskas government is committed to keeping the scheme within its legislative target of a maximum 2 per cent average premium rate to ensure the scheme is financially sustainable and does not impose an unfair disadvantage on South Australian businesses.

This bill responds to the Summerfield decision by amending the provisions relating to a combination of impairments in section 22(8)(c) to make it clear that an injured worker is entitled to combine impairments from their injuries only when they arise from the 'same trauma', not the 'same injury or cause', as stated in the act. Consequential amendments ensure continuity and consistency of language throughout the act.

By incorporating the 'same trauma' test, this bill explicitly adopts the reasoning of Chief Justice Kourakis concerning the same phrase in *Marrone v Employers Mutual Limited* (2013) SASFC 67. The use of this well-settled legal definition aims to provide much-needed certainty about the operation of section 22(8)(c). These changes will restore the scheme to how it was originally intended to operate when the Return to Work Act was passed prior to the Summerfield decision.

This bill will apply to all workers who undergo their whole person impairment assessment after 1 January 2023. This provides advance notice of the changes to workers, doctors, legal professionals and the South Australian Employment Tribunal so that appropriate arrangements can be made prior to the commencement of the legislation.

The board of Return to Work has made it clear that, if this legislation is not passed before the winter break, it intends to bring forward its decision on the average premium rates for the 2023-24 financial year to give businesses advance warning of the significant premium increases that will be necessary if parliament does not remedy the Summerfield decision.

I can confirm that this bill, as is convention, will not be debated today. The bill will be listed for debate in the next parliamentary week of sitting. In the meantime, the government will consult with affected stakeholders and take their views into account. We are committed to ensuring this legislation goes no further than necessary to restore the scheme to its original intended operation.

The government fully understands this bill will be a disappointment to some stakeholders and that workers will be left worse off because of these changes. The government recognises that,

while there are many positive aspects of the current scheme, it is not perfect. That is why we will separately be introducing legislation to improve the operation of the scheme for injured workers. This will strengthen the duty of employers to provide modified alternative duties and close loopholes which prevent workers from accessing much-needed surgery. A draft version of that legislation is intended to be tabled next week so that members can have certainty of the government's commitment to reform this area.

The government will be consulting on that legislation with workers, unions and businesses over the winter break and is open to considering other improvements to the scheme that do not impose an unreasonable adverse impact on premium rates or the financial sustainability of the scheme. The intended application of the changes to the combination of impairments in this bill can be illustrated with three examples.

Example 1: as a worker goes to pick up his toolbox he falls over and injures his right knee (event A). The worker has a short period off work and returns to work. However, six months later, he claims as a result of an altered gait over time (event B) caused by his original knee injury he has sustained a lumbar spine injury. As a result of his lumbar spine injury he takes medication (event C) and develops issues chewing and swallowing.

The worker is assessed by an accredited medical practitioner as having a 10 per cent whole person impairment in relation to the right knee, a 12 per cent WPI in relation to the lumbar spine and a 14 per cent WPI in relation to the chewing and swallowing injury. Without the change in this bill, the impairments for these injuries would be combined and they would be found to have shared a common cause, being the original right knee injury, and the worker would be a seriously injured worker as his combination of WPI would be over 30 per cent.

With the change in this bill, the worker would be entitled to compensation for each of his injuries, but his injuries would not be combined to determine his degree of impairment. This is because the injury to the right knee arises out of event A, the injury to his lumbar spine arises out of the series of events A and B and the issues with his chewing and swallowing arise out of the series of events A, B and C. Event A and the two series—A and B and A, B and C—are not identical, so the right knee injury, the lumbar spine injury and the chewing and swallowing injury are not from the same trauma.

What this example serves to illustrate is that any two injuries do not arise out of the same series of events, that is, the same trauma, unless all of the events are the exclusive cause of both injuries. Two further examples provide scenarios where a combination would be likely to occur.

Example 2: a worker is working on a platform a couple of metres above the ground, trying to pull a fitting from a wall when the fitting suddenly gives way, causing her to stumble and fall off the platform to the ground, which leads to a broken right ankle and a tear in her left shoulder. This event is the exclusive cause of the injury to the right ankle and the left shoulder, so they are from the same trauma.

Example 3: a worker is lifting a heavy box and suffers a work injury to the lower lumbar disc. They subsequently develop sciatica as a normal progression of the disc injury. The sciatica is treated as part of the disc injury, so it would be from the same trauma—by way of example.

The transitional provisions contained in this bill operate so that the changes apply to any work injury that has not yet progressed to a final examination of WPI prior to 1 January 2023. Schedule 1 defines when a final examination of WPI has occurred and notably it will not have occurred where further attendance, radiological or other investigation or examination is required—including any attendance following further radiological or other investigation or examination—to enable an assessment of the WPI. Essentially, everything that is necessary to enable an assessment of the whole person impairment must have been completed.

It is intended that if there is more than one assessor required to assess impairment for injuries from the same trauma, as long as one of the examinations has been completed by one of the assessors before the designated date, the changes will not apply.

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

Leave not granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Explanation of clauses:

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Return to Work Act 2014

3—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends the definition of trauma so that for the purpose of the principal act, trauma means an event, or the same series of events, out of which a work injury arises.

The clause also inserts proposed subsection (7a) to provide further detail about the meaning of trauma in the event that there is more than one work injury so that all the events forming the series of events need to be the exclusive causes of both or all of the injuries in order for the series of events to constitute the same trauma for both or all of the injuries.

4—Amendment of section 22—Assessment of permanent impairment

This clause amends section 22 of the principal act by substituting subsection (8)(c) so that the following principle is taken into account (when assessing the degree of impairment applying to a work injury), namely, the principal that if a worker suffers two or more injuries arising from the same trauma, the injuries are to be assessed together and combined to determine the degree of impairment of the worker (using any principle set out in the Impairment Assessment Guidelines).

5—Amendment of section 56—Lump sum payments—economic loss

This clause amends section 56 of the principal act by substituting subsection (5) so that in determining an entitlement to compensation for loss of future earning capacity by way of a lump sum under the principal act, if a worker suffers two or more work injuries arising from the same trauma, the injuries will be assessed together and combined to determine the degree of impairment of the worker (using any principle set out in the Impairment Assessment Guidelines).

6—Amendment of section 58—Lump sum payments—non-economic loss

This clause amends section 58 of the principal act by substituting subsection (6)(a) so that in determining an entitlement to compensation for non-economic loss by way of a lump sum under the principal act, if a worker suffers two or more work injuries arising from the same trauma, the injuries will be assessed together and combined to determine the degree of impairment of the worker (using any principle set out in the Impairment Assessment Guidelines).

7—Amendment of section 122—Powers and procedures on a referral

This clause amends section 122 of the principal act by substituting subsection (6)(d) so that, if a medical question relates to any matter that is relevant to the assessment of whole person impairment (including as to whether an impairment is permanent), the following principle is taken into account, namely, the principle that if a worker suffers two or more injuries arising from the same trauma, the injuries are to be assessed together and combined to determine the degree of impairment of the worker (using any principle set out in the Impairment Assessment Guidelines).

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions to support the transitional provision.

2—Application of amendments

This clause sets out transitional arrangements to support the implementation of the measure.

The transitional arrangements provide that the amendments made to the principal act by the measure apply in relation to any work injury where the final examination relating to the worker by an accredited medical practitioner for the purposes of an assessment under section 22 of the principal act occurs on or after the designated day.

The transitional arrangements further provide for the arrangements that apply where two or more accredited medical practitioners are required to undertake an examination or assessment under section 22 of the principal act to determine the degree of impairment of a worker in relation to injuries arising from the same trauma so that the amendments made to the principal act by the measure will only apply if none of the injuries are the subject of a final examination by an accredited medical practitioner for the purposes of an assessment under section 22 of the principal act before the designated day.

The transitional clause finally provides that the final examination relating to a worker by an accredited medical practitioner is when no further attendance, radiological or other investigation or examination is required (including any attendance following further radiological or other investigation or examination) to enable an assessment of whole person impairment under section 22 of the principal act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti.

CROSS BORDER COMMISSIONER BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 May 2022.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (11:24): I note that we have had further amendments filed today, and I appreciate that we will go through those in the committee stage, but this followed amendments that were lodged on Tuesday, if I recall correctly, or it might have been late Monday night, so I would just like to place on the record that that makes it very difficult, particularly for the crossbench, for appropriate consideration of those amendments. There seem to have been a lot of, I am sure, unintended consequences that come from that, and I think that is something that we will certainly explore more as we go into the committee stage.

However, in general I would just like to point out that the purpose of this role that we are proposing to introduce is to assist with collaboration, consultation and liaison with other jurisdictions where there are particular issues that affect cross-border communities in particular. I will have more to say about that when we go into the committee stage in relation to some of the amendments that have been proposed, but I do hope that there will not be any deliberate attempts to slow down either the legislation or the work of the commissioner, because those of us who live in cross-border communities are very well aware that these are issues that we are dealing with every day.

People as individuals, families, small businesses, industry, all have these issues that they have been dealing with, often for a very long time. They need to be able to come to the commissioner, who we want to get in place as soon as possible, to ensure that those issues can be dealt with as quickly and effectively as possible. I do hope that there will be widespread support for the bill overall, and I hope that those amendments that are proposed, that by accident or design appear to frustrate the work of the commissioner, will not be supported.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I move:

That progress be reported.

There are so many amendments that have been put forward over the last couple of days—

The CHAIR: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, you have moved that progress be reported. There is to be no debate.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 9
 Noes 7
 Majority 2

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Centofanti, N.J.	Curran, L.A.
Game, S.L.	Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Pangallo, F. (teller)	Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Hanson, J.E.	Maher, K.J.
Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Wortley, R.P.		

PAIRS

Girolamo, H.M.	Pnevmatikos, I.	Wade, S.G.
Hunter, I.K.		

Progress thus reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 May 2022.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:34): I rise to speak on behalf of SA-Best on the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) Bill 2022. The bill, as we know, seeks to rectify minor legislative errors under the Attorney-General's portfolio, as occurs from time to time, and you will be pleased to hear, Mr President, I do not intend to speak on this extensively today in terms of all those errors.

The government has chosen to fast-track straightforward amendments to three acts contained in the previous government's reform bill, which did not pass before parliament was prorogued. I understand consideration will be given to the other justice-related measures at a later date. The bill seeks to amend the Bail Act 1985 to provide flexibility to the court in determining the wording and form of certain bail documents, and I understand these amendments coincide with the commencement of the new electronic courts management system in July.

I note that the opposition has filed an amendment seeking to incorporate another measure contained in the previous bill but not picked up in this one. It seeks to clarify the identity of the relevant bail authority where a person on bail was seeking permission to travel interstate. I understand it is already current practice that, where the bail authority is the court, a magistrate or judge will approve interstate travel, and where the authority is a police officer, a police officer over a certain rank may provide that approval.

It also seeks to clarify the requirement of two death certificates for the issuing of a cremation permit under the Burial and Cremation Act 2013. Understandably, certification is held to a higher standard when a body is cremated with no future recourse if it became apparent that something was amiss.

At present, a permit must not be issued unless two death certificates have been issued, one signed by the medical practitioner responsible for the medical care of the deceased immediately prior to the death or who examined the body, and one by another medical practitioner. It specifically relates to death certificates issued under section 36 of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act. Section 36, however, requires only the first certificate by the responsible medical practitioner, thus exposing the legislative inconsistency that we are trying to fix, so the bill will make it crystal clear.

The final amendment is to section 66 of the Correctional Services Act to repeal an obsolete definition of 'serious drug offence' following changes made by parliament last year. Again, this is intended to provide clarity and ensure that persons sentenced to less than five years' imprisonment for a serious drug offence are not automatically entitled to parole. These offenders must now apply to the Parole Board for consideration of their release.

When asked to comment on this aspect of the previous government's bill, the Criminal Law Committee noted the significant delays in parole hearings and decisions. My office has been contacted by a person in this category—we were contacted earlier this year—who was frustrated by such a delay. His parole period had ended in July 2021 and, six months later, he was still waiting for his hearing.

I will ask some questions about this during the committee stage but my understanding is that there are no time frames for consideration, so even if it is one of those automatic parole situations there is actually no time frame for that individual in terms of having their hearing and consideration of parole applications provided for in the Correctional Services Act.

To me that seems like something that we should consider further because rightly or wrongly, however you want to consider it, if someone is eligible for parole, they are eligible for parole. Six months may be appropriate in some circumstances, perhaps like those we have had around COVID. I do not know what the average time is, but certainly if there is no time frame whatsoever there is an indication that that time frame someone could be waiting is perfectly unreasonable in the scheme of things.

To that extent, I think the Attorney will have to provide some explanation (a) as to how long it is on average that people wait to have their parole application considered and (b) whether there are factors which have contributed perhaps to delays in those applications being considered, where we normally sit in terms of consideration of such applications and whether this is something that ought to be looked at legislatively in terms of ensuring that people have reasonable access to having their applications heard in a reasonable time frame.

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

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 1 June 2022.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (11:40): I rise to speak in reply to the speech of Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson AC, Governor of South Australia, at the opening of the First Session of the Fifty-Fifth Parliament. I congratulate the Governor on her appointment as South Australia's 36th Governor and thank her for her opening address. I do enjoy the parliament's opening, where we as a society acknowledge a very important part of our parliamentary process and democracy by inviting our Chief Justice and other judges here, members being sworn in and the election of the President.

Mr President, I acknowledge your promotion to the chair of this place and I know that you will conduct yourself in an impartial and professional manner. I would also like to acknowledge our new members to this place: the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Sarah Game and the Hon. Laura Curran. Thank you all for your first speeches and for sharing your personal stories and what you hope to achieve in this place in the next few years. I have known the Hon. Reggie Martin, former secretary of the ALP, for many years and in my personal opinion he has one of the smartest and sharpest political minds.

At the conclusion of the last parliament, we lost three outstanding contributors to this place and to the people of South Australia: the Hon. Rob Lucas, the Hon. John Darley and the Hon. John Dawkins. I had the pleasure of getting to know the three of them over the last eight years and I wish them all good health in their retirement.

During the Governor's opening address, she outlined key priorities that this Malinauskas Labor government plans to implement over the next four years. I would like to take this opportunity to speak about a couple of these. At the March 2022 election, the fundamental issue that resonated with people from all parts of South Australia was health. After living under shifting COVID restrictions for the past two years, it is easy to understand why health became the number one priority and why it is a critical area of focus for this Malinauskas government.

The ambulance ramping crisis plagued the former Liberal government for more than two years. It is why Labor spoke out against the former Liberal government's plan to spend \$662 million on a basketball stadium. A government that gives priority to a \$662 million basketball stadium over fixing our health care is a government that has lost the plot. The Malinauskas government has reflected, through the Governor's speech, that fixing our state health care will involve making genuine structural change.

This Malinauskas government is determined to fix the ramping crisis. We can look forward to the newly elected federal Labor government working with the Malinauskas government to deliver a \$400 million expansion of the Flinders Medical Centre and upgrade of the Repat. This joint investment is part of the Malinauskas government's plan to improve health care for South Australians and includes investing \$77 million in the Bragg Comprehensive Cancer Centre in South Australia, delivering a new mental health and wellbeing centre in Bedford Park and \$13.7 million to improve and expand access to vital suicide prevention services in Adelaide.

I acknowledge that previous governments, both Liberal and Labor, have often neglected communities in the outer suburbs and regional areas, instead focusing on places with larger populations. This Labor government listened to the people living outside the city. These are people who have been crying out for help for a long time, asking for more services to meet the needs of their neglected communities and feeling frustrated that their voices have not been heard.

This government has responded and committed \$220 million to build a new hospital in Mount Barker with 120 beds—68 more beds than the current facility provides. The new hospital will also include a mental health unit, as well as rehabilitation, obstetrics and palliative services. There is also funding of more than \$50 million for health in Mount Gambier, including a \$24 million upgrade to the Mount Gambier hospital. The upgrade for this regional hospital will comprise of an \$8 million emergency department redevelopment, \$11.4 million on six new mental health unit beds and \$4.6 million for two drug and alcohol detox beds.

These health commitments were made possible by Labor's pledge not to waste millions of dollars on a basketball stadium in our CBD and instead respond to the voices and healthcare needs of the people living outside the city and in regional areas.

It was highlighted by the Governor that another significant priority of this Labor government is climate change. Labor acknowledges the truth about the seriousness of the world's climate crisis. A vital project will be our world-leading hydrogen power station to be built and operated by the government to power green manufacturing right here in South Australia. Our Premier has identified billionaire mining magnate Andrew Forrest and his Fortescue Future Industries as a potential partner in the planned state-owned \$593 million hydrogen power station.

We can look forward to a greater degree of collaboration around hydrogen in South Australia as our state unlocks more investment in renewable technologies. I am proud to be a member of a government that will act to address the gravity of the climate crisis and has a plan to turn South Australia into a green hydrogen giant.

The Malinauskas government has reflected through the Governor's speech that fresh vision and a long-term focus will assist in implementing its mandate to deliver improved opportunity for the next generations. With our future generations in mind, it is hard to comprehend the extent of the former Liberal government's cuts to training programs, which affected our youth. Labor plans to invest \$175 million and build five new technical schools, with a further \$30 million in operating costs being

provided over three years. Labor's technical colleges will facilitate more pathways for students to complete school and help greater numbers of our youth reach their fullest potential.

In her opening address, the Governor highlighted the significance of the \$6 million investment in the Hutt Street Centre, Catherine House and Vinnies. The Liberal government's decision to slash funding to these three critical organisations had a devastating effect on services for our homeless and most vulnerable. Unlike the former government, this Labor government understands the huge importance of these services and the relationships that the specialist staff employed by these organisations build with clients.

The Liberal cuts to this funding resulted in many of these specialist staff finding themselves unemployed. This Malinauskas government knows the only way we are going to properly address the problem of homelessness is to put resources into organisations with experienced staff that are actually on the ground working with and helping people every day.

I would like to reiterate the words of our Governor: preserving and supporting our cultural institutions and celebrating our internationally recognised arts community must be an integral part of any future plan for South Australia. Our vibrant multicultural communities, the arts and our many festivals are the heart of this wonderful city, and we must not lose sight of that.

This Malinauskas government plans to implement a set of comprehensive policies to ensure we revitalise the creative industries post-COVID. Our many creative industries are, as Her Excellency described them, 'the soul of our state'.

I am proud to be a member of a political party that has firm, progressive Aboriginal affairs policies and is committed to a state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart. It is exciting that South Australia's Fifty-Fifth Parliament will be the parliament that fulfils the promise of a meaningful treaty with the First Australians and guide the establishment of an Aboriginal Voice to Parliament, the restarting of a Treaty process and the retelling of a Truth.

Finally, I want to express thanks to all our retail and hospitality employees, healthcare workers and volunteers, and our hospital and emergency care workers and volunteers for their steadfast service during the past two years of COVID. To repeat the words of Her Excellency, 'All of our South Australian communities owe a debt of gratitude to each and every one of them.'

The Hon. J.S. LEE (11:51): It is a great privilege to rise today to support the adoption of the Address in Reply. Sincere thanks to Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson AC, Governor of South Australia, for opening the Fifty-Fifth Parliament of South Australia. Her Excellency reminded us in her speech that we were the first place where women successfully campaigned for the right to vote and stand for parliament—in 1894. This changed the status of women in our society forever.

As honourable members know, Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson is a proud sixth-generation South Australian. Her mother, the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore AM, was a South Australian parliamentarian. The Hon. Ms Cashmore was a Liberal Party member of the South Australian House of Assembly between 1977 and 1993, representing the eastern suburbs seat of Coles, known as Morialta since 2002. Her Excellency's mother was the third woman to be elected to the House of Assembly.

We were deeply honoured to have Her Excellency open the Fifty-Fifth Parliament in this place where her mother was once a valuable member of this parliament. Her Excellency is an inspiration to us all, and what a great asset to our state to have her return to South Australia to take on this important role as our Governor after her trailblazing role on the world stage. We are incredibly fortunate to have the Hon. Frances Adamson as our Governor and I thank Her Excellency sincerely for her speech and her commitment to serve the people of South Australia.

Mr President, please accept my congratulations on your return to the esteemed office of President of the Legislative Council. I know you will serve the role with distinction and fairness and maintain the highest order and dignity of this chamber.

While the 2022 March election result was very disappointing for the Liberal Party, congratulations to the Malinauskas Labor government. Congratulations also to all members who have been re-elected, and I welcome new members who were successfully elected for the first time.

From this side of the chamber, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Dennis Hood and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for being re-elected and extend my warmest welcome to the newest Liberal member of the Legislative Council team, the Hon. Laura Curran.

I believe the Hon. Laura Curran is currently the youngest member of the Legislative Council. She brings a fresh approach and energy to this place and we congratulate her for immediately stepping up to the important role of Opposition Whip, as well as shadow assistant minister. I join all honourable members in congratulating the members who have been re-elected to this chamber and the newly elected members of the Legislative Council: the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Reggie Martin.

This council seems a bit strange without the familiar face that was here for over 39 years, and I think honourable members know exactly who I mean. I would like to take this opportunity to once again thank the Hon. Rob Lucas, the former Treasurer, who retired at the last election after serving for more than 14,000 days in the South Australian parliament. He certainly had a long and distinguished parliamentary career. The Hon. Rob Lucas will be remembered for his thoughtful and fearless debate, his significant contributions and the profound impact that he made in this place and for the South Australian community. I wish all members who have retired from this council a very happy retirement.

Sadly, at every election some sitting members fight really hard but face the devastation of not being returned. I wish to take a moment to acknowledge and thank the members of the parliamentary Liberal team whom we will miss following the 2022 state election. These members are: the former member for Stuart, Dan van Holst Pellekaan; the former member for Gibson, Corey Wingard; the former member for Adelaide, Rachel Sanderson; the former member for Elder, Carolyn Power; the former member for King, Paula Luethen; the former member for Newland, Richard Harvey; and the former member for Davenport, Steve Murray. Two Liberal members in the other place did not contest the 2022 election: the former member for Schubert, Stephan Knoll, and the former member for Flinders, Peter Treloar.

Everyone came into this parliament to make a difference, and these members have utilised their skills, experience and capabilities to do everything they can to serve their respective electorates and communities. I wish to thank each and every one of them, the former members of parliament, for their contributions to the Marshall Liberal government and for their tireless work as outstanding local members of parliament.

I thank these colleagues for their significant contributions to the Liberal Party and for their wonderful friendship. They will all be sadly missed by our parliamentary team and those they served. I wish them and their families well in their future endeavours. No doubt they will still be out there serving our communities with the same passion and vitality, just in different capacities.

Turning my attention back to the Legislative Council, it is very rewarding for the Liberal Party to have four women from the upper house on the front bench holding shadow minister positions. This is quite a contrast to the Labor Party. I recall that in 2011, the Hon. Gail Gago was recognised in the media as the most powerful Labor woman in the state when she became government leader in the upper house, and the only minister in the upper house at the time.

As sole minister, the Hon. Gail Gago had to remain in the chamber at all times and had to handle every piece of legislation that went before the upper house. Currently, the Labor government only has two ministers in this house. Perhaps they should think about promoting the Hon. Emily Bourke to cabinet. It is a bit odd that she is Assistant Minister to the Premier but without any portfolio duties. Of course, that is a matter for the Labor Party to work through.

In contrast, on our side of the chamber we have four Liberal woman who have been appointed to shadow minister positions. What I am incredibly proud of is that the Liberal Party recognises talent, diversity and wideranging experience in the upper house. I congratulate and acknowledge the Hon. Nicola Centofanti on her elevation to the new Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council. She is passionate about the regions in South Australia and has proven to be an inclusive and dynamic leader. I believe the Hon. Nicola Centofanti is the first woman on our side to be elected to the position of leader in this council. It is a marvellous achievement for the honourable member personally and for our Liberal Party.

Living in a state where diversity is celebrated across our communities, I would also like to thank my colleagues for their trust and confidence to elect me as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council. It is truly a great honour to be a first-generation Australian with Asian heritage to be elected in this position. I am deeply humbled and grateful to have the opportunity to work alongside the Hon. Nicola Centofanti in the new leadership team. We will work diligently to support our new Liberal Party leader, the Hon. David Speirs MP, the deputy leader, the Hon. John Gardner, and the whole shadow cabinet and the Liberal team to ensure that we hold the Labor government to account and ensure that South Australians get the best services and outcomes they deserve.

The South Australian community has responded well to our united, dynamic and fresh Liberal Party team. We will continue to work hard to focus on matters that are important to the people of our state. We will harness ideas from our community to present new options and alternative vision for South Australia.

It is probably true that winners are usually grinners. I would like to caution the new Labor government and Labor members not to be too arrogant about their election win. For the record, about a third of South Australians voted Labor, but also about a third of South Australia's population voted for the Liberal Party. The Labor Party has the Greens to thank for their electoral success, based on the strong flow of preferences they received from the Greens. Just a gentle reminder to the Labor government that they must not be too boastful about their election win.

At this point, I would like to express my thanks to all the Liberal Party members, volunteers and people who voted for us, because these people recognised and appreciated that the Marshall Liberal government managed to save lives and livelihoods during the global pandemic that we have never seen before. It would be an understatement if I said that the Liberal Party came into government in unprecedented times. As we know it, our world was crumbling with infectious disease and, like everywhere else in the world, our state was facing a global health and economic crisis. No other Premier before the Hon. Steven Marshall in this state had ever had to deal with challenges like the coronavirus pandemic.

When we came into government in 2018, not only did we inherit the mess from the previous 16 years of Labor government, we were impacted by the drought, bushfires, followed by coronavirus in our first term of the Liberal government. I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the Hon. Steven Marshall, the member for Dunstan, for his incredible leadership throughout the COVID pandemic. He worked relentlessly, diligently as Premier during the most difficult and darkest time for our state. I also would like to thank the Hon. Stephen Wade for his hard work and empathy as the minister for health, ageing and wellbeing.

It has been an honour to have served in the Marshall Liberal government. Often we say that leadership in crisis allows us to truly judge the strength of character of a leader. Premier Marshall did not back away from the hard stuff, and it is important we acknowledge the difficult position he was in during the pandemic and pay tribute to his leadership, resilience and commitment to serve the people of South Australia.

It was an honour to serve as Assistant Minister to the Premier and to be a part of the Marshall Liberal government, which achieved so much and delivered record funding in infrastructure, hospitals, schools and roads for our state despite a once-in-a-lifetime challenge presented by the pandemic. When the Liberal leader, the Hon. David Speirs, announced his shadow cabinet, I was deeply humbled to be appointed as the shadow minister for multicultural affairs and shadow minister for communities and shadow minister for tourism and hospitality. I was a little bit surprised that in the speech prepared for Her Excellency by the new Labor government there was not one mention about multiculturalism or interculturalism in that speech. Perhaps it was an oversight.

While we are all eagerly anticipating the release of new census data this year, we know that the 2016 census showed that nearly 25 per cent, almost one-quarter, of the South Australian population are migrants or children of migrants from a non-English-speaking background. South Australians proudly come from about 200 countries and it was surprising that there was no acknowledgement of our diverse and harmonious multicultural community in this year's opening

address in parliament. I think this is quite a stark contrast to the Marshall Liberal government's proud commitment to acknowledging the contributions of our multicultural communities.

I am also very proud that the Marshall Liberal government undertook the first major review of South Australian landmark multicultural legislation in 30 years, delivering the South Australian Multicultural Act 2021, which introduces the concept of interculturalism as a way of strengthening multiculturalism and recognises the valuable contributions to our state made by South Australians from diverse backgrounds.

I hope the omission from the opening address is not a reflection of the Malinauskas Labor government's commitment, or lack thereof, to supporting our multicultural community members. I fully intend to dedicate myself to ensure that one-quarter of South Australia's population are not forgotten or neglected by the new government.

As I take on portfolios as new shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, I cannot help but reflect on Steven Marshall's passion and dedication to the South Australian tourism industry. Latest figures from the South Australian Tourism Commission reveal that six of South Australia's 11 tourism regions have exceeded their visitor spending targets four years ahead of schedule.

I was pleased that the Malinauskas Labor government recognised the important policy settings of the former Liberal government by highlighting that the South Australian Regional Visitor Strategy 2025 is helping drive outcomes for tourism success. This strategy, the Regional Visitor Strategy, was released in 2021 under the former Liberal government after extensive consultation with stakeholders.

I was delighted to see that, despite the severe disruption of the global COVID-19 pandemic, regional tourism performance has bounced back. Regional tourism now makes up 60 per cent of South Australia's total visitor expenditure, up from 44 per cent at the end of 2019. While Labor can try to piggyback on these achievements, it is thanks to the former Liberal government's initiatives to support our tourism operators that we are seeing such great outcomes across our state.

The Regional Visitor Strategy has provided a road map for navigating the challenges of the past two years, and initiatives brought in under the former Liberal government, such as the hugely successful Great State Vouchers, have helped drive the tourism boom. Six of the state's 11 tourism regions have surpassed the 2025 visitor expenditure target, helping drive total visitor expenditure in regional South Australia to \$3.6 billion in 2021, just \$400 million shy of its December 2025 target of \$4 billion.

Just a few weeks ago, I visited Monarto Safari Park with my parliamentary colleagues and was delighted to speak with Mr Peter Clark, Director of Monarto Safari Park. He could not speak highly enough of Steven Marshall's commitment to our state tourism industry and the incredible investment that the Marshall Liberal government delivered as part of a major zoos package for South Australia. This is just one of many examples of what we have achieved under the Marshall Liberal government.

I am delighted to have been appointed as the shadow minister for communities. I want to particularly thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the former Minister for Human Services, for her work for the communities. I am committed to ensuring that our vulnerable young people and families receive the support and services they need to flourish and achieve their aspirations in South Australia.

As the new shadow minister for communities, I am focusing on keeping the Labor government held to account and ensuring that the strategies, programs and services that were put together by the Hon. Michelle Lensink as the former minister will help to drive wellbeing and ensure that individuals, families and communities across South Australia are maintained and continued.

I will continue to be passionate about advocating for people from all walks of life and working together with people from diverse backgrounds and industries to build a harmonious and inclusive South Australia. This is a great place for our local community and visitors to South Australia from around the world. They can really enjoy living, playing and visiting here. I am proud to take on the new portfolios, as I mentioned before, and I will continue to work closely with all members of parliament to advance the interests and welfare of all South Australians.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (12:10): I am going to begin, as others have, by acknowledging that we meet today on stolen Kurna land and that the sovereignty of the Kurna people was never ceded. I pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging, and I acknowledge their continuing spiritual connection to their lands and their waters. For emphasis, if you like, this is stolen land. It is and always was and always will be their land.

In acknowledging those truths, it is important that I also pay my respects to my leader in this place, the Hon. Kyam Maher, who is our first Aboriginal Attorney-General. Kyam's appointment to this role is a pretty large moment of historical significance that should not be lost on any of us. The privilege that we all have that no other government has ever had is actually quite remarkable and deserves our respect. Once again, I congratulate you, Mr President, on your elevation to the role. I am sure you will continue to perform in that role as you did last year.

I also wish to extend my congratulations to some others in this place. Somewhat unusually, there have been quite a few so it might take some time and, fortunately, we have it. I would like to start with those who are no longer in this place and in doing so I acknowledge the Hon. Mr Lucas, the Hon. Mr Dawkins and also the Hon. Mr Darley. I was only here for, I think, the final five years of their varied tenures but in each case for these gentlemen I can say that there were unique things they brought to this place that will not be easily replaced.

I know that at least one government department should be quite relieved that the level of scrutiny brought by the Hon. Mr Darley may be slightly lowered by his absence—I am not sure. We will see how the opposition goes. I also wish to thank the Hon. Mr Dawkins for his service, not only to this place but also, quite sincerely, for his service to the north-east of Adelaide where he was so well known. I think he will be greatly missed.

I wish to congratulate the returning members to this place and in doing so I think it is worth noting that for a chamber that is often alleged by some to be a very left-leaning place, that shrugs its shoulders and just lets legislation through, the diversity of the legislative capability of returning members, on any objective analysis, is actually quite impressive, even to someone who might not be sure what it is exactly that we do here.

The Hon. Mr Ngo and Hon. Mr Maher returned, bringing their meaningful diversity of culture and history to this place, which mirrors what we see outside this place. I appreciate it and I look forward to what it shall undoubtedly bring once again. The Hon. Mr Hunter and the Hon. Mr Simms, in addition to their wealth of other skills, return a pretty important sort of diversity, especially as we reflect on the recent memorial of Mr Duncan's death. I think it sends a pretty crucial message of representation and inclusivity to our community.

I congratulate the Hon. Ms Lensink and the Hon. Ms Centofanti. They are welcomed back. In doing so, I note that they occupy prominent frontbench roles. While there can only be one leader, it did not escape my notice that there was more than one female candidate in the Liberal Party for the role. I hope that is a healthy sign of things to come for your party—not too healthy.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: We will always ask your advice, Justin.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I welcome that interjection, and I will hold you to that, the Hon. Ms Lensink. The Hon. Mr Hood will also continue to bring a perspective that reflects the values of so many outside this place, and I am certain that he will continue to do so with the comportment of the gentleman that he is.

This of course only leaves one returning member: the Hon. Mr Wortley—I leave the best to last, or the last to best, obviously. The guy just blatantly refuses to accept the logic of Meatloaf, who said that two out of three ain't bad. Mr Wortley is taking his third spin here and who knows when it will end? We might see the Hon. Mr Lucas's record fall. I am not really sure; it is clearly in his sights. All humour aside for the Hon. Mr Wortley, I welcome him back to this place and in doing so I gladly welcome the wealth of experience he brings, both in the union movement and the multicultural community.

This brings me to our new members. I welcome the Hon. Mr Martin, with whom I am very familiar. Not to be rude to any other party secretaries who may occupy the Labor government benches here, but in my view Mr Martin remains the most successful secretary this state has seen

in living memory. It was quite clear in the most recent federal election that our federal colleagues have been listening to him too. I welcome him.

I am less familiar with the Hon. Ms Curran and the Hon. Ms Game, a healthy mix, undoubtedly, of youth and experience. But from my brief interaction so far, I feel that there is quite a deal of common ground to be found between us, a quality that is so very important and needed for what we do in this place and for it to operate effectively for the people of our state. Welcome to you both.

In short, the gauntlet has been thrown by this chamber to the other: diversity of all kinds is the order of the day and this chamber is delivering. I live in hope that, as our society moves forward and further towards equity and opportunity for everyone, the other place will one day reflect the same kind of diversity that we see in this place.

At this election, Labor celebrates so many new faces in the other place. It would be remiss of me not to celebrate that seven of them are women. All seven of them are newly elected in seats gained from the Liberal Party, a fact which brings our lower house vote, our lower house Labor team, to a majority of female members. Not so long ago, such a thing would have been thought as impossible. In recognising the achieved goal that we have, today it gives me great pleasure not only to congratulate our new female members but, more particularly, to honour the trail blazed by all those who came before them.

I also extend my personal congratulations to my great and long-time friend, the new member for Playford, John Fulbrook. The wealth of his varied experience is only mirrored, in my opinion, by the depth of his character and understanding. The people of the north are truly lucky to have him. I am certain it will not be long before, like me, many of them shall also have him as their friend.

I would like to thank all those who put up their hand to represent their community in the most recent election but did not get the votes required. I think it is pretty plain that events elsewhere in the world have shown that a free and fair election is not something to be taken for granted. The value of our election is not just in the results we achieve here but in what other nations may take from seeing such a process take place.

I honour the efforts of all those deserving candidates who ran and lost, but extend a special mention to my other good mate, Ryan Harrison, who was the Labor candidate for Unley. A harder worker I guarantee to you all you shall not find. In a personal message to you, mate: they almost chose the salad—almost.

Finally, I extend my thanks to Her Excellency the Governor on her opening of the Fifty-Fifth South Australian Parliament. I think in doing so, I find myself picturing what it must be like for those who were elected recently or who ran in the election or, for that matter, those who just voted for change.

When I first came to this place five years ago, I had this idea in my head of what I wanted to achieve, but I did not really know how to do it. Labor had been in government for 15 years and there were a lot of strong personalities who had brought so much already to the Rann and the Weatherill governments. After just 12 months in this place, I got involved, where I could, in the election of 2018 against, frankly, an incredibly popular Steven Marshall and a resurgent Liberal Party, which was promising change. And, of course, Labor lost.

Like so many in the Labor Party, after the loss I took some time to assess our values and take seriously the election result delivered by the South Australian people. A loss will teach you all sorts of things. It taught me that we needed to go out and start speaking to those who we had lost the confidence of, so I did.

I went local and I went regional to begin those conversations. When I went out to do it, I remember thinking that the purpose of this was to change minds—to make people see what we had achieved in those 16 years. But what it taught me was that, in fact, we had failings, not least in the areas of health, cost-of-living pressures and in services. It was a pretty humbling experience.

I also found out that I was not doing it alone. I recall very specifically that our new Premier, who at the time was the new Leader of the Opposition, told us to accept the loss and to learn from it. He told us to go out to speak to people to find out what went wrong—to take the hits. Of course, it

was then, without realising it, that we started forming what it was that would bring us to where we are now.

What I did not expect out of all that process was that it would change me more than I ever changed the minds of those people I spoke to. People I spoke to did not talk about the achievements of this place. Lot Fourteen never got mentioned, I can assure you. No-one spoke in terms of how much infrastructure or the difference between state and federal expenditure and there was never any talk about a change of minister from one to another. I can assure everyone from the other place that, although it will disappoint them greatly, no-one cared if I was from the upper house or the lower house and they definitely did not care which party I was from, but of course all that only made it more educational.

The process taught me of the hopes and the aspirations of people. It taught me that, despite the huge geographical spread of our state, South Australians have a shared experience, a shared desire, across the state to look to the future in so many respects. It taught me that people did not really care so much about which party was in government; it taught me that all they cared about was that it was a good government.

It taught me that people wanted decent jobs that gave dignity in equal measure to the wages they earned. It taught me that people were worried about jobs and climate change equally and that the problem to them was not one of choice and that good climate policy will make the change to good economic policy when both those things are on equal footing.

It taught me that, for many people, health, long before the pandemic, was often about the person next to them. People did not want their mum or their dad or their child to have to go to an emergency room to stay healthy, but if they did they wanted to be secure in the knowledge that an ambulance would arrive.

When I started working on the election for the government we have now, what surprised me was how many other people were already there and how ready they were, too, because it turned out that quite a few people had been feeling this way and they were preparing in their own ways for the election.

The candidates who put themselves forward to form part of this Labor government in so many ways were more prepared for the problems facing them than I ever was when I came to this place. It was not a matter of me seeing myself in these people or not; it is just that they were so much better than I was from where I started five years ago, and as successful as it may have been, no-one was looking to recreate either of the previous Labor governments.

The candidates were better in so many ways: they are smarter, more organised and more effective in policy development and in communicating our messages to the community. In saying that, it is clear they were so successful in how they communicated their messages as we had community wins before we even reached government. The transport and Service SA cuts were reversed and SA Pathology was saved from privatisation.

Even as the pandemic stalled the politics of the day, I was astounded to see that it did not stall their resolve and determination in any way whatsoever. While ramping surged, billion-dollar defence projects were cancelled and the very culture of what we share in this state and our way of life was altered by the pandemic, I watched as more people volunteered more of their time, not less.

The pandemic did not make us timid. It made us even more certain, and we looked to build on these bold policies that we had. Bringing back our trains and trams, ending privatisations, is bold stuff. We looked to create future jobs by establishing hydrogen power in this state—to revolutionise that manufacturing industry that we all want to go back to. We looked to make a once-in-a-generation change to education, with five more technical colleges, preschool from the age of three and an aim of bringing our universities back into the top 100.

We proudly said that culture in our state cannot just be about the many festivals that we are so proud of, that we would build a new aquatic centre and that we would bring back the Adelaide 500. We said that we would cancel a stadium that did not make any sense, not just for the sake of it but rather with a promise that we would invest that money in a health system so pressured by the twin problems of the cuts and a pandemic.

There is no doubt, in saying all this, that these are big promises. People will be watching to make sure we deliver on them. But the power of these promises is in the fact that they are big ones, that they are all about genuine structural change to address the genuine structural problems facing our state.

So when I watched these candidates we had working in these seats, these volunteers we had on the doors, on the phones and putting up corflutes and even just the people who said that we had their vote, I realised that we did not actually have to change people's minds. We merely had to communicate to them that we had a vision for a better future and the community was ready to embark on that journey with us.

We have heard several new members in the other place say a couple of weeks ago—and I can personally attest on the basis of my campaigning in Unley—that many South Australians voted Labor in this last election for the very first time in their lives. We and the community were working together for something that we all knew would make the change that was needed for the future of South Australia and its people after all the challenges we had faced. We understood together those challenges that were before us, and we understood that the path forward was one of complexity and demanded great shared ambitions and, above all else, great leadership.

I guess that is why, before the resounding election results came in on the night, I felt like we had achieved the essence of what this place is actually all about, because in the policies that we had developed, because in the candidates we had chosen, because in the connections we had already made in communicating with people and because in the belief we had found in each other that we could face and surmount the challenges that faced our state, in all these things we were looking forward together, not just at the next four years but well beyond that, and the community was looking forward with us.

That makes it all possible, does it not? I think that is really what people are looking for in not just this government but any government: one that offers a vision that aligns with their hopes and their aspirations, one that brings them along on a journey that is going to deliver on that vision. More specifically, I guess, for me, for us, when we formed government, it was not about beating the last (Marshall) government anymore, it was about forging a new direction. It was about seizing opportunities to create a future that all South Australians deserve. It was about realising what we can achieve as a team and as a community in the years and years to come.

The policies we have promised are going to be delivered, and I know that because our new and returning members in the other place will not disappoint me, because they get it. They get what it means to deliver good government. South Australian Labor gets what it means to deliver good government. I want to thank the South Australian people for so resoundingly at the last election giving us the opportunity to do that once again.

When you are in opposition seeking to be re-elected, it is pretty important, obviously, to present that kind of vision, to look forward, to look at the future. I am enormously proud to be part of this government, one that I know will do tremendous things for this state and for its people, particularly those who are in dire need of the support of a good government.

Our workforce, particularly our health workforce, will get the opportunities, the conditions and the respect they deserve. The members of our community experiencing homelessness and crisis will be seen, will be heard and will be supported by this government, as will the people in our regions whose health care and economic outcomes lag behind their metropolitan peers. Our young people, so many young South Australians, will be getting a better education and have a greater future opportunity as a result of the reforms that we are going to achieve. Our environment, our flora, our fauna have suffered so much neglect and deliberate disregard and degradation over the past four years.

This is the vision that people were looking for, exactly the sort of vision that could inspire someone to vote Labor for the first time in their life. That is what makes good government and that is why I am proud to be delivering it. The future that our community will enjoy thanks to the policies that this government delivers over the coming years will be one of hope and will be one of promise and the realisation of their ambitions.

The next four years put us on a path to just about the brightest future I can imagine for our wonderful little jurisdiction tucked away at the bottom of the world. We have done this together, our candidates, our caucus, our party membership, our unions and, very importantly, our community. I hope and I wish for a better era for South Australian history that will change this state forever. I hope to see it. I hope we are going to change it very much for the better. I think we can, and I think that the South Australian people think we can too.

The PRESIDENT: I call the Hon. Ms Lensink.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (12:31): Thank you, Mr President, for the opportunity to make some remarks in relation to the Address in Reply. I will not be as comprehensive as some previous speakers, so those whom I do not acknowledge through this process, please forgive me. At the outset, I would also like to thank our Governor, the Hon. Frances Adamson AC, and her husband, Mr Rod Bunten. We are so well served by her experience, graciousness, intellect and integrity.

I would like to thank her for her Kurna welcomes, which she has consistently given at every opportunity when she speaks. It is very impressive, and I am sure all people of Aboriginal heritage appreciate that she has taken the time to learn the Kurna language. I would also like to acknowledge her support of women in her previous roles, which is well known, through her consular service and in her role as Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. She is a wonderful appointment for us and we are very proud of her.

I would like to congratulate returning members of this place as well, but in particular our new members, including, of course, the Hon. Laura Curran MLC, who was a member of a nearly all-female Legislative Council line-up and is our youngest member. We originally had seven on our ticket: myself; the Hon. Dennis Hood as the sole male; Dr Nicola Centofanti; the Hon. Laura Curran; the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, who came into this place when the Hon. David Ridgway, of blessed living memory, retired; Kathleen Bourne; and Tania Stock. We are extremely proud that the Liberal Party, without quotas, chose women and has done so in the House of Assembly as well in what could be regarded as two fairly safe seats: Schubert and Frome.

I would also like to congratulate the Hon. Reggie Martin MLC, the former Labor state secretary—I welcome him to this place—and Dr Sarah Game as the first elected representative of One Nation in South Australia. I also congratulate our leadership team in this place: Dr Nicola Centofanti and the Hon. Jing Lee. It is pleasing to see that in our party we continue to have women in leadership roles, including greater diversity. Our leadership team across the board, including in the other place, has a wealth of experience that will serve this parliament and our community well.

I would like to congratulate the Australian Labor Party on their election victory and, in this place, the return to the ministry of the leader, the Hon. Kyam Maher, and the Hon. Clare Scriven. We look forward to keeping them to account in their new roles. I would also like to congratulate all of the new members of the House of Assembly. I could not be happier to see women join the ranks of this parliament in numbers never seen before, and I would like to congratulate all of the new members on their first speeches, which I have been reading with interest. As I think has been said, there is much common ground that we can find in our life experiences.

I am hopeful that with more women in parliament the culture of this and other parliaments will continue to change and become more in line with our community's values. While it has traditionally fallen to women to try to call out poor behaviour, it is now well recognised that we need our male allies to also play their part.

I am hopeful there will be a change in the culture within the current party of government. In my time in parliament, there has been some pretty despicable behaviour that we have all been witness to. In the last four years, even though the Labor Party had more women on its front bench than in my party, it was plainly obvious to anyone that the boys were calling the shots, and I fear that this continues. We can look no further than who was asking the questions in the House of Assembly during question time. The tally shows that, of all the questions the Labor Party asked in the last term of parliament, a staggering 2,572 were asked by men and 678 were asked by women.

We also had the pretty lame performance, particularly during late-night debates, of what I call the pointless boys' debating club, who certainly liked to ask questions of our Deputy Premier, the Hon. Vickie Chapman, which she, with her usual grace and dignity and perhaps a touch of sarcasm, was able to bat away like mosquitoes.

We have also seen, through a leaked report about EMILY's List, that there continues to be the culture in the Labor Party that women face standover tactics, threat and intimidation when they seek office against factionally-backed male candidates. We also saw the treatment of the Deputy Premier, whom the boys' club tried to take down. She should be commended as a fearless first law officer who has implemented so many significant changes in just one term. She has set an example that should be emulated. So I do hope that Labor does not use its female members as a human shield.

I would also like to congratulate Labor on its election more broadly. It has proved to be very good at winning elections in this state. I think in the last 30 years it won the popular vote twice—obviously on 19 March this year and also in 2006. I would disagree with the Hon. Justin Hanson: I think it has proved much less capable of being a good government when it has been elected, broken many promises, caused a lot of anger, drove the state into the ground and turned it into a rust bucket.

It has been elected with a very ambitious spending agenda. Given how familiar some of us on this side are with the state of the budget—I cannot recall how many times I referred to our former Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, as benevolent and generous, which I am sure made his inner bean counter squirm—the new government is going to have to make some unpalatable choices in order to fund all of those commitments, and some of those we have started to see already.

As other speakers have commented on, COVID has had an impact on everyone, whether it is young people who have wanted to socialise, people with compromised health who have been more reluctant to leave their homes, our elderly in aged care who have endured lockdowns, people who work in the live arts industry, events management or businesses that have had cancellations or had to cancel things because of staff shortages—the list is quite endless.

In that, I would like to sincerely acknowledge and thank our former Premier, Steven Marshall, and the former health minister, the Hon. Stephen Wade, for their leadership throughout the pandemic and their willingness to respect the expert advice of our Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier, and also acknowledge the role of police commissioner Grant Stevens as State Coordinator. We should all be grateful for that leadership throughout what was a very difficult time.

COVID continues to be a disruptive force in our lives, whether it is through contracting the illness or cancelling things that have taken months to set up. I would also like to acknowledge the workforce that has carried the greatest load of all throughout this period: the domestic and family violence counsellors, personal support workers, community workers and of course the nurses, doctors, ambulance officers and our wonderful police.

I think it does bear reflecting that, in spite of the challenges of the last four years, whether it has been two years of the pandemic, the fires or other things that have faced our state, Steven Marshall was still able to deliver record employment and bring some business confidence back to our state, reduce the cost of doing business, and reduce the costs for South Australian households and families. Of that, I am extremely proud.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (12:40): I thank the Governor for opening the Fifty-Fifth Parliament. I join her in acknowledging the traditional owners. The land on which this parliament meets and the land on which South Australians live and work is the traditional lands of Aboriginal people. I pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging.

The Governor welcomed 14 new members to the parliament and 55 of us who have returned to the parliament. She gave the following sage advice:

...the necessarily adversarial nature of Parliament should not overshadow the far greater qualities that unite you all, most significantly your desire to make a meaningful difference in the lives of South Australians as evidenced by your embrace of Parliamentary service.

The aspiration to make a meaningful difference has been affirmed in a number of maiden speeches. For my part, I am no maiden; I am marking 17 years of service in this place. It is, however, timely to

reflect on the meaningful difference being made by myself and the Liberal Party group, of which I am proud to be part.

For the last eight years, I have been my party's spokesperson for health and wellbeing. It is a privilege to serve in the health portfolio, a portfolio that I asked for. It is a privilege to serve as a minister. It has been an extraordinary privilege to serve as health minister during a global pandemic. Health has been a high priority for the Marshall Liberal team, from undoing the damage of Labor's failed Transforming Health policy to delivering the long-term solutions required to ensure all South Australians can access the health care they need closer to home.

That commitment was reflected in strong resourcing for health. The Marshall Liberal government invested a record \$7.85 billion in our health system in 2021-22, \$1.35 billion more than in the last year of the former Labor government. The Marshall government health capital program of \$3 billion included provision for a new purpose-built Women's and Children's Hospital. We employed more doctors, nurses and ambulance officers than ever before in the state's history. In fact, in 2022 total health staffing was 2,500 FTE higher than mid-2018 levels.

I took the ministerial reins in health following four years of turbulence. Under the Transforming Health experiment, Labor had closed one hospital and downgraded three others. Much of the capital investment in hospitals in Labor's term was to build assets to provide accommodation for services relocated as a result of the closure of other facilities. In contrast, the Marshall Liberal government invested in expanding facilities and services in hospitals throughout the state to deliver better health care for South Australians.

Perhaps the hospital worst affected by Transforming Health was Modbury Hospital. The Marshall government invested in a \$98 million upgrade of Modbury Hospital to deliver a range of facilities: a four-bed high dependency unit, an eight-bed extended emergency care unit, a new and expanded surgical ward, a new outpatients department, a new purpose-built 20-bed palliative care unit, and a 26-bed short stay medical unit. Last year's budget committed a further \$48 million for a new older persons mental health facility at Modbury. Reportedly, at one stage Modbury was slated for closure by Labor; it now has a bright future.

At the nearby Lyell McEwin Hospital, the Marshall government's expansion is almost doubling the size of its emergency department and adding a new eight-bed mental health short stay unit. This \$58 million expansion will see an additional 1,900 square metres of space come online in the emergency department, 32 new treatment spaces, additional resuscitation and triage capacity, and dedicated paediatric areas.

The Marshall government's flagship investment was the new Women's and Children's Hospital. Labor originally promised to build a new Women's and Children's Hospital alongside the new RAH and then broke that promise, proposing instead to build two hospitals, one for women by 2024 and another one for children at some future point in time at an undisclosed site and for an undisclosed cost. Labor's plan obviated two key benefits of co-location: providing access to aeromedical retrieval for children and providing access to ICU services for women. We scrapped Labor's plan to build two separate hospitals, which would have compromised the health care of both women and children in our state.

We were planning and designing a new \$1.95 billion Women's and Children's Hospital with construction expected to begin in late 2022. The new hospital included 500 treatment spaces and an emergency department nearly double the size of the current one. As we planned for the new hospital, we invested in the current Women's and Children's Hospital with an upgraded neonatal intensive care unit, theatres, paediatric emergency department and mental health ward.

The Marshall Liberal government was delivering a huge \$314 million redevelopment of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital to ensure residents in Adelaide's western suburbs could access quality health care closer to home. Construction is underway on a new intensive care unit, operating theatres and a much larger emergency department. We are also adding a 52-bed rehabilitation unit and additional areas for medical imaging, pathology and more. An upgrade to The QEH was promised by Labor more than a decade ago but never delivered. Instead, Labor cut services as part of their failed Transforming Health experiment. We restored 24/7 cardiac services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital within months of being elected.

In the south, we undertook an \$86 million expansion of hospitals and health services right across southern Adelaide. We almost doubled the size of the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department, making it the biggest in the state with an extra 30 treatment spaces. We delivered a 12-bed acute medical ward at Noarlunga Hospital, which means that more patients can be treated locally, estimated to reduce ambulance transfers by about 1,000 a year and easing pressure on the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department.

We saved the Repat. The Marshall Liberal government tore up Labor's contract to sell the Repat and reactivated it as a thriving health precinct. In partnership with the federal government, we committed \$125 million to reactivate the Repat as a thriving health precinct and a vital part of our current and future health system. Dementia services, older persons mental health, specialised brain and spinal rehabilitation and surgery are just some of the services that will be offered at the revitalised precinct. The new Repat's Veteran Wellbeing Centre and a neurobehavioural unit have opened their doors and we are establishing a Statewide Eating Disorder Service on the site.

The Marshall government invested in the SA Ambulance Service. We increased the SAAS budget by over \$28 million since Labor's last budget. Our spending per capita on ambulance services is the second highest in the nation. In the last year, we announced the recruitment of another 125 paramedics, 50 of whom are already on the ground. We doubled the number of paramedic interns to 96 and employed 20 extra 000 call takers. We have delivered 65 new or upgraded stations across the state over the past four years.

A range of initiatives across the health system saw ramping levels in South Australia reduce by almost 50 per cent in the last four months of the Marshall government. Within hospitals the Marshall government worked closely with our teams to improve the delivery of elective surgery. We provided additional funding to reduce waits for both elective surgery and colonoscopies. The maximum wait time for outpatient service was reduced and regular updates on the waits were provided for the first time. Prior to the Omicron wave, all of our local health networks, with the exception of CALHN, were on track to slash overdue elective surgery numbers to fewer than 300 across the public health system.

The Marshall Liberal government appreciated that key to delivering better health care for South Australians is to provide more of that care earlier and more of it beyond the hospital environment. In that context, we established one Adelaide Hills and four suburban GP-led priority care centres, staffed by general practitioners and emergency care nurses.

The centres provide critical care in the community for emergency department arrivals or ambulance patients who need urgent but not emergency care. These centres see around 60 to 80 patients a day, all of whom would otherwise be at the emergency department. We established My Home Hospital, which has provided hospital-level care to thousands of South Australians in the comfort and security of their own home. We have made more palliative care outreach services available 24/7. We have introduced 24 hours, seven days a week nursing staff at five key police custodial facilities.

I think one of the most significant achievements of the Marshall government is the development of virtual health services. The Virtual Care Service based at Tonsley Park connects emergency department doctors and nurses to ambulance officers through telehealth so that ambulance teams have the support they need to treat a patient at home if it is safe to do so, or to link the patient with other care pathways.

The Women's and Children's Hospital Child and Adolescent Virtual Urgent Care Service connects parents with a virtual team of highly skilled emergency doctors and nurses who can assess and provide medical advice for patients aged six months to 17 years. I am particularly excited that this service is for the first time providing emergency care expertise at the Women's and Children's Hospital to children and young people throughout the state, including our regional areas.

At the Repat, SALHN now provides the CARE program, which supports the very elderly, often in nursing homes, where geriatricians and nurses are able to reach out to the home rather than sending the patient to the ED. During the pandemic, the COVID response community teams were monitoring over 30,000 South Australians remotely at home. The use of heart, oxygen and respiratory monitors to detect if patients were deteriorating was key to our COVID response.

A persistent problem has been the need to find more suitable accommodation for dozens of long-term patients who have collectively been in hospital for many thousands of days—some individuals for more than a year—despite them being clinically ready for discharge. Whilst we made positive progress working with the federal government, particularly during the pandemic, sustained reform in the NDIS and aged care is needed. The commonwealth and states need to work collaboratively to better drive better pathways.

The Marshall government took a holistic view of health, embracing the mental health and wellbeing aspects of health as well as the physical aspects. When we were elected, there was no strategy in mental health—there had not been for years. Working closely with clinicians, patients and families, the Chief Psychiatrist developed a well-grounded, internationally referenced Mental Health Services Plan for South Australia.

In the 2021-22 budget, the Marshall government invested \$163.5 million in mental health and the rollout of the plan. This included a significant investment to ensure South Australians can access the services they need in an appropriate setting, which is often community based, rather than in an emergency department. For example, the Marshall government opened Australia's first 24-hour Urgent Mental Health Care Centre in March 2021. The \$14 million centre in central Adelaide aims to provide care to people who need urgent mental health care but who do not need to be admitted to hospital.

A recent mental health agreement with the commonwealth secured funding for four more adult mental healthcare centres: one in the northern suburbs, one in Mount Barker and two in other locations. Planning is underway and funds committed to establish a 16-bed crisis stabilisation centre for mental health patients in Adelaide's northern suburbs. Mental health specialists now ride with paramedics in some ambulances to provide treatment in the community or to link patients to more suitable options, where appropriate.

In the shadow of Labor's Oakden legacy, older persons' mental health has been a particular focus of the Marshall Liberal government. We opened a neurobehavioural unit at the Repat to provide care for people with the most severe behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia. We established a specialised advanced dementia unit at the Repat for people with dementia needing medical care. We partnered with HammondCare, a world-leading provider of dementia services, to deliver an innovative dementia care village. We funded a 20-bed, older persons' acute mental health facility at Modbury.

In mental health services more generally, we increased funding for child and adolescent mental health services and community and forensic mental health services. We delivered a new child and adolescent inpatient mental health facility at the Women's and Children's Hospital. We established the Borderline Personality Disorder Collaborative. Psychiatric intensive care bed capacity has been increased. We provided funding for mental health support in the context of bushfires and COVID.

We established a paediatric eating disorder service and the Mental Health Commission has been strengthened with an increased focus on lived experience. The Marshall Liberal government delivered Australia's first Suicide Prevention Act, expanded the Suicide Prevention Networks to 42, and was well advanced in the development of a suicide prevention plan 2022-25.

The Marshall Liberal government recognised that the best time to deal with a health challenge is to prevent it. We pursued a holistic, preventive, early intervention approach. This is one of the reasons the Premier appointed me as South Australia's first Minister for Wellbeing. The government established Wellbeing SA as a preventive health agency, which applies an evidence-based approach in multiple preventive care programs to try to support the health and wellbeing of South Australians by implementing better pathways of care, leading community-wide action on the determinants and risk factors of good health and wellbeing and supporting South Australians' mental wellbeing.

Regional communities have engaged in the SA Healthy Towns Challenge to foster the wellbeing of their communities. Last year, more than 4,000 South Australians were involved in the Billion Steps Challenge. A statewide walking strategy was launched. Wellbeing SA provided around

50 consultation and screening opportunities, including an Aboriginal one-stop screening shop and Well Women's Screening, and Wellbeing SA delivered a compression garment subsidy scheme.

After 16 years of Labor, in the Marshall Liberal government South Australians in regional communities finally had a government that listened and took action to deliver health care closer to home. The government delivered a fivefold increase in investment in country health capital works. We committed more than \$200 million to country health and actually spent \$70 million. We upgraded facilities and expanded services at regional hospitals, including Murray Bridge, Victor Harbor and Yorketown.

We started construction of a new emergency department at Mount Barker hospital, undertook a massive expansion of the Gawler hospital emergency department, secured land for an expansion on Kangaroo Island and progressed a new Barossa hospital.

We acted to tackle the maintenance backlog at country hospitals. There are now double the number of complex country chemotherapy units, with new units in Victor Harbor, the Riverland and Port Lincoln. We expanded renal dialysis services at Mount Gambier and Ceduna hospitals. Through six country local health network boards, we acted to decentralise decision-making to country people, so that more decisions are made locally.

One of the greatest challenges in rural health care is securing the workforce needed to deliver quality care. Through our \$20 million Rural Health Workforce Strategy, we developed a series of plans and initiatives that foster the recruitment, training and retention of rural health professionals. Consistent with the Rural Medical Workforce Plan, the government established a rural generalist pathway to provide a training framework for GPs with the advanced skills needed by country hospitals.

The Marshall Liberal government invested an estimated \$188 million over two years to attract and retain country doctors through the Rural GP Agreement. This represents more than a 20 per cent increase in funding, which is the most significant investment in rural GPs in a generation. Key benefits of the agreement include a sign-up bonus of up to \$50,000 for a doctor to work in remote areas and more flexibilities for country doctors in how they work and charge. We supported the safety and retention of rural health professionals through enacting Gayle's Law, providing for a second officer to accompany health workers to oversee their safety. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:16.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

SACE Board of SA—Report, 2021-22

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

2022 Estimates Committee Schedule

Question Time

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations regarding the Return to Work scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The CFMEU released a statement this morning, titled 'Labor's broken promise betrays injured workers'. In that statement the CFMEU highlighted that:

Before the election you couldn't turn around at a workers rally without tripping over a Labor politician taking a selfie for their social media profiles, and yet just weeks into their term the Labor Government's agenda has turned into attacking the most vulnerable of injured workers, and refusing to even speak to workers and unions before they do it.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Did the union seek a meeting with the minister on the Return to Work scheme?
2. If so, and he didn't meet with them, why didn't he meet with them?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:18): Have sought, have had a meeting. I thank the honourable member for her question. Yes, unions have sought a meeting and unions have had a meeting.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:19): Supplementary: when did the unions have meetings?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:19): I won't go into private discussions, but I've had a large number of discussions. But certainly, in recent days there have been many discussions and large meetings.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:19): Further supplementary: when did the government first consult with the unions over their legislation that they introduced in this place?

The PRESIDENT: Just before the minister answers, it is one thing to ask questions about the scheme, but not to ask questions about the legislation.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I will rephrase that.

The PRESIDENT: Thanks, the Hon. Ms Bonaros.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: When did the minister first consult the unions over the revised Return to Work scheme?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:19): I thank the honourable member for her question. I don't remember the exact day, but in the last week.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations regarding the Return to Work scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The CFMEU has claimed that:

The Malinauskas Government's plan directly breaks its promise to injured workers before the election. The South Australian Labor platform 2022 released in October 2021 contained a firm commitment against placing injured workers and their families into poverty.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the Malinauskas government breaking the commitment it gave to the CFMEU and injured workers before the March election?
2. How many other election commitments does the minister expect his government to break before the end of the term?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for her question.

It is extraordinary that the Liberal opposition would be thinking this is an issue on which they could play politics.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Summerfield decision was handed down in 2019.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There has been three years for the former Treasurer to make a decision.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Not just that, but the former Treasurer said publicly that the next parliament is going to have to make a decision on this, knowing and admitting that he squibbed making any sort of decision. He squibbed making any sort of decision. These are not easy decisions, but at the end of the day—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wade!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —at the end of the day a scheme that is not viable—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —a scheme that is unfinancial can't help anyone, including injured workers.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:21): Supplementary: if that was the view of the government, why didn't they flag that during the election campaign? Could it be because they knew working people wouldn't support them and wouldn't support this attack on their rights?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for his question. We made no commentary about the Summerfield case or any potential about it during the campaign, except to say that we couldn't make a decision from opposition without having government advice and knowing what the actuarial situation was.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hood was on his feet first. The Hon. Mr Hood has a supplementary question.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:22): Does the Attorney-General acknowledge that this is a complete backflip from Labor's position prior to the election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:22): No.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, do you have a supplementary question?

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:22): Was the government, this government, consulted on about the Summerfield changes before the election by Return to Work or anybody else?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:22): I am happy to double-check for the honourable

member. I don't recall Return to Work consulting with the opposition at the time, but I am happy to check to see if that's correct.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:23): Further supplementary: was the government consulted with by the opposition, while they were in opposition, about the Summerfield case and the Return to Work scheme?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:23): I think the question is: did the former Liberal government, probably Rob Lucas as the minister responsible, consult with the opposition? I don't recall, but again I will double-check that.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about foot-and-mouth disease.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Foot-and-mouth disease is regarded as one of the most significant disease threats to Australia's livestock industry, with the Cattle Council suggesting an outbreak could cost the sector \$100 billion. Indonesia is currently dealing with an outbreak and there are fears that if it reaches Bali there could be a foot-and-mouth highway created between Australia's major airports and Bali. My questions to the minister are:

1. Has the minister's department briefed her on possible initiatives to mitigate the risks of foot-and-mouth disease and ensure South Australia's preparedness in the event of an outbreak?
2. What initiatives have been or are being introduced to mitigate the risks of an outbreak and to prepare South Australia in the event of an outbreak?
3. Has the minister's department made any requests for additional resources to support these proposed initiatives?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:24): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question. Foot-and-mouth disease is indeed one of Australia's greatest livestock biosecurity risks. In April 2022, an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease was detected in cattle in Indonesia. So far, I am advised, the disease has been detected in East Java and Sumatra; however, it is likely that the disease is in fact more widespread.

The Australian government (the federal government) has offered assistance to Indonesia to combat and contain the foot-and-mouth outbreak. This comes on top of the assistance already being provided to respond to an outbreak of lumpy skin disease that was recently detected in Sumatra. It is likely that this outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Indonesia will take many years to eradicate. This biosecurity threat will remain a high risk to Australia for the near future.

A foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in Australia would have a devastating impact on Australia's livestock industry, with severe economic losses due to a shutdown of Australia's export markets for live animals, meat and animal products. In 2011, modelling showed the costs of a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in Australia were estimated to be between \$6 billion and \$50 billion—a very wide range—depending on the size of the outbreak, and the impacts would be felt over many years. These figures are being updated by ABARES, and early estimates indicate it could be \$80 billion to \$100 billion. The impacts of a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak would be felt well beyond agriculture.

The 2001 outbreak that occurred in the UK had severe and long-lasting social and mental health impacts and impacted other sectors, including tourism, education and businesses that were not related to agriculture. The impact to South Australia will still be devastating, even if an outbreak occurs in remote northern Australia. It will still result in immediate loss of international markets, and Australia will need to attempt to negotiate an international zoning arrangement, which will require

significant effort to support the required movement controls and proof-of-freedom surveillance to support our proposed zones.

PIRSA will be working closely with our state peak industry bodies and nationally through working groups to contribute to both national and state preparedness activities. PIRSA's key areas of activity for preparedness will be enhanced surveillance to ensure early detection of disease, and planning to ensure a rapid and effective response should detection of this disease occur in Australia. This will include a communication strategy to complement the national efforts being undertaken.

Many of the preparedness activities being undertaken currently for a lumpy skin disease outbreak in Indonesia will address the threat of foot-and-mouth disease. An industry task force has been established to work on preparedness activities. The resourcing required will be extensive, and it is expected that foot-and-mouth disease preparedness and costings will be raised at national forums.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary: I thank the minister for her response. I just want to get an answer to the third question, if that's okay, on whether her department has made any requests for additional resources to support those proposed initiatives.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): As I mentioned in my original answer, this is a national problem. We want to address it on that level as well as look at preparedness activities for the state. As I said, the resourcing required will be extensive and it is expected that as a national issue that will be raised in national forums.

ABORIGINAL FISHERIES OFFICER CAREER PATHWAY PROGRAM

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the Aboriginal Fisheries Officer Career Pathway Program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for his question. Fisheries officers play an incredibly important role right across our state in protecting and preserving fish stocks, educating those who share marine resources both recreationally and commercially, detecting and preventing offences within fisheries and upholding the law when it comes to fisheries legislation that we set here in this place.

Fisheries officer positions, I am told, are highly sought after. Those who fulfil these roles are multiskilled and passionate about their jobs. Indeed, when I met with two of our fisheries officers in Whyalla last week, they certainly fit that bill: very passionate and clearly very skilled in a variety of ways.

While needing to understand all aspects of fishing and how it fits within complex state and national laws associated with commercial and recreational fishing, they also need to be able to communicate effectively with a range of diverse communities and cultures about compliance and regulation so that we can sustainably manage our aquatic resources. Their roles are educational as much as they are compliance-based. That is why it is important that fisheries officers reflect the diversity of the community in which they serve and this, of course, includes the Aboriginal communities where such an important part of the culture is held within Aboriginal traditional fishing.

In South Australia, Aboriginal traditional fishing is recognised by the Fisheries Management Act 2007 and provides for the development of Aboriginal traditional management plans, in conjunction with existing and/or new Indigenous land use agreements. In 2016, the Aboriginal Fisheries Officer Career Pathway Program was established, becoming the first program of its type to be implemented in South Australia. The program is dedicated to meeting obligations under the act to provide opportunities for Aboriginal people but also to have a substantial benefit to fisheries management across the state.

This highly successful program includes extensive training and professional development over a two-year period which sees the participants obtain skills that meet the requirements to transition to authorised fisheries officers. The trainees are involved in day-to-day operations, and that includes both overt and covert operations and at-sea inspections aboard the fisheries patrol vessel *The Southern Sea Ranger*, which I look forward to having the opportunity to get on board myself in the future.

PIRSA provides approximately \$800,000 annually to fund the program which currently employs five Aboriginal people, including three fisheries officers—one based in Mount Gambier and two in Yorketown—one traditional fisheries management officer and one traditional fisheries manager. These roles, in particular the fisheries officers, are representative of some of the key Aboriginal sea nation communities, including Boandik in the Limestone Coast and Narungga nation on the Yorke Peninsula.

The program thus far has seen an 80 per cent completion rate of the two-year program but I am told that 100 per cent of participants have either gone on to other roles within PIRSA or in the fisheries and aquaculture industry, which I think is an incredible outcome. The participants are role models within their communities and the program provides a strong base for others like it to be implemented. The program, and its resulting appointments to ongoing roles, has also strengthened the positive relationships between Aboriginal communities and government across the state, while at the same time improving fisheries and aquaculture management and compliance efforts.

I look forward to this program continuing and hearing of all the successes of those who are involved in it in the future. The government and my department remain committed to working together with all Aboriginal sea nations, communities and other parts of the fishing industry to sustainably manage our precious aquatic resources.

ABORIGINAL FISHERIES OFFICER CAREER PATHWAY PROGRAM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary: can the minister assure the council that government funds to the fisheries officers will not be cut in today's state budget?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:32): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question. Today is 2 June and 2 June is, indeed, budget day, and the budget is handed down at 3 o'clock. According to our clock here it is 2.32, so my understanding is that the budget has not yet been handed down.

I must admit when I came to this place I did not expect to be giving directions and instruction about how to read a calendar or, indeed, how to read a clock, but it seems that that might be what is required, when we see this line of questioning, not just today but over the last few days as well. In terms of the budget, we look forward—all of us—to seeing that budget when it is handed down later today.

ABORIGINAL FISHERIES OFFICER CAREER PATHWAY PROGRAM

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:33): Supplementary: will the minister oppose any budget cuts to the department announced in the budget today, if they are?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you can choose to answer that, if you wish.

CHILD CUSTODY

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General on South Australians fighting for custody of their children.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: I have been contacted by a number of constituents who have had their lives torn apart by former partners restricting access to their children. They now face long and expensive battles in court. Parenting proceedings in the federal circuit and Family Court of Australia cost an average of \$50,000 per parent but may cost many hundreds of thousands depending on the complexity of the case and how well the other side is funded.

It can take many years for custody cases to be resolved and for alienated parents left with years of worry and isolation from their children. My question to the Attorney-General is: in what way is the Malinauskas government going to work with the new federal government to advocate for the South Australian parents alienated from their children while being caught up in the expensive and time-consuming web of the court system?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this area. I think, as the honourable member alluded to in the question, the Family Court, or it is now part of the Federal Court, is a commonwealth jurisdiction. Certainly, we do in South Australia, and will continue to, advocate for those involved in the federal system to make sure people have reasonable access to justice.

We have institutions in South Australia like the Legal Services Commission, like Community Justice Centres, like the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, that do help people who face barriers because of their personal circumstances and financial ability to access the justice system. We are happy to advocate, as we often do, to make sure that those who have struggled to access justice and participate in the legal system can do so if they have financial barriers, in particular, to doing that.

AGRICULTURAL SECTOR LABOUR SHORTAGES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:35): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the agricultural sector. My first question is: what level of labour shortage has been reported by the agricultural industry in South Australia to the minister? Can the minister inform the council about the statistics that she received of the labour shortages, and in which sectors? Knowing that the problems of labour shortages are putting our agricultural industry at risk, what measures has the minister put in place to address the issues in immediate terms?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am happy to bring back to the council any specific statistics, but what I think is really important is that we have been hearing this on every level from every community in regional areas, as well as, indeed, here in the city—there are also labour shortages here—but particularly in regional areas from the agricultural industry, from the horticultural industry, from the tourism industry, from hospitality, and the list goes on.

I think when there is that level of concern in the community, that level of concern amongst businesses and in particular small businesses, which of course is a sector that was totally ignored and forgotten by the former Marshall Liberal government, we need to ensure that when we are hearing that from every sector across the state that we are listening, which is something of course that we are already doing.

I have had a number of meetings, since becoming minister about nine weeks ago, with various peak bodies from many organisations and, again, the issue of labour shortages is one of their top priorities, second perhaps only to the related issue of housing and then, of course, biosecurity. As I think we have discussed on a number of occasions in this place already in this session of parliament, the housing shortages are a particular barrier to being able to address the workforce shortages.

In terms of going forward, we have already discussed in this place one of the initiatives that has been already put in place, which was the ten-pound Pom, or the ten-euro Pom program, which has shown some success already. I will be continuing to work with all of my colleagues, as well as with industry, with regional development associations and regional councils and regional small businesses and larger businesses to address this issue, which does need a cohesive cross-department and cross-sector approach.

I have had a number of quite innovative ideas raised as possibilities and I am very keen to be able to look at those, both with my department and with all of those others involved, and that of course includes the Minister for Housing and the Minister for Human Services. We are aware that, unfortunately, due to the distinct lack of action by the previous government, we haven't seen the

improvements in housing that we need to see that would then be the enabler for the improvements to a gaining workforce.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It is quite fascinating, some of those opposite are still giving excuses for what they didn't do for the last four years.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: They are still giving excuses for what they didn't do for the last four years.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, sit down.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Is everyone finished? Minister, continue, please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It appears, perhaps, that those opposite are going to just pretend the last four years didn't happen and I am sure the state would prefer to pretend the last four years hadn't happened because what we have seen already is the now opposition, instead of perhaps reflecting on what they didn't do in their four years in government, are now trying to say that the issues that we are faced with here today in 2022 are somehow as a result of a government from prior to 2018.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Because they are.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: 'Because they are,' the opposition says, so clearly—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Actually, the Hon. Mr Wortley, we don't need your help with this. The opposition is wasting its question time and the crossbenchers' question time, so, minister, please conclude your remarks and let's move on.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Certainly, I'm happy to conclude on the note that the opposition should not be trying to explain away today's problems because they didn't do anything for four years.

POINT PEARCE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister update the council about the draft master plan being developed by the Point Pearce Aboriginal community and the Yorke Peninsula Council?

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to hear the minister's answer, please. Attorney-General, let's go.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in this area. After the end of the last sitting week, I had the opportunity to visit Narungga country to meet with members of Aboriginal groups and communities across the Yorke Peninsula. One of the most rewarding parts of the job as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs is the opportunity to get out across the state to meet with Aboriginal people on their country and to hear firsthand about their concerns and aspirations.

During that trip, I was able to see some good examples of practical work being done towards reconciliation. The Yorke Peninsula Council has partnered with the Point Pearce Aboriginal

community to prepare a master plan for that community: the Bookooyanna Master Plan. As some members will be aware, Point Pearce on the Yorke Peninsula was the site of the Point Pearce Aboriginal mission from 1868. In 1972, the lands of that site were returned to the Aboriginal people through vestment with the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

Point Pearce has been and is home to a strong community and has huge significance not just to members of the Narungga community who live there but to many people with connections to that site and that area. The Community Coordinator, Aunty Kaylene O'Loughlin, serves as a very strong advocate for her community and I am grateful for her giving me the time and explaining some of the opportunities she sees for Point Pearce.

It speaks volumes about the forging partnership between Point Pearce and the local council that the first visit Aunty Kaylene suggested to me was to stop at the council office in Maitland to meet with the council with her and to go through their master plan. It is an important piece of work outlining the past and present of Point Pearce community and, importantly, identifies 20 projects for the community that could have investment in the future.

The projects include things such as repairs to the youth shed to provide important recreation and learning opportunities for younger people in the community; upgrades to the community hall and church, a much-used site in the community that is in need of some attention and restoration; and a whole range of other projects that will make a difference to the community.

The master plan is just a draft at this stage, but it's already a high-quality document that will be a great tool for looking at upgrades in the future at Point Pearce. It really is a testament to the Yorke Peninsula Council that they are forging this relationship with the Aboriginal community at Point Pearce. I was impressed by how closely council staff have worked in partnership with that community, working on these projects and providing support for the master plan in setting a vision for the community.

Some of those projects have already come to fruition, such as the metal warriors that greet visitors when driving into the community, protecting the community and reminding visitors of the long Aboriginal heritage in the area. As we come towards the end of Reconciliation Week, I think what's important, as we have mentioned in this chamber already this week, is ways we can put that reconciliation into practice, and Yorke Peninsula Council in their partnership with Point Pearce community are doing just that.

I wish to applaud everyone at Point Pearce community—in particular, Aunty Kaylene O'Loughlin and Uncle Eddie Newchurch—and those at the council, including Mayor Darren Braund and CEO, Andrew Cameron.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General and industrial relations minister a question about the Return to Work scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In this very same chamber last year, the very wise Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos introduced the Return to Work (Impairment Assessment Guidelines) Amendment Bill. In your support of the bill, you stood up in this place and said, and I quote:

Earlier this year, many members of the community were disturbed at the proposal of the government...to drastically change the Impairment Assessment Guidelines that affect some of the most vulnerable injured workers in South Australia...

The changes to the guidelines affect those who could be assessed with a 5 per cent whole body...impairment, a WPI threshold for workers to receive a lump sum compensation for many genuine injuries. It will make it impossible for many workers to receive lump sum compensation for common and debilitating injuries, including injuries to the knee, arms, hips, ankles and wrists.

You went on to say:

You need look no further than a recent [SAET] judgement highlighting how volatile this area of law can be, both for injured workers and medical practitioners...

After 18 months of listening to this government tell us daily about the importance of following expert health advice, we now find that parts of the government actively seek to undermine and try to change expert health advice.

My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Do you stand by the comments you made last year in support of the Labor private member's bill? If so, do they now fly in the face of your revised position and comments in here publicly today?
2. Will you consider the same bill favourably if and when it is reintroduced?
3. Does the government's revised position on Return to Work undermine the SAET decision you yourself referred to in this place last year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:46): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I think I will answer the middle one first. Will we favourably consider legislation such as that put forward by the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos? The answer is yes, we will favourably consider that. We are actively looking at how that bill will look in terms of doing that.

I will answer the first and third parts by saying we do stand by comments we have made in the past. The very big difference between what the former government did with the Impairment Assessment Guidelines was the changes to the Impairment Assessment Guidelines were not made because of any financial pressure on the scheme.

The difference with what's being faced by Return to Work now is the results of the decision in the Summerfield case are putting extraordinary financial pressure on the scheme: a \$1 billion black hole in deficits and \$100 million extra costs in the future. That's the very big difference between what the previous government did and what is being faced as a result of the Summerfield decision. As I said earlier in relation to an answer to a question, a scheme that is not financial and not sustainable is not good for anyone, including, and in particular, injured workers.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:48): Supplementary: I will ask the question again. Does the government's revised position on the Return to Work scheme undermine the SAET decision—the one you have just referred to and the one that you used to back your support for that private member's bill introduced in here last year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:48): I will endeavour to answer without breaching standing order 187 in relation to—

The PRESIDENT: Referring to the bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —legislation that is before us, sir. Certainly, on the advice the government has, the Return to Work scheme, as I have outlined, is \$1 billion in deficit now as a result of that court decision and is facing \$100 million extra costs per year. The scheme as it currently stands is not sustainable and that is not good for anyone, including injured workers.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:49): Supplementary: does the minister have confidence in the ReturnToWork board?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you can answer the question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have not had a meeting with all members of the ReturnToWork board; I will seek to do that in the future. I have had concerns raised with me that return to work rates have been cut over time, aggressively perhaps, and also that no provision seems to have been made in contemplation of the Summerfield decision, so they will be issues I will be raising with the board.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:49): Further supplementary arising from the original answer: can the minister confirm for the record that the decision that he was referring to in his contribution last year was the Summerfield case?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:49): I will have to come back to the honourable member. I do not have in front of me exactly what that was, but I am happy to go back and have a look to see what I was referring to.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:50): Final supplementary: do you acknowledge that the rank and file members of trade unions have been betrayed by your revised position on return to work?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her question. We did not take a position in relation to a response to the Summerfield decision to the election.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:50): Supplementary question: when was the minister first made aware of the financial position?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): Soon after coming to government we would have been made aware of the financial position. It would have been in a briefing early on in our time coming to government that we were given details of the financial position of the Return to Work scheme. Then, of course, we have had further discussions and the board has had a meeting since then.

ABORIGINAL LEGAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It was reported in InDaily on 27 May this year that the Law Society in a submission to the state government ahead of the release of the state budget called for an inquiry to be conducted into the demand for Aboriginal legal services across the state. The Law Society has reportedly asked the state government to commit to providing funding to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement on top of what is already provided by the commonwealth to ensure that the organisation can keep up with demand. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. What level of demand is the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement currently experiencing?
2. Will the Attorney-General establish an inquiry into the demand for Aboriginal legal services in South Australia?
3. Has the Attorney-General assured Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement leaders, including CEO Chris Larkin and principal legal officer Chris Charles, that their concerns with regard to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement's capacity to provide services, including on the APY lands, will be addressed?
4. Is the Attorney-General confident that the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement is sufficiently resourced to meet the current and future demand for its services?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. Certainly, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement has a proud history of providing legal services to Aboriginal people. I think, if my memory serves me correctly, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement was founded initially in 1972 and became incorporated in 1973, and it has

been providing decades and decades of support and help for Aboriginal people across South Australia.

In relation to funding for the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, the member I think alluded to the fact that there is significant federal funding, and I can inform the chamber that the ALRM receives approximately \$33 million over a five-year period from the National Legal Assistance Partnership, between 2020 and 2025, to provide culturally appropriate legal information, advice and advocacy to Aboriginal South Australians.

In addition, the ALRM does receive separate grant funding, and I am happy to go away and find whether there is more information about separate grant funding from the commonwealth. I can also inform the honourable member that the ALRM receives separate grant funding from the state government to deliver other programs, such as the Aboriginal Justice Advocacy Service. Certainly, the ALRM has raised, on a number of occasions, issues in relation to the adequacy of the National Legal Assistance Partnership funding and what that means for their services.

I have a scheduled meeting with the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement coming up soon, where I will discuss these issues further. But I do acknowledge the work the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement has done for almost 50 years in this state.

ABORIGINAL LANDS WEED MANAGEMENT

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the council on the state government's work in addressing the growth of weeds on Aboriginal lands?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions regularly undertakes various forms of pest and weed management to assist local communities and industry. I am delighted to update the council today on a two-year project that PIRSA has commenced, which will be delivered by a biosecurity operations coordinator, to build the weed management capacity of Aboriginal land managers.

I am advised that in the initial stage of the project the coordinator is holding three public forums in regional centres while consulting with Aboriginal communities to determine the impacted areas and identify weed threats to public amenity and biodiversity. These forums aim to increase participation in weed surveillance and response by Aboriginal communities and will also cover weed identification, prioritising weeds of concern, weed impacts on country, weed surveillance and weed threats to public amenity and biodiversity.

Some of the weeds of national significance that will be targeted include the African boxthorn and cacti, and this program will also assist in identifying other weeds impacting communities. I understand this project seeks to build capacity for Aboriginal land managers to manage weeds, in particular the weeds of national significance, which are subject to cross-jurisdictional management plans.

Managing weeds of national significance and aligning biosecurity outcomes to local community needs are priorities of Healthy Country plans, which are in place to help Aboriginal people look after their country. This project will support their delivery through provision of technical knowledge and expertise in on-ground management to Aboriginal land managers.

This program will be delivered through consultation, prioritisation and then analysis, including risk assessment, provision of science-based advice and training. I understand the first of these forums, in Port Augusta at the SA Arid Lands Landscape region, was held last week. A forum in Maitland for the Northern and Yorke region will be held on Tuesday 14 June, and Meningie will host the Murraylands and Riverland region forum on Tuesday 19 July.

ABORIGINAL LANDS WEED MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:57): Supplementary question arising from the answer: is any of this work to be conducted on the APY lands and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:57): Whilst I don't have the specific information the honourable member has asked for in that question, I'm happy to seek it, but in the general sense I am assuming that prioritisation has been done in terms of where those highest priority weeds of concern and other relevant issues have been identified and also potentially in regard to the location of the Aboriginal land managers. But I am speculating on those specifics and am happy to see if there is any further information I can provide to the honourable member.

ABORIGINAL LANDS WEED MANAGEMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): Supplementary: can the minister assure the chamber that the government funds to the weed management programs will not be cut in today's state budget?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:58): It is 2.58pm. I am sort of feeling a little bit like groundhog day here. The budget is handed down at 3 o'clock. The budget papers will be made available, I believe, at 3 o'clock. The budget officially becomes the 2022 budget at 3 o'clock.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I will be very much looking forward to further assistance to those opposite in terms of reading a clock, as that does seem to be an issue that is of particular challenge to those opposite—both in terms of calendars and clocks. I could simply add that the budget will be handed down today as arranged, and I am sure there will be plenty of questions coming from that.

RETURN TO WORK SA BOARD

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of injured workers to the Minister for Industrial Relations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Earlier today, representatives of a number of South Australian unions sent a letter to Labor MPs. In that letter, it was stated that, as reported in InDaily:

...the Return To Work SA board has 'undertaken no steps—

this is from the union officials—

to ensure the scheme was adequately funded'...

'Instead, they have allowed the underfunding of the scheme to develop to a point where they have threatened a massive increase in the RTW Levy unless the government cuts entitlements,' the letter said.

'The unelected Board of a government agency should not be making law. That's not their job; it's yours.'

It says to the Labor MPs. The letter goes on to say, according to InDaily, that they have:

...'lost faith' in the organisation's board and management, arguing RTW's 'mismanagement of injured workers' entitlements [has] led to this ultimatum being placed at the feet of your government'.

My question to the minister therefore is: why hasn't he met with the ReturnToWork board and does he have concerns about the lack of representation of unions and working people on the board?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, I had discussions with the department, who liaise with the board. Do I have concerns? Yes, I do.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:00): Supplementary: can the minister explain what his concerns are and what action he will be taking?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his questions.

Certainly, there have been representations with those who represent employees that there is not an employee representative on the board. I know that sometime ago the board went from a representative-type board to a skills-based board, but that is a concern of those who represent employees and one I will be having a very good look at.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:01): Supplementary: what action will the minister be taking in response to those concerns?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his question. Once again, it is something that in very recent times has been a representation made to me, and I will be looking at that.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:01): Supplementary: has the minister or any other member of this government had discussions with former Attorney John Rau, who is also a member of the board?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:01): In relation to matters to do with ReturnToWork directly, I don't think I have, but I will double-check. If that's not correct, I will bring back an answer. I am not aware of what other members of the government have done.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:02): Supplementary: will the minister also undertake to find out what other discussions other members of his government may have had with the former member John Rau and current board member John Rau?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:02): To the extent that I am able to do that, I will do so.

CROP AND PASTURE SEEDING INTENTIONS REPORT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:02): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the annual crop and pasture seeding intentions report:

1. Is the minister committed to the continued publication of the crop and pasture seeding intentions report?
2. When will the latest data be published?
3. Can the minister assure farmers that the crop and pasture seeding intentions report will not be defunded by her government, noting that the time is 3.02pm?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for her question and congratulate her on learning to read the clock in the last couple of days. That is certainly a step forward for both herself and her colleagues. I do not recall seeing a briefing specifically in regard to the crop and pasture seeding intentions report. It is possible that it has come across my desk, but I don't recall that. I am certainly happy to make inquiries and bring any further information back to the house that is available to me.

CROP AND PASTURE SEEDING INTENTIONS REPORT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): Supplementary: will the minister commit to the continued—

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Point of order: I know it is cold in here, but we all know in this chamber that we do not wear party political material. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to remove her scarf.

The Hon. C. Bonaros: Is that the best we can do today?

The PRESIDENT: Just hang on, what was party political about the scarf?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: That.

The PRESIDENT: Okay; outrageous, yes. Supplementary question.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I apologise, Mr President. I am now cold, but I will put my jacket on in due course. Supplementary: will the minister commit to the continued publication of the crop and pasture reports, which are due every second month, noting that the most recent report currently available on the PIRSA website is dated January 2022?

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:04): I couldn't help but notice the interjection there of the opposition saying that they were a good government that cared about regions.

The PRESIDENT: And you shouldn't respond to them.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I certainly won't respond—

The PRESIDENT: Good.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and I won't allude to the fact that they lost so much support in the regions, despite what they keep saying, keep telling the public was their excellent work along that. In terms of the specific question, as I have indicated in my original answer I will seek some further advice from my department.

ABORIGINAL RANGERS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:05): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General inform the council about the government's plan to employ 15 new Aboriginal rangers to protect our parks and wildlife?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for his excellent question and his interest in this area. I am very pleased to inform the chamber about the plan to employ 15 new Aboriginal rangers to protect our parks and wildlife. Our state is home to some of the most incredibly stunning natural parks and wildlife in the world. You can travel in any direction in this state and see magnificent sites of the natural environment that are uniquely South Australian.

We have a very proud history in South Australia of protecting our environment in parks and on private property, all of which is Aboriginal land. That is why I was excited on the weekend just gone to join Dr Susan Close, the member for Port Adelaide, Deputy Premier and Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, to confirm that the South Australian government will employ 15 new Aboriginal rangers, on top of all rangers already employed, to protect our parks and wildlife as part of a \$5 million state initiative which is aimed at increasing Aboriginal management of our natural environment.

This comes as a key part of our election commitment to maintaining, promoting and sustaining traditional cultural sites and practices within parks. We are putting the traditional owners at the forefront of our parks network to ensure their stories are an integral part of visitor experiences. Some of the other initiatives that the government plans to introduce are better protecting Aboriginal heritage and cultural sites and ensuring Aboriginal people have a voice in the future of the Murray River.

Many Aboriginal people can trace their heritage back thousands of generations to a particular area of our country. When we see farming families can trace four or five or six generations back to a

particular part of the country, they are quite rightly proud of their connection to that part of the land. To have a connection that dates back thousands of generations and tens of thousands of years is quite a remarkable thing. It is that experience and that link, the knowledge and the caring for country, that this seeks to build upon.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service ranger workforce of 139 currently includes 21 First Nations people. The extra 15 will bring the total to 36 First Nations people. The Australian government offers other funding opportunities as well to employ First Nations people through the Indigenous ranger program. The Indigenous rangers right now are most typically associated with co-managed parks such as the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park and Dhilba Guuranda-Innes National Park.

As I have said, the history and the knowledge many Aboriginal people bring with tens of thousands of years connection to country brings a unique understanding of the natural environment. Giving Aboriginal people a greater say on our natural environment in national parks is not only the right thing to do but will also enrich the enjoyment of parks for everyone.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Health in another place, a question about the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The reputation of the once world-renowned Women's and Children's Hospital has taken a significant hit in recent years. The reasons for it have been the subject of countless stories in the media. Frontline clinicians have warned about a dire lack of medical and nursing staff, resources and equipment at the hospital, which has had a multimillion-dollar backlog of medical equipment requiring upgrading or replacing.

Those same frontline clinicians have also been scathing of the health executive led by chief executive officer, Ms Lindsey Gough, and blame it for the hospital's demise. I have been informed that, in the final months of the former Liberal government, Ms Gough's contract was renewed, much to the frustration of many clinicians and nurses working there. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does this minister believe Ms Gough has operated the hospital to its full capacity over the past four years?
2. Does this minister have confidence in Ms Gough in her current capacity?
3. Does this minister have confidence in the hospital's executive team?
4. Does this minister have confidence in the hospital's board overall?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for her question and I will refer it to the minister in another place and bring back a reply in relation to that question.

While I am on my feet, I am advised that in answer to a question the honourable member asked earlier—a case I think from 18 months ago, and was that the Summerfield decision—my advice is (and, again, if it is not correct I will triple-check that) that referred to a different case where there was a suggestion of interference with medical reports.

MINISTER'S RECREATIONAL FISHING ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the Minister's Recreational Fishing Advisory Council. Will the minister retain the Minister's Recreational Fishing Advisory Council, and will the minister be keeping the Recreational Fishing Strategy 2021 to 2024 for South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for her question. Before the election, one of our election commitments in regard to recreational fishing was that we would re-establish RecFish SA as the peak body for the recreational fishing sector. The committee to which

the honourable member refers is of course aware of that decision, and we are currently in the process of formally winding down what is colloquially known as the MRFAC, and of course we have already been in contact with RecFish SA and I have had a joint meeting with the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing in another place and RecFish SA in regard to that.

Another part of our commitment was that recreational fishing would fall under the remit of the other minister, the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, and therefore we will have that separation, if you like, between the recreational fishing sector and the commercial fishing sector in terms of ministerial responsibilities. Of course, many of the regulations and other instruments in regard to recreational fishing are covered or impacted by the acts which are under my jurisdiction as Minister for Primary Industries and therefore there will be some crossover. But in terms of the peak body going forward, that will be RecFish SA.

We certainly appreciate that the members of MRFAC have put effort into the role that they have had over the last couple of years. I recall that there were a number of resignations from that committee under the term of the previous government and certainly feedback whilst I was in opposition indicated a strong sense from many recreational fishers of having RecFish SA as the peak body—as I understand that it was for many years prior to the election of the previous Liberal government.

I am very happy today to place on the record our thanks to MRFAC and look forward to future positive interactions with all recreational fishers. I also would encourage members of MRFAC, should they so wish, to become involved in RecFish SA and potentially stand for office if they would like to continue to be involved in the recreational fishing sector.

FISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:13): Supplementary: how does that separation that the minister refers to impact decisions around quota allocations for the remainder of the fishing industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:13): The setting of quota allocations, as I understand it, is under my remit as minister. Of course, I will be in close discussion with the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing in regard to the input from recreational fishers through what is now the peak body, which is RecFish SA.

FISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:14): Further supplementary: has the minister committed to funding a different peak body for the remainder of the fishing industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:14): Sorry, the question is not clear—different to what?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: A separate peak body for the remainder of the fishing industry.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: That didn't form part of the election commitments prior to the election of the then Labor opposition.

The PRESIDENT: Final supplementary.

FISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:14): Has the minister considered funding a peak body for the remainder of the fishing industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:14): Certainly, it's under active consideration and I have had some discussions with various groups who are involved, particularly in commercial fishing but, as I mentioned, I have also had discussions with RecFish SA. As I recall, that didn't come up in that meeting, although if I am mistaken I will certainly come back and correct the record.

I think there is a certain level of support for a peak body for the fishing sector that does not include the rec fishing sector, but there are also others who have questioned the appropriateness of

that. In respect of considering a peak body, I am certainly very open to that. I will continue to have discussions with the very wide and varied sectors within the fisheries sector.

I am certainly very open to hearing from people in this place as well, and from their constituents or the people who might be making representations to them, about how they would like to see that happen. I know that was one of the proposals under the previous government and I think, from my advice, there was a strategy that was developed months and months before the election but only announced right on the cusp of the election. If that had actually had the opportunity to be released earlier, there would have been more opportunity for greater consultation and greater feedback.

In summary, it is something that, whilst it wasn't committed to as a commitment of the then Labor opposition (so it doesn't form part of our election commitments), it is certainly not something that I am closed off to. I look forward to continuing to have discussions, conversations and also see how robust the consultation was by the former government in relation to this because, as we know, on a number of aspects there have been assertions by the former government that robust consultation took place only to find that in actual fact they have either been unaware of decisions being made, unaware of strategies going forward, or perhaps not even involved in being aware of the decisions that are under consideration. In regard to—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, are you going to conclude your remarks?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The Leader of the Opposition is now learning to read the clock as well, very good.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I think, certainly, it is very much easier for governments, often, to be able to liaise with a single peak body, but what I want to ensure is that if such a peak body was established that it would be reactive and in response to the needs of industry and all of the stakeholders, rather than simply because it is easier for governments. I do appreciate that there are great opportunities—

The PRESIDENT: Minister!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —across all of the sectors and they do want to be able to make sure their voices are heard. Ensuring that a peak body is truly representative—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you have deprived the Hon. Mr Wortley of a question. You can apologise to him later, I think.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I still have more to say.

The PRESIDENT: Have you finished?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: No, I have still got more to say. Ensuring that all of the different sectors are represented will of course always be my top priority.

Parliamentary Procedure

BUDGET PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Budget Paper 1—Budget Overview 2022-23

Budget Paper 2—Budget Speech 2022-23

Budget Paper 3—Budget Statement 2022-23

Budget Paper 4—Agency Statements 2022-23 Volume 1

Budget Paper 4—Agency Statements 2022-23 Volume 2

Budget Paper 4—Agency Statements 2022-23 Volume 3

Budget Paper 4—Agency Statements 2022-23 Volume 4
Budget Paper 5—Budget Measures Statement 2022-23

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2022

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 15:20 the council adjourned until Tuesday 14 June 2022 at 11:00.