

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 28 September 2022

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:16 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.

Condolence

CAMERON, HON. T.G.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:17): By leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of the Hon. Terry Gordon Cameron, former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Terry Gordon Cameron was born on 11 October 1946 with what can only be described as an impeccable Labor pedigree. His father was Senator Don Cameron, a Labor senator for South Australia from 1969 to 1978 and former state secretary of the Australian Workers' Union. His uncle, Clyde Cameron, also served in the federal parliament at the time as the member for Hindmarsh. Throughout the Whitlam government Clyde Cameron held senior ministries, including Minister for Labour, Minister for Labour and Immigration and Minister for Science and Consumer Affairs.

In his first speech in this place Terry Cameron recalled having been a member of the Labor Party since the age of 14, attending Labor and union meetings throughout his life and campaigning at countless Labor elections. He also recalled his deep family connections within the union movement, particularly the AWU. Indeed, in that speech he noted:

I have been privileged to hold almost every position possible within the Labor Party, from membership officer, sub-branch secretary and president to party secretary, national vice-president, and I am currently a member of our national executive.

Terry Cameron would go on to serve as state secretary of the South Australian Labor Party, including through the difficult period of the 1993 State Bank election. I think it is clear from later events that the State Bank saga weighed heavily on his mind, as it did for many, if not all, Labor members at the time.

Terry Cameron entered this place on 11 October 1994, replacing retiring former Labor member and former Attorney-General Chris Sumner. He joined a Labor caucus still reeling from the 1993 election loss. He would later serve on the Labor front bench as shadow minister for transport and shadow minister for small business in 1997, under the leadership of then future Premier Mike Rann.

Of course, Terry Cameron is most well-known for his decision in 1998 to cross the floor of this council and vote to support the privatisation of ETSA. This decision cost him membership of the party and many of his friends and colleagues in the Labor movement at the time. All of us in public life will be judged by the decisions we make publicly, and I am not sure how history will, in future years, regard those who advocated and supported the sale of ETSA. I wonder now, if he had known the effect it would have and the consequences that have played out for electricity prices, whether he would make the same decision again.

Regardless of decisions made, it is a sad occasion on the passing of a former member of this place, and I think it is important that we acknowledge the long service of Terry Cameron to the Labor movement in that time and his important service in this place. On behalf of the government, I extend my sympathies and best wishes to his family, who will be going through a very difficult time. At the passing of someone who has certainly made his mark on this council, I commend the condolence motion to members.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I rise on behalf of the opposition to acknowledge the life of the Hon. Terry Cameron MLC and to pass on our sincere sympathies to his family and friends, following his recent passing. Terry Cameron was born on 19 October 1946 to parents, Don and Colleen Cameron. He grew up in a very political and trade union family. His father was the former Senator Don Cameron, and his uncle, Clyde Cameron, was the former federal member for Hindmarsh, who pioneered industrial relations reforms under Gough Whitlam.

At just six years of age, Terry would join his father on visits to the Botanic Gardens to listen to the speakers who would gather on Sundays to express and debate their political philosophies. In his maiden speech, Terry paid tribute to the influence of his grandparents, particularly his grandmother, who was politically active and passed on their philosophies to their children and grandchildren.

By the age of 14, Terry was a member of the Australian Labor Party. He spent his formative years attending union and party meetings, pounding the pavement and letterboxing, on the hustings handing out how-to-vote cards, and at the office of the Australian Workers' Union. The Australian Workers' Union would play a central role in the life of the Cameron family but not always a positive one. At one point, his father was involved in a bitter dispute with the AWU, having been elected to the position of secretary of the Australian Workers' Union in South Australia, only to be thrown out of office by the union's national executive. A lengthy battle ensued, but Don Cameron was eventually reinstated to his position—a testament to his strength and resilience, traits that were clearly passed on to Terry.

Terry spent nine years working as an industrial advocate with the Australian Workers' Union. Reading Terry's maiden speech, it seems that history repeated itself to some degree in his own tussle with the AWU as he stood up for what he believed in—an early test of his strength and character, which, as we all know, is a quality he will always be remembered for.

Terry was appointed as a member of the Legislative Council in October 1994, filling a vacancy following the resignation of the former Attorney-General, the Hon. Chris Sumner. Terry entered parliament at a tumultuous time for South Australia, with the state still reeling from the State Bank disaster. He spent some time on the front bench as spokesperson for transport and small business, and he was also a strong advocate for the importance of mineral and oil exploration in South Australia. He had a strong interest in industrial relations, public sector management and the state's tourism potential.

The defining moment of his time in parliament came on 20 August 1998, when he crossed the floor to support the sale of ETSA. With South Australia saddled with crippling debt and the impending second wave of the Asian economic crisis about to hit the nation, Terry spoke in parliament about the proposed sale of power assets in New South Wales and South Australia, saying:

One would have to be an economic idiot to come to any other conclusion other than that they have made out a compelling case in NSW and we must have even more compelling reasons in this State for getting rid of ETSA.

His stance and decision to vote against his own party took immense character and bravery. He knew the consequences would be swift and severe, including automatic expulsion from the party, ironically under rules brought in by his uncle, Clyde. In the lead-up to the critical vote, *The Advertiser* reported:

If Mr Cameron supports the legislation, he will face being drummed out of the Labor Party in disgrace, a member without a friend. As a former secretary of the Labor Party, Mr Cameron could not expect any friends among the Liberals. And Labor does not tolerate defectors. So Mr Cameron would run the risk of being driven into an isolated life in the political wilderness.

He knew that if he crossed the floor he would be ending his 40-year relationship with the Labor Party. He knew that if he crossed the floor he would lose friends, colleagues and supporters. He knew that if he crossed the floor he would most likely be ending his political career. Despite all that would be lost if he crossed the floor, he did it anyway. Why? Because he made a decision that was not based on his own personal interest, because he made a decision to put the interests of others, of this state, ahead of his own.

Terry Cameron's courage and convictions are to be applauded. It is courage that should characterise everyone who has the privilege of sitting in this chamber. We are here to represent the

best interests of South Australia and South Australians. Terry Cameron understood this, he respected this and he lived by it. Vale, the Hon. Terry Cameron MLC.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Angus Redford, who served with the Hon. Terry Cameron. I am sure the Hon. Angus Redford will acknowledge the fact that they were very good friends.

Condolence

CAMERON, HON. T.G.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): I would also like to rise to acknowledge the passing of the Hon. Terry Cameron. I knew Terry from when I first joined the Labor Party, or certainly a few weeks later, so in about 1989. He was in a different faction, a faction that no longer exists in our party, but I certainly found him to be a very strong person in terms of his support for people who were getting involved with the party.

He was state secretary at the time, and in fact a couple of years later when I moved to a different sub-branch his father, former Senator Don Cameron, was a member of that branch and I certainly found Don to be an incredible person in terms of encouraging young people to be involved.

That was something that Terry was also quite keen on, encouraging young people. In fact, I would say there was something of a competitive streak there amongst those who were within the Labor Party and who were trying to recruit, mentor and encourage young people. My mentor was a different member of parliament, but Terry was certainly part of involving people and making sure that they did have an opportunity to have their say.

I certainly had a lot of respect for Terry for those early years. I had less to do with him once he actually entered parliament and therefore I will not make much comment about his actions after that, but I do want to pass on my condolences to his family. May his soul rest in peace.

The PRESIDENT: I would ask all honourable members to stand in their places and carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:28 to 14:40.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:40): I bring up the 14th report of the committee.

Report received.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I bring up the report of the committee on its inquiry into Local Government Land By-laws: Public Conveniences.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Inclusive SA—State Disability Plan 2019-2023—Interim Review 2022

The Lifetime Support Authority of South Australia—The LSS Rules

*Ministerial Statement***ECHUNGA DAM**

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:41): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Echunga Dam made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services

*Question Time***CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MARITIME, MINING AND ENERGY UNION**

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations regarding the CFMEU. What concerns does the minister have for South Australian job sites or construction industry workers following reports in *The Advertiser* on 19 September this year about alleged intimidating behaviour by members of the Victorian and South Australian branch of the CFMEU, headed by John Setka?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:43): I thank the member for her question. I will repeat what I have said before, that if anybody is engaging in any conduct that is criminal they ought to be subject to full investigation and the full force of the law.

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MARITIME, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary: will the Minister for Industrial Relations be looking into the alleged reports?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. I would encourage anyone who thinks there is any evidence of any criminality being conducted to take that to the proper authorities for investigation.

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MARITIME, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:44): Further supplementary: does the minister not think that he has a special responsibility to look into these issues, rather than it being a general community issue?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:44): I am happy to repeat my answer, sir, that if anyone has any concerns about wrongdoing or criminality I would encourage them to take them to the appropriate authorities, as I have stated a number of times before.

CASHLESS DEBIT CARD

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs questions regarding cashless debit cards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Concerns have been raised by Indigenous community leaders regarding the federal Labor government's decision to abolish the cashless debit card which has been operating in parts of South Australia, Northern Territory, Western Australia and Queensland, targeting Indigenous communities in particular. Senator Jacinta Price opposed the move, stating:

It appears the government is only prepared to listen to those who are pushing to scrap the [cashless debit] card because it suits their agenda...There are Indigenous people seeing success in their...communities because of the card...It's about food versus alcohol [and] supporting families to make sure the bills are covered.

At a Senate committee on community affairs, Cape York Partnership founder, Noel Patterson, further criticised the cessation of the scheme, saying—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Noel Patterson?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Peterson, sorry.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Pearson.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Peterson. He said:

We will have to give up hope on the idea that we can change anything for those Indigenous communities...The welfare reform work we have done over the last 20 years will collapse.

My questions to the minister for Aboriginal Affairs are:

1. What is the minister's response to the Indigenous leaders who have spoken out against the cessation of cashless debit cards?
2. Will the minister lobby the federal Labor government to reinstate the cashless debit card system to ensure that communities experience continued success due to the scheme?
3. If the cashless debit card is not reinstated, what measures will the state government introduce to ensure that Indigenous South Australians are not adversely impacted by the removal of cashless debit cards?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:46): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am not sure who the Cape York person the honourable member is referring to is; however, it is an important issue and it's an issue that I know that the federal government, who are responsible for this, have taken numerous soundings about.

I know that a former federal minister at the time, minister and then shadow minister, Jenny Macklin, has been to Ceduna where this has been instituted a number of times. I know that the current federal Minister for Indigenous Australians, the Hon. Linda Burney, has also been to Ceduna a number of times, and the minister who is responsible in this area, the Hon. Amanda Rishworth, has also been to Ceduna to listen to community concerns a number of times.

I have to say that if the honourable member thinks that there is a universal view that there should be compulsory income management in Ceduna or, indeed, other places, I don't think the honourable member has conducted the sort of consultation she chastises others for conducting. Certainly, I have heard a range of views in Ceduna about the income management on a card. I have heard some of the reasons why people are in favour of a card and would choose to be on it voluntarily.

I have also heard concerns and I have to say, over four or five years of visiting the West Coast regularly, increasing concerns about the ways that the card has disadvantaged people, including people buying goods on the card from supermarkets and other stores and then selling them for a fraction of their value to obtain cash, which has plunged people into further poverty than they would have been in if they had access to cash.

I know that the minister in charge federally, the Hon. Amanda Rishworth, has been to Ceduna herself to talk to locals about what the federal government's plans are, and I support that sort of direct consultation with those who are affected by such initiatives. I know that there is a range of views by policymakers. The honourable member I think quotes Senator Jacinta Price. I would never presume that Senator Price's views are universally shared by Aboriginal people and certainly, in a range of areas, I think they are a small minority of views in the Aboriginal community in different areas that Senator Price holds views about.

I know also that the federal government is looking at putting millions of dollars of further support in place in areas that have been subject to income management, which has affected largely Aboriginal people in those areas. I welcome and encourage the federal government to continue consulting and to continue putting supports in place in these sorts of areas.

CASHLESS DEBIT CARD

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:49): Supplementary: is the minister aware of cases in South Australia and across Australia where people have found that the cards don't work, particularly where there are power outages, and they have been left with the inability to buy food; where, when they are on the income management scheme, the income management has not paid their rent and so they have found themselves homeless through mismanagement and maladministration; where,

to buy a bra, they have had to give their bra size to public servants to be approved to buy intimate apparel; and where they have been forced to leave their communities to escape the management of these cards?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. Yes, I have had these sorts of incidents reported to me, where cards don't work in stores that they are supposed to work in, where stores don't take the cards where goods are needed to be purchased and where the cards sometimes don't or haven't worked in very remote stores, and also the pressure that places on people when they have become accustomed to using the card and then, often for cultural reasons, need to travel and find themselves in a lot of trouble without access to any goods, services or money.

CASHLESS DEBIT CARD

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:50): Supplementary: does the minister believe that the community will welcome the ability to be able to buy a raffle ticket for their children's school fundraisers or participate in the cash economy, which allows them to buy second-hand goods locally rather than have to have everything approved and bought new through the current system?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. Yes, I think there will be many members of the community who do welcome that. I have heard stories, for example, at Yalata community, which is about an hour or so the other side, the Western Australia side, of Ceduna, where for junior sports carnivals and other events people haven't been able to buy food at those because the cashless debit card isn't taken.

Having said that, I do acknowledge there are members of the community who, for various reasons, would choose to continue voluntarily to be on the cashless debit card. There are differing views and differing reasons why people see a benefit, but certainly that autonomy that it restricts has been raised with me a number of times over a number of years.

CASHLESS DEBIT CARD

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Supplementary: thank you, minister, for that answer. Does the minister support a voluntary cashless debit card?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:51): I support federal Labor's position, and they are looking at nuances in certain communities depending on levels of support but, as a general principle, supporting that autonomy and self-determination that voluntary use of the debit card would allow.

WINE INDUSTRY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about wine support.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Yesterday, in this chamber, the minister announced a \$1 million partnership with the South Australian Wine industry Association, saying:

...the South Australian government has a formal partnership with the South Australian Wine Industry Association, which is supported by a \$1 million commitment over the next four years. The funding, referred to as Project 250, is the first year of a four-year commitment given by the government to this critical industry for our state.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Can you confirm your announcement yesterday of a continuation of funding to Project 250 for the next four years until 2026?

2. Is this in addition to the \$5.4 million funding allocated by the Marshall Liberal government to the wine expansion and recovery program, or has the wine expansion and recovery program funding been cut?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): I am happy to provide further detail and to do so I will take that question on notice.

REGIONAL SHOWCASE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:53): My question is for the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister please update the chamber on the 2022 SA Regional Showcase?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for his question. The South Australian Regional Showcase People's Choice Award closes this Friday. The Regional Showcase program puts a spotlight on regional South Australia by uncovering, telling and showcasing the stories of success.

I would encourage members and the public to take time to read through the top 20 articles for 2022 on the Solstice Media website, which is solsticemedia.com/regional-showcase, and vote for your favourite by this Friday 30 September. The top 20 includes a range of inspiring stories from across regional communities. For example:

- From Eyre Peninsula the mating rituals of the unique colony of giant Australian cuttlefish, swimming just off the Whyalla coastline, can now be viewed in all their psychedelic glory from the comfort of a glass-bottom boat.
- From the Far North the small South Australian community of Orroroo won a spot in the national Our Towns program, funded by Rural Aid to give the town a makeover.
- From the Mid North a new approach to managing shearing teams is paying dividends in the Mid North and helping address the skills shortage.
- On Kangaroo Island endangered flora on KI is being given a lifeline, thanks to the newly established Threatened Flora Seed Production Garden within the island's Cygnet Park Sanctuary.
- From the Lower North Elijah Hobby has spent years giving back in the Gawler community of Hewett, creating a safe space for those living with mental health challenges and disability.
- From the Yorke Peninsula once locally extinct marsupials, reintroduced to South Australia, are thriving with the help of researchers and the Marna Banggara Rewilding Project.
- From my own community in the Limestone Coast is a story about Robyn Verrall, the winner of the 2022 AgriFutures Rural Women's Award, who is on a quest to bring fresh low-cost produce to country people through local business Kere to Country.

The Regional Showcase program runs year long and celebrates the achievements of individuals, groups and businesses that have made significant contributions to regional South Australia.

PIRSA is a proud sponsor of the program and has been for nine years, since 2013, with the long-standing program now in its 22nd year. The Regional Showcase aims to shine a spotlight on regional South Australia by uncovering, telling and showcasing the stories of success, using regional journalists. These stories are published to a local, national and international audience, and this helps to grow knowledge of the regions and uncover opportunities for economic investment and growth. The Regional Showcase celebration event will be held on Friday 4 November, and I look forward at that event to seeing the six award category winners being presented.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the Hon. John Dawkins, a former President of this place.

*Question Time***WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL**

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney, representing the Minister for Health in another place, a question about the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I note that yesterday morning the Premier and health minister announced the new site for the new Women's and Children's Hospital, with the expected price tag of \$3 billion to \$3.2 billion. I note also that, as part of those announcements, the government said that it would be 'futureproofing cardiac surgery'. My questions to the minister are:

1. What does futureproofing cardiac surgery mean?
2. Is the government committed to pursuing a dedicated cardiac unit as part of the medium to long-term plan for the new hospital?
3. Can the minister give an indication of what he is doing to fulfil that commitment and overcome the need for babies and children to travel interstate for surgeries that could otherwise be done here in South Australia?
4. What options are being considered for the old Women's and Children's Hospital site once the new one is operational?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is an issue that I know the honourable member is passionate about and has raised publicly previously. I will go to the minister in another place, and I am sure he will bring back a speedy reply for the honourable member.

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about environmental regulation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: As we know, the various states have different levels of environmental regulation. In South Australia the major ones are native vegetation and natural resource management. A major issue in South Australia at the moment regards the costs of water management being passed on to landholders and a lack of transparency of what they are paying for. The cost of regulation of water resources continues to be a major issue for regional development. My questions to the minister are:

1. What measures would the minister put in place to address the cost of water management for landowners in our regions?
2. What strategy would the Malinauskas government introduce to address the lack of transparency of what landowners are paying for?
3. Will the minister commit to rectifying the rising cost of land and water levies for landholders in the regions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): The two acts to which the honourable member refers, the Native Vegetation Act and the NRM Act, are not acts that are committed to me. I'm happy to take her question and refer to the relevant minister in the other place.

UMOONA ART CENTRE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister update the council on the government support for a new art centre at Umoona?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in Aboriginal affairs, and his interest in regional South Australia generally. South Australia is fortunate to be home to some truly incredible Aboriginal artists whose work is celebrated not only here but around the world. In many Aboriginal communities across the state, art centres are also about more than just somewhere to paint on a canvas. They provide a cultural place for community, social connection and culture. That's why I was proud to announce a few weeks ago that the government is investing more than \$430,000 towards the construction of a new art centre in the Umoona community outside of Coober Pedy.

I am pleased to be able to bring some further and new information to this chamber in relation to that project. I am pleased to be able to confirm that this funding is also being matched with a similar contribution from the Indigenous Land and Sea Corporation (ILSC). I would like to thank the ILSC for their funding commitment and for collaborating with the state government on this very important work.

I recently had the privilege of visiting the proposed site for the Umoona Art Centre next to the Umoona art shed and spending some time with some of these artists. One of the artists, George Cooley, spoke to me about the regular art workshops that have recently been running at Umoona. At the moment, they are held in the basketball stadium between the housing at the Umoona community and the township of Coober Pedy. Given the enormous scale of some of the artworks, it's easy to see why such a big venue is needed.

George told me that they had some 60 artists attend their first workshop, and since then they have formed a group of around 30 artists regularly attending the workshops that are held. This core group has seen young artists through to elders, men and women, produce some extraordinary artwork. There was a real excitement about what a new dedicated art centre could do for the group, the Aboriginal community and the Coober Pedy district. They expect to see more artists participating, more works being produced and real economic and cultural benefits flowing through these artistic endeavours.

The artists I met with told me they expect to see benefits particularly for Aboriginal women, who are currently finding it difficult to secure ongoing work through their art. Whether it's some of the jobs during the construction of the centre, the jobs to keep the centre running or, and most importantly over the long term, the livelihood of artists promoting and selling their works, this centre will provide a real economic boost for Umoona and Coober Pedy.

The group at the arts centre is particularly excited about the opportunities to market their works to visitors and tourists in Coober Pedy more effectively than ever before. I would like to thank in particular George Cooley, Christine Lennon and Joanna O'Toole for taking the time to meet with me at Umoona and for sharing their art centre story and their hopes for the future of it going forward.

I would also like to knowledge the APY Arts Collective, of which Umoona arts and the new art centre is anticipated to be a member. Having the works of local Aboriginal artists displayed in Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and around the world is an exciting opportunity for the artists and for our state as a whole. I look forward to being able to visit the art centre once built and seeing the benefits it delivers to the community.

SACRED MOUND SPRINGS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on the sacred mound springs of the Arabana people.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: There are two stories to tell regarding the sacred mound springs of the Arabana people, according to the ANTaR website. These are the springs around the region of Lake Eyre, known as Kati Thanda, in far north South Australia. They were described by early European settlers as mound springs—these physical features of the landscape being natural outlets for the pressurised groundwater of the Great Artesian Basin, one of the largest of its kind in the world.

That story, of course, is thousands and thousands of years of the Arabana people living there with a supply of potable water that provided the environmental basis for a rich and multi-layered transport

and communication corridor through otherwise inhospitable desert country'. The region is rich in songline history and archaeological evidence, indicating that it was a centre of interconnected trade routes that crossed the nation.

The other story is, of course, more recent and concerns the extraction of water from the Great Artesian Basin. That began in the late 19th century, with the pastoralist era increasing this significantly to the current day. Since the 1980s, in terms of the water drawdown, there has been a significant acceleration of that.

In the last 20 years, we have seen the springs disappearing due to industries such as mining, pastoralists and petrochemical companies. These mounds have no protection under the Aboriginal Heritage Act due to the special carve outs of the legislation of 1982, the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act, which continues to be in place, with protections afforded to BHP and their Olympic Dam site. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is he concerned that the mound springs aren't afforded the protections of the Aboriginal Heritage Act?
2. Does he believe that the 1982 protections carved out for BHP should stand today?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for her questions and her ongoing interest in this area. The honourable member is quite right: the 1982 Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act did allow things to occur without reference to certain acts of parliament and one of them was the later to be introduced 1988 Aboriginal Heritage Act in South Australia.

I am a supporter of making sure Aboriginal heritage is protected to the highest standard it can be. I know that the issue of protection for Aboriginal heritage had quite a large spotlight shone on it in the wake of the Juukan Gorge rock shelters being demolished in Western Australia. Not only did it lead to much more significant awareness in Australia and internationally but it focused the minds of legislators and led to a Senate committee being established to look into the issue and that made a number of recommendations that certainly we are looking at in South Australia to see how they might apply to Aboriginal protection in South Australia.

I can't remember the exact quote, but in the wake of the destruction of Juukan Gorge I know BHP in South Australia pledged that, notwithstanding the indenture agreement, they would look to not disturbing heritage sites without consultation with traditional owners, even in areas that they had previously done so or been given permission to do so. I will seek an update. I suspect I will have to consult with my colleague the Minister for Mining about BHP's operations and bring back further information as I can get it in relation particularly to mound springs.

COERCIVE CONTROL

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General on coercive control.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: On about 16 August, the Attorney was on radio, particularly the ABC, discussing the issue of coercive control and made reference to consultation on this matter. Since that, six weeks have passed. What consultation activities have taken place?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is indeed an important one. One thing we do know is that coercive control can often be a predeterminant of much more serious things, including victims of coercive control becoming victims of homicide. It is an issue that, at my first meeting of attorneys-general around Australia, was one of the key agenda items, as the federal government was keen that state and territory jurisdictions that have responsibility for these laws look at implementing laws in their states and there are a couple of jurisdictions that have gone down this path already.

It is something that, in addition to being the right thing to do—to protect people who are often the subject of family violence and, as I have said, it is often a precursor to much more serious violence

occurring—is also an election commitment that this government took to the last election to legislate for criminal penalties for coercive control. It is something that in particular Queensland and New South Wales have done.

We have started consultation with a wide range of groups that are involved in this area, as well as other jurisdictions that are further developed in terms of coercive control legislation than South Australia. That consultation continues, and I know it is something that I regularly discuss with my colleague Minister Katrina Hildyard seeking views. Once that consultation has concluded, we will have draft legislation that eventually we will put before this parliament.

COERCIVE CONTROL

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:10): Supplementary question: is there a reason why the discussion paper on the AGD website hasn't been updated since prior to the election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): I'm happy to find out. I know there's been significant direct consultation with groups in the South Australian society on coercive control that I think is probably better and more meaningful engagement than an article or a function on a website, but I'm happy to look at that issue.

COERCIVE CONTROL

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:10): Further supplementary question: what consultation with community groups has this government undertaken since the election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): I'm happy to go back and check. There would be, on many, many areas, extensive consultation; I'm happy to go and check.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Just on this issue?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: On coercive control—just how extensive consultation has been and will be.

COERCIVE CONTROL

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:11): Further supplementary: would the Attorney be surprised to know that AGD advised recently that there hasn't been any since the election?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: I didn't get that?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That the AGD advised recently that there hasn't been any consultation since the election.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:11): I have certainly been personally involved in consultation.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the chamber on recent achievements by the South Australian Research and Development Institute?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:12): I thank the member for his very important question. It is certainly a great privilege to be able to bring to this place acknowledgement of the achievements of some of the staff of SARDI. As many of you will know, the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) is the principal research arm of the state government, with a network of research centres, laboratories and field sites in metropolitan Adelaide and in our regions.

I was very pleased to see the ongoing work of our SARDI researchers has been recognised with two crop science staff achieving recent success in separate award categories. Dr Tara Garrard was awarded the Paul Johnston Memorial Award for the best presentation by a young scientist at the Australian Barley Technical Symposium held on the Gold Coast from 22 to 25 August. This award

is judged on originality, knowledge of research, scientific merit, industry impact and knowledge of the Australian barley industry.

Dr Garrard's presentation on fungicide resistance in barley in the southern growing region of South Australia summarised the research being undertaken in response to fungicide resistant net form net blotch of barley, a disease which I am advised was first found on the southern Yorke Peninsula in 2019.

The research, undertaken in conjunction with the Centre for Crop and Disease Management in Western Australia, has found fungicide resistance is becoming widespread in South Australia and into Victoria. The results allow growers and agronomists to adapt management practices and more effectively control this disease in barley to minimise yield losses.

Secondly, at the Wheat Breeding Assembly held in Narrabri from 28 to 31 August, Dr Mariano Cossani won the best poster award. His submission was titled, 'Symmetric response to neighbour in binary mixed cultivars associates with genetic gain in wheat yield over the last 5 decades'. This work was co-authored with Dr Victor Sadras. Their research paper identified that wheat genetic yield gains associate to phenotypes with reduced competitive ability.

The paper also found that less competitive, higher yielding phenotype has shorter plants with smaller root systems with compensatory higher nitrogen uptake per unit root length and erectophile canopy that favours more radiation and higher nitrogen concentration in leaves at the bottom of the canopy. The judges highlighted the scientific depth and industry relevance of this work. The manipulation of crop phenotypes with reduced competitive ability could improve wheat yield and meet future challenges associated with food security.

I would also like to mention that, in addition to working with Dr Cossani on wheat yield research, Dr Victor Sadras was also honoured as a fellow of the Australian Society of Agronomy at the 20th Agronomy Conference in Toowoomba. Fellowships are awarded for distinguished contribution to the field of agronomy. Victor was recognised for his exceptional publication and citation record, his contribution to agronomy theory and practice, his supervision of PhD students and his role as journal editor.

Finally, I would like to recognise Dr Penny Roberts, who is based at the Clare research centre, where she leads a team of nine staff, supervises a PhD student and mentors junior researchers. She was recently awarded a prestigious fellowship by the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust. With the fellowship, Dr Roberts plans to travel to Europe and North America to learn about the significant plant protein sector there, with the aim of bringing that knowledge back to Australia and helping us grow this industry here. There were only six fellowships awarded in South Australia, so this is an excellent achievement.

Dr Roberts has a passion for the application of agricultural science to address challenges, such as adaptation to climate change and supplying a growing population with nutritious food. In line with this, her current research is focused on supporting the development of the pulse grain sector in South Australia. Dr Roberts is currently research scientist, SARDI, and affiliate associate lecturer at the University of Adelaide.

I would like to extend my congratulations to these scientists on receiving these awards, which recognise some of the great work SARDI is doing to support the South Australian primary industries through applied research and development. They are further examples that demonstrate why SARDI has developed a reputation as a research leader and continues to assist to increase the productivity, sustainability and adaptability of the state's agriculture, food and wine, fisheries and aquaculture, and bioscience enterprises.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:16): 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 SA Ambulance Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: In the South Australian Ambulance Service 2018-19 annual report, at page 57, ambulance transport was stated to be \$102,512,000, being \$218,519,000 in total fees that were raised, less \$66,542,000 in ambulance cover concessions and \$46,456,000 in pensioner concessions. In subsequent annual reports, only the ambulance transport figure is provided, without the breakdown of the total fees raised, ambulance cover concessions and pensioner concessions. My question to the minister is:

1. For the financial years 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22, can he please provide for ambulance transport the total fees raised, ambulance cover concessions and pensioner concessions, as the SA Ambulance Service annual report did in 2018-19?

2. Can the minister provide the reasoning for excluding this information in the annual reports for the past three years?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer those important issues to the Minister for Health in the other place and bring back a reply.

ABORIGINAL MONUMENTS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:18): My questions are to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding Aboriginal monuments. What is the progress of the statue of Lowitja O'Donoghue AC CBE DSG, commissioned by the former Marshall Liberal government? Will this be the first statue, or amongst the first statues, to be finalised, borne out of the work by Dr Roger Thomas, which sought to investigate and create statues of monuments that would celebrate Aboriginal people of significance?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for her question. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, Dr Roger Thomas, is in fact doing consultations about the implementation of this government policy for Aboriginal statues around South Australia. The honourable member refers to Lowitja O'Donoghue, who celebrated her 90th birthday recently and who is, in many people's feedback, an appropriate person to have a statue of. In relation to individual details, I am not going to go into matters the member has raised, in particular about previous matters with that statute, out of respect for Aunty Lowitja's family.

COUNTRY CABINET

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:20): My question is to the Attorney-General. Would the Attorney update the council on its engagement with the legal sector in the Upper Spencer Gulf during the recent country cabinet?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. As members are aware, the Malinauskas Labor government held our latest country cabinet to the Upper Spencer Gulf on 14 and 15 September. Country cabinet is a proud institution of Labor governments, ensuring ministers and departments get out and engage with the regions and provide opportunities for local communities to ask questions directly of government, being departmental or elected members.

Of course, as Attorney-General I was grateful to be able to spend time in the Upper Spencer Gulf and areas further north. In particular, I was grateful to members of the legal profession and to the honourable member himself, who joined and took time to attend a legal sector breakfast held at the Arid Lands Botanic Gardens during that country cabinet visit. I am especially grateful to those who attended, given that the circuit court was sitting in Port Augusta that day and all the demands that can bring on the legal profession in a regional area.

The Hon. Justin Hanson and I were joined by lawyers from the Legal Services Commission, SAPOL and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, from organisations like Family Violence Legal Service Aboriginal Corporation, Victims SA, Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and from firms such as WestSide Lawyers and Johnston Withers, amongst others.

I would like to particularly acknowledge Magistrate Rodney Oates for attending. It was certainly informative to speak with him, particularly for some of the younger legal practitioners in the room who are used to seeing magistrates in court settings rather than in social settings like a breakfast outside of the courtroom. His presence was greatly appreciated.

In addition to some good local scones, the breakfast was a great chance to catch up on issues affecting legal practitioners and their clients in the region. It also quickly became clear that many of the challenges were shared by the different organisations and practitioners in attendance, which made for a good opportunity to connect and share ideas.

Ahead of the country cabinet in Port Pirie and Port Augusta, I was also fortunate to visit Coober Pedy, where I had the opportunity to chat with representatives from the Working Women's Centre, the Legal Services Commission and the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. The Working Women's Centre were on a visit promoting their workplace sexual harassment and discrimination program, which the government has been very pleased to provide funding to support, particularly targeting Aboriginal workers in remote and isolated areas.

At the same time, the Legal Services Commission was delivering the Your Story Disability Legal Support service and the Defence and Veterans Legal Service. Those two services support people sharing their experiences with the disability and veterans' suicide royal commissions, and I think it is crucial that people in very remote areas are supported as well as they can be, as people in metropolitan areas expect such services.

From the Upper Spencer Gulf all the way to north of Coober Pedy, it was a useful opportunity to connect with legal practitioners and services doing incredibly important work in regional South Australia. I thank everyone who shared their experiences and I thank the Hon. Justin Hanson for his involvement in a number of things that occurred in that country cabinet.

RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Attorney-General on the topic of rental stress.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yesterday, the Anti-Poverty Network released the results of their survey of low income renters in South Australia. The results showed that 64 per cent of low income renters felt that they were discriminated against when applying for rentals, mostly due to being a recipient of Centrelink payments. The Anti-Poverty Network has called for strengthening basic standards and protections for tenants in South Australia. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Is the Attorney-General concerned that people on low incomes feel they are being discriminated against when trying to secure rental accommodation in South Australia?
2. What action is the government taking to remedy this?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:24): I thank the honourable member for his question. It has come up a number of times, and the honourable member has certainly been a very solid advocate for ensuring rental affordability in South Australia across a range of areas. In terms of discrimination experienced by people in a rental setting, that is one of the significant areas.

I think the report that was tabled yesterday from the equal opportunity commissioner found that accommodation is a significant area of work the equal opportunities commissioner is involved with in the areas of discrimination she looks after. Certainly, there are other areas that the honourable member advocates for and would be aware of where people experience discrimination that are not covered by the Equal Opportunity Act. It is of concern when people are discriminated against in a whole range of areas.

I might talk to the honourable member regarding whether he has suggestions about how we can make improvements, maybe not necessarily through legislative changes but through policy or through other ways where we might be able to improve the experience of people seeking rental accommodation.

RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:26): Supplementary: the minister referenced the commissioner's report. Is the minister able to advise what remedies are currently available in terms of action that people can take if they are facing discrimination in the rental market? If he is not able to provide the answer today will he undertake to do so on notice?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:26): I thank the honourable member for his question. The primary focus of action taken by the equal opportunities commissioner is conciliation. I don't have the statistics in front of me, but a large percentage of complaints are resolved through the consultation process. I am happy to go away and find out the percentages and other remedies available.

VICTIMS OF CRIME PAYMENTS

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General questions regarding victims of crime compensation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN: It was recently reported that the Law Society of SA formally contacted the Attorney-General seeking amendments to the Victims of Crime Act to ensure that the means of calculating compensation payouts for victims of crime adequately reflect the severity of injuries and financial loss. In some cases under the current regime, medical expenses and loss of income have exceeded the amount of compensation received by victims, with the Law Society having the view that there is a compelling argument for increasing payments.

The amendments sought by the Law Society, which include changing the formula used to calculate injury payments and repealing a section of the act directing that those awarded over \$2,000 receive only 75 per cent beyond that amount, are also supported by the Commissioner for Victims' Rights. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. What is the Attorney-General's response to the Law Society of SA in relation to this proposal?
2. Has the Attorney-General commenced consultation with stakeholders on this matter?
3. When could South Australians expect a bill to be introduced seeking to amend the Victims of Crime Act?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:28): I thank the honourable member for her questions in relation to the Victims of Crime Fund. Of course, the Victims of Crime Fund has funded numerous services as well as direct payments to victims of crime.

In relation to requests that have been made by the Law Society, I have indeed received correspondence from the Law Society putting forward some suggestions in relation to the way the Victims of Crime Fund might be accessed, including, I think, in addition to the areas outlined by the honourable member, payment for legal costs in relation to bringing victims of crime applications.

I have asked for a briefing on the matter and I will consider that and if there are any changes to be made we will bring legislation forward based on advice that I receive, and make sure also that it balances the needs between a sustainable fund and rights of victims. I know that in four years of the previous government these things were open to the Liberal Party to change, but for reasons—and they may be compelling and similar reasons that I will be advised not to make such changes.

BEST OF WINE TOURISM AWARDS

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:30): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the Minister please update the chamber on the 2023 Best of Wine Tourism Awards?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:30): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in wine. I am very pleased to advise the chamber that the Great Wine Capitals 2023 Best of Wine Tourism Award entries have now been short-listed for judging ahead of the presentation which will take place at the opening night of CheeseFest on Friday 14 October 2022.

Now in their seventh year, the Best of Wine Tourism Awards celebrate innovation and excellence in wine tourism and provide an opportunity for wineries to gain exposure and recognition for their commitment to providing leading wine tourism experiences across our 18 world-class wine regions. This year a total of 13 wineries and wine tourism experiences from six South Australian regions have been named on the short list for the 2023 Best of Wine Tourism Awards.

Short-listed entries will now go to the judges for deliberation. The judges for the South Australian awards are South Australian tourism expert Helen Edwards and well-known Australian wine writers Nick Ryan and Tony Love. This year, for the first time, entry criteria was adjusted giving the opportunity for wineries to put forward their sustainability credentials as a key criterion. It is wonderful see the grape, wine and tourism sector in South Australia take such a strong leadership position in sustainable practices.

The category winners for this year's awards will then be in the running for an international Best of Wine Tourism Award which will be awarded at the Great Wine Capitals annual meeting and conference which is to be held in Mendoza, Argentina, from Sunday 30 October until Thursday 3 November. This is another great benefit created by South Australia's membership of the Great Wine Capitals global network, which commenced in 2016 under the former Labor government to position the state alongside the world's most renowned wine producing regions, including internationally renowned wine regions of South Francisco/Napa Valley in the US, Bordeaux in France, Bilbao in Spain, Lausanne in Switzerland, Mainz/Rheinhausen in Germany, Mendoza in Argentina, Porto in Portugal, Valparaiso/Casablanca Valley in Chile, Verona in Italy, Cape Town/Cape Winelands in South Africa, and us, Adelaide, South Australia, with our 18 individual wine regions around the state.

BEST OF WINE TOURISM AWARDS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:32): Supplementary: given the minister's comments around the importance of the wine industry and wine tourism, can she confirm that her government has not cut the wine export recovery and expansion program?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let's let the minister give an answer, please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:33): I have made no such cuts.

BEST OF WINE TOURISM AWARDS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:33): Supplementary: have any of her cabinet colleagues made such cuts?

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Leader of the Government, I will determine that, thank you.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Yes, you are always very helpful. It is not a supplementary question.

COVID-19 VACCINATIONS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, a question on COVID-19 vaccinations in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: 98.1 per cent of Australians have had one dose of the approved COVID-19 vaccines; 96.4 per cent of people have had two doses of the vaccine; and 71.8 per cent have had three doses. This is the first time in history when the bulk of our population has been vaccinated against a disease, yet the frequency of that disease continues at a high rate. The vaccine has been shown to not be effective in reducing transmission. There have been over 10.2 million reported cases of COVID-19 in Australia, 766,000 here in South Australia, and this week alone a reported 3,037.

We now have a situation in the state where people can visit a person in an aged-care facility without being vaccinated at all, yet there continues to be a negative impact for people who are not classified as fully vaccinated. Several sectors continue to have policies excluding unvaccinated staff from working. These mandated vaccination policies are based on earlier government precedents. There has been no advocacy by the government to give these sectors the confidence to alter their policies.

People may not be fully vaccinated for a number of reasons, including a bad reaction to a previous dose of the vaccine, being young and healthy or having gained natural immunity from a prior infection, cultural restrictions, and a genuine fear of the vaccine. My questions are:

1. What will the Malinauskas government do to reverse this damage caused by mandates which were implemented by government precedents?
2. Will the government remove vaccine mandates for the general population, given it has no significant effect on reducing transmission?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:35): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I will be happy to pass on the questions in relation to the scientific evidence for the efficacy of vaccines to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

VETERINARY PRACTICES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about the Veterinary Practice Act 2003.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In the 2022-23 budget, there was a budget target for PIRSA to prioritise legislative reform, including amendments to the Veterinary Practice Act 2003. My questions to the minister are:

1. What consultation has the minister done with members of the veterinary profession, including the South Australian branch of the Australian Veterinary Association, on this issue since the election?
2. When can the veterinary profession and the South Australian public see a copy of the draft amendments to the Veterinary Practice Act?
3. Will she commit to legislative reforms coming before the parliament during the First Session of the Fifty-Fifth Parliament?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:37): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I do acknowledge of course that she is part of the veterinary profession. I understand she has still maintained her required registration, and I am sure she will have a high level of interest in this.

Certainly, there was a discussion paper and some consultation under the previous government in regard to the Veterinary Practice Act. It appears that they have then failed to progress any further. That is something that has been raised with me on a number of occasions, and it's something that I think is a shame because it certainly would appear that there is scope for some changes and some improvements.

The Veterinary Practice Act 2003 review was initiated in 2020. My advice is that there was an independent desktop review of the legislation initially. It is being led by PIRSA. The act requires the registration of veterinarians and regulates the provision of veterinary treatment in the state. The act also establishes a statutory authority of the Veterinary Surgeons Board.

Veterinarians are highly qualified professionals who contribute significantly to this state by providing for the health and welfare of companion, production and performance animals, in addition to the state's wildlife. Veterinarians also play a vital role in ensuring food safety, market access and biosecurity.

The legislative review is being undertaken to ensure that South Australia maintains a contemporary and flexible framework that continues to meet the objectives of protecting animal health, welfare and the public interest, which includes of course users of veterinary services. This is important given the nature and types of veterinary practice that have changed significantly since the act came into effect in 2003.

The functions and therefore the required composition of the Veterinary Surgeons Board have also evolved considerably. This is primarily because the responsibility for hearing and determining disciplinary proceedings alleging unprofessional conduct against veterinarians was transferred to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal in May 2020.

There was broad consultation over a period of nine weeks through the release of a discussion paper, and the discussion paper explored a number of topics, including the structure of the board, registration of veterinary nurses, and the licensing of veterinary premises and services offered by non-veterinary animal care providers. I am told that the paper was informed by meetings with key stakeholder organisations and through a comparison study of interstate and overseas veterinary legislation.

Consultation, unsurprisingly, generated some significant interest, and there were close to 200 submissions received from a wide range of individuals and stakeholder groups, including organisations associated with animal health and welfare, consumers, veterinarians and advocacy groups. I can confirm that following consideration of that feedback, as I mentioned at the beginning of my answer, it did not appear to progress for some time after that, but I have now reinvigorated that process.

If I recall correctly, I think I recently signed letters out to stakeholders who were involved with an original discussion paper to advise that. I didn't put this in the letter, but contrary to what happened under the previous government where it seemed to just stall, we are now looking at that legislation progressing and looking at having legislation drafted to bring into this parliament.

VETERINARY PRACTICES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:41): Supplementary: I thank the minister for that answer. Can she please answer what groups in the veterinary profession she has met with, and has she met with the South Australian division of the AVA on this issue? What feedback has she received regarding the changes to the regulations made by the previous Liberal government?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:41): I meet with a number of organisations and individuals, some who are individual vets and members of their relevant professional association, as well as more formally on occasions. In terms of feedback on regulations changed in the previous four years, I don't recall anyone providing feedback on those regulations specifically in any of the meetings I have had.

VETERINARY PRACTICES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:42): Supplementary: the minister spoke about occasions when she has met with—

The PRESIDENT: Just ask the question. You are not allowed to give an explanation.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: What occasions? Can the minister provide those occasions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:42): Since the Leader of the Opposition FOI's my diary monthly or six-weekly, I think, I am sure she can go through and see what meetings I have had.

APY LANDS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:42): My question is to the minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister update the council on the government's support for a new—sorry I've got the wrong one. I've done that one. He gave such a good answer. Will the minister update the council on investments the government is making in the APY lands?

The PRESIDENT: I call the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to answer either question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:43): I thank the honourable member for his very important question and for remembering who he is today in asking that unexpected question. As a government we were pleased to be able to allocate funding for a range of initiatives on the APY lands but also on the Maralinga Tjarutja lands, projects that will make a meaningful difference to some of the communities on the APY and Maralinga Tjarutja lands.

One of the investments we are making is to provide urgently needed upgrades to fridges and freezers for fruit and vegetables at the Mai Wiru regional store in Pukatja. Stores in regional and remote Aboriginal communities are very important and very often the only source of groceries and other goods, and that is what makes upgrades critically important to such stores. Similarly, we are investing \$175,000 to renovate and extend the Oak Valley store on the Maralinga Tjarutja lands. This will make a real difference in what is quite a small store in Oak Valley, improving the services it can provide to the community.

I have been to Oak Valley a number of times, and at different times of the year when there are different events—and particularly cultural occurrences—happening, there can be influxes of hundreds of visitors to remote communities like Oak Valley. The capacity of a smaller store like that in Oak Valley is under tremendous pressure and often all goods sell out in a very short amount of time, so the funding to extend and modernise the stores both in Pukatja and in Oak Valley will have a significant benefit to those communities.

Matters of Interest

PAKISTAN FLOODS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:45): Today, I rise with a heavy heart to speak about the devastating floods and crisis unfolding in Pakistan. Authorities and humanitarian groups are responding to the worst floods Pakistan has experienced in decades. The disaster has impacted some 33 million people and led to the deaths of more than a thousand people over the past two months. One-third of Pakistan, a country of about 220 million people, was underwater, creating a crisis of unimaginable proportions since June when the monsoon seasonal rainfall began.

In its latest situation report, the National Disaster Management Authority, leading the response in coordinating assessment and directing humanitarian relief to affected people, declared 72 out of the country's 160 districts as disaster zones. The NDMA noted that at least one million homes, 162 bridges and nearly 3,500 kilometres of roads have been damaged.

Major rivers have breached their banks and dams have overflowed, destroying homes, farms and critical infrastructure, including roads, bridges, schools, hospitals and public health facilities. UNICEF estimates that as many as seven million people have been displaced and thousands of schools have been damaged or destroyed across the country.

Even as floodwaters begin to recede, outbreaks of diseases, including typhoid and malaria, are increasing, as millions of people live in temporary shelters or out in the open near stagnating water. Many of the hardest hit areas are among the most vulnerable in Pakistan, where children and families already suffer from high rates of malnutrition and lack of access to clean water and sanitation.

Our hearts go out to all the families and communities impacted by this devastating crisis. Understandably, the anxious Pakistani community in South Australia has been deeply affected by this humanitarian tragedy, with many concerned for the health and safety of family and friends still living in Pakistan. It has been heartening to see the incredible outpouring of support from within the Pakistani and wider multicultural community to raise awareness and funds to help with the disaster.

I was privileged to attend a fundraising dinner to support the victims of the Pakistan flooding disaster organised by the Sindhi Sangat Australia—South Australia Chapter on Tuesday 13 September 2022. I would like to sincerely thank the hardworking president, Mr Faheem Samejo, and the dedicated organising committee working alongside Zafar and Safdar, proprietors of Olives Pakistani Cuisine, for putting together an urgent fundraiser.

Sindhis are an ethnic group of Pakistan primarily from the provinces of Sindh and Balochistan, two of the areas that were most heavily affected by devastating floods and landslides in Pakistan. One can only imagine the distress the community must be going through seeing all the horrible images and news stories broadcasted across the media.

The dinner raised over \$11,000, which has been sent directly to Pakistan to charity groups and people that are personally known to Sindhi Sangat SA and can immediately provide urgent food relief, medical supplies and on-the-ground services to those most affected by the flooding. Thank you also to all the volunteers, generous donors, sponsors and community leaders who came together to support this important cause.

Today, I would like to also highlight another incredible fundraising initiative organised by Human Appeal Australia assisted by Adelaide Sisters Association and supported by many community organisations. It is my privilege today to inform this parliament that the Human Appeal fundraiser held on Saturday 17 September successfully raised over \$400,000, including sponsorship of over 140 orphans. I would like to thank Human Appeal Australia and all the community organisations for this wonderful fundraiser.

While the Australian federal government committed \$2 million initially and later an extra \$3 million in humanitarian assistance to Pakistan, community members in South Australia and across the nation believe that Australia can do more and must do more. I join members in South Australia calling on the Albanese Labor government to increase Australia's support to help Pakistan. Our thoughts and prayers remain steadfast with everyone who has been affected by the Pakistan flood and I thank all those who contributed with solidarity and kindness to the community in need.

FALCONIO, MR P.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:50): No parent should ever have to bury their own child. Worse still, no parent should have to grieve the loss of their child without knowing where their remains are. That is the dreadful predicament Joan and Luciano Falconio have been forced to endure for the past 21 years after their beloved son Peter was murdered in the Northern Territory in 2001 in a case that attracted worldwide attention.

Peter was just 28 years old, on a trip of a lifetime with his then girlfriend, Joanne Lees, when he was shot dead and his body dumped in Australia's remote outback by deranged killer Bradley Murdoch. Peter would have turned 50 last week, a tragic milestone that sparked Mrs Falconio to reach out to me desperately seeking help.

Like any of us in the same predicament, the Falconios simply want closure. They want to bring Peter's remains home to be closer to his family and loved ones. In an emotional email, Mrs Falconio appealed to anyone with a conscience to reveal where her son's remains are. She and her husband, Luciano, who are aged 75 and 80 respectively, feel the Northern Territory Police have given up on them. In her email to me, Mrs Falconio wrote:

We want to bring Peter home where he belongs near his family. Our pain is always with us.

He was murdered 21 years ago, aged just 28 years.

His murderer, Bradley Murdoch, is as far as I know in Darwin Prison.

Peter has a beautiful niece and two lovely nephews who he never got to see or know.

I am appealing to anyone with a conscience to help me however small to tell me where he was put.

His life stopped on a lonely road—the Stuart Highway on 14th July 2001. Shot dead by cowardly Murdoch, who will not reveal where or what he did with him.

My heart breaks for the Falconios, including Peter's three brothers, Mark, Nicholas and Paul. That is why I have written to the Northern Territory's Chief Minister, Natasha Fyles, and police minister, Kate Worden, urging the Northern Territory government to post a \$1 million reward for the recovery of Peter's remains and for the Northern Territory Police to embark on a new media campaign in the hope that new evidence will be forthcoming as to where Peter's body was dumped. I have also asked the Northern Territory Police to consider engaging specialised forensic archaeologists with expertise in locating gravesites to conduct fresh searches of likely burial places.

Peter's murder remains one of Australia's most baffling outback mysteries. Murdoch is serving life imprisonment in the Darwin Correctional Centre for Peter's murder and the abduction of Ms Lees on a lonely stretch of the Stuart Highway near Barrow Creek in the Northern Territory in 2001. Miraculously, Ms Lees, who today is 47 and lives in seclusion near Huddersfield in the United Kingdom, managed to escape by hiding in surrounding bush. She remains deeply affected by the ordeal.

Murdoch is believed to have disposed of the body somewhere between Alice Springs and Broome, 1,700 kilometres away in Western Australia, an area covered by a vast expanse of desert. Despite police searches near the scene of the murder, no remains have been found. Mrs Falconio reached out to me soon after I was elected to the South Australian parliament after I covered Peter's disappearance with the Seven Network. I believe Murdoch either disposed of the body on Neutral Junction Station in the Northern Territory or in the Tanami Desert after he filled up his vehicle with petrol in Alice Springs and fled to Broome.

Murdoch will be eligible for parole in 10 years but will not be released under the territory's 'no body, no release' policy for convicted murderers. Somebody must know where Peter's body was dumped or might have some information or recollection that could be useful to police, no matter how insignificant they might think it is. Joan, Luciano, Mark, Nicholas and Paul Falconio and their families deserve closure after all these years of grieving and uncertainty. I will keep my fingers crossed.

WEAVERS, SAM

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:54): Last week, I joined the Flinders University research in inclusion and specialised education discussion. Over morning tea, I met Sam Weavers. Sam mentioned that he was joining the panel to share his experience as an autistic teenager. He also mentioned that he makes popcorn and that I could take some home for my three girls. Sam assured me it would be the best popcorn I would ever taste.

Unfortunately for my girls, I did crack those bags on the way back to my car. Needless to say, my girls did not get all three bags of popcorn. Sam, you were right. It was by far the best popcorn I have ever tasted.

Sam Weavers may only be in year 10, but he is popping up everywhere and for good reason. And it is not just because his popcorn is delicious. At age 9, Sam Weavers decided the popcorn industry needed a shake-up and he set to work doing just that. After a year of experimenting, Sam's popcorn sales moved from family and friends to his primary school's schoolyard.

It was quickly becoming apparent that Sam's secret recipe was going to be a big hit, so much so that his sweet and salty crunchy popcorn snacks made him a superstar. But for Sam this was never about making money or becoming a superstar, so he decided to share his success to help make change for others.

Like many children, Sam's family has been touched by cancer. Inspired by his grandmother's experience, Sam formed a partnership with the Childhood Cancer Association. Today, 40 per cent of money raised through the sales of Sam's popcorn goes directly to help children through the Childhood Cancer Association.

With the help of his very loyal and growing customer base, Sam's popcorn has raised \$25,000 to support kids with cancer and their families. Sam's collection of oversized novelty cheques that he presents to the charity would be the envy of most politicians, so too would his impressive media appearances on TV, radio and print media throughout the country.

It is unsurprising that not only have Sam's mass popcorn cook-ups taken over his family home, so too has his collection of impressive awards. He has been a winner of the Australia Day Outstanding Citizen award 2022, winner of the SA Fred Hollows Humanity Award and winner of the 7NEWS Young Achiever Award for South Australia in the leadership category, making him the youngest ever winner of any category at the time in 2019. He was also the winner of the Tea Tree Gully council Youth Achievement Award in the leadership category, winner of the Minister for Education award and winner of the Westfield Local Hero award.

Sam's delicious popcorn has also taken him from a superstar in the schoolyard to a big hit in Singapore, where he was invited to speak on the topic of 'Thriving with autism' at the Asia Pacific Autism Conference, attended by 2,600 people. At this conference he also shared a very important message:

For me, autism is not a disability or disadvantage. In fact, I feel that autism is one of the reasons I am successful as an entrepreneur. Who know if I would have been successful if I was not on the spectrum?

Sam, for these reasons, is a regular guest speaker at schools across the state, where he shares this and other important messages about believing in your abilities. He reminds students that he is only 15 and it shows that if you pick carefully what you want to do, if you have the drive and you want to do it, you can do it. As Sam mentioned to me, autism can be a superpower and, sure, you might have some difficulties, but he doubted he would be starting a business at the young age of nine if he was not on the spectrum.

Sam, thank you for sharing your message with schools and the broader community. It has been reported that your move to a new school altered the outcome and changed your life forever—that when you were eight, you changed schools because you felt like you did not fit in and that this was the best thing that could have ever happened.

Your new school provided new opportunities, strategies to cope with autism and, most importantly, new friends. It allowed you to focus on your goals. It allowed you to focus not only on becoming the king of popcorn but to go on to win multiple science awards and have a future plan to study medical science to focus on infectious diseases.

Sam, I hope our commitment of funding an autism inclusion teacher in every public primary school will help change the experience you went through in your first school. I hope other students will now be able to fit in and feel that they can also achieve their goals.

FESTIVAL PLAZA PRECINCT

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:00): The matter I rise to speak on this afternoon is one that will be of importance to all those South Australians who value our open public space; that is, the future of the Festival Plaza. Just last week, the Minister for Planning, the Hon. Nick Champion MP, told *The Advertiser* that the Walker Corporation had lodged plans for a second office tower on the Festival Plaza. That is next to the 29-storey tower that has already been approved for the site, the tower that is already on the way but is running behind schedule.

It is an outrage that our city's prime civic space is being used to host one private office tower, let alone two. It was the Weatherill Labor government that first approved the Walker Corporation's construction of this tower, back in 2012. In fact, they granted the Walker Corporation exclusive use over that site. That was our public land—our public land—being gifted to a billionaire. Indeed, the South Australian taxpayer will be contributing more than \$250 million to facilitate this private takeover of our public land—\$250 million of taxpayer funds to gift to a private corporation to help them take over our public land. It is an outrage. It is a disgrace.

In a city where there are already so many vacant office buildings, it beggars belief that one of our key civic sites will be used in this way, particularly when one considers that it is on the Adelaide Parklands, our national heritage-listed Parklands, arguably the most valuable real estate in South Australia. This space could have been returned to the Parklands for a fraction of the cost. This tower will cast a long shadow over our historic Parliament House and the new Festival Centre.

I mentioned earlier the role of the Weatherill government, but this has been a bipartisan project, a project between the two major parties. Indeed, last year the Liberals approved an extra two storeys on the tower. Back in 2020, they reduced the number of trees the Walker Corporation

were required to plant and the required public contribution increased by another \$20 million. Of course, we know that this new tower will not be paying any rates.

The Walker Corporation will be exempt from paying rates to the City of Adelaide because the building will be on Crown land. *The Advertiser* has estimated that that will be a loss of revenue to the local council of \$150,000 every year, and now the government is actively considering a second tower for this site. It is a disgrace.

It seems that whatever developers want in this state, they get. We have a planning system that is designed to serve the interests of the big end of town at the expense of the public good. What say do the people of South Australia get? None. What say does the parliament get? You guessed it: we get no say whatsoever.

Last year, when the Liberals announced their plans to rezone the Adelaide Parklands to allow further commercial development along the Riverbank, I introduced a private members' bill that would have prevented rezoning of our Parklands without parliamentary approval. What happened to that bill, you may ask. Well, it was blocked. Surprise, surprise: it was blocked by the Labor and Liberal parties, the two parties that are in the pocket of the development class in our state.

The reason is very clear: both the major parties want an unfettered right to develop our public land, to carve off the Parklands and sell them off to the highest bidder. It is an absolute disgrace. The community is ill served by this planning regime, and I urge the government to think again, to listen to the will of the community when it comes to our public spaces, to reject a proposal for yet another office tower on the Festival Plaza, to actually show some imagination when it comes to our public space, to treat the community with the respect they deserve and give them a say, and to stop giving away our public land to developers.

MCCULLOCH, MS D.E.J.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:05): I rise to make some remarks in honour of Deborah Elizabeth Jane McCulloch, otherwise known as Deb McCulloch, who passed away nearly 12 months ago and was well known to a number of us. Deb was the elder daughter of an artist and an entomologist. She was born in Sydney in 1939 and was educated at Girton Proprietary School for Girls, the University of Adelaide, where she achieved a Bachelor of Arts with honours and a diploma of education, and Flinders University, where she achieved a doctorate in sociology.

Deborah taught at Adelaide Girls High School from 1960 to 1966, Daramalan Catholic Boys High School from 1967 to 1968 and Elizabeth High School in 1969. She was a researcher for the Australian Dictionary of Biography and also lectured at the Salisbury CAE. Deborah instantly, according to the records, became a feminist in 1971 when she read Shulamith Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex*. She threw herself into women's liberation and was approached to set up the Women's Electoral Lobby in Adelaide, of which she held the first meeting here in South Australia at her home in July 1972.

Deborah is well noted for her role as women's adviser to the South Australian government from 1976 to 1979. She had been given a brief by Premier Dunstan to eliminate sexism in the South Australian Public Service, and she initially focused in that role on employment and education. She was also responsible for ensuring that cabinet submissions were inclusive of women and for developing women-specific policies. She was considered to be a very important contact point between government and community women's organisations.

Part way through her tenure she changed her focus and her role from changing existing structures to starting to put in alternative structures. One of her staff had been in San Francisco and seen a women's information switchboard. Using this model, she set up the Women's Information Switchboard (WIS) in Adelaide in 1978, which became a model for similar services around the country, and the WIS celebrated 40 years in 2018.

WIS, which is now known as the Women's Information Service—it carries the same acronym—was famous for its phone-ins, which allowed women to give direct feedback on issues. It provided many unique and important services over the years, including accompanying women to medical appointments for family planning and to Family Court hearings, assisting women in how to

present to court for the benefit of their case, re-educating family lawyers about how to communicate with their vulnerable clients, and many other things.

It has been described to me as having undertaken some fairly radical things at the time, such as assisting with access handovers of children in violent families. WIS staff had no fear of ringing up anyone within government or the political system when they thought they needed to, whether it was a minister, a head of department or other members of parliament.

WIS carries, as I said, the same acronym and remains as relevant today as it was then. It still does court support, as well as tax help and other practical supports. It has children's centres and havens, which are staffed by well-trained volunteers, to provide a safe space for women to receive support. Under the Marshall Liberal government, the havens were expanded as a key implementation of an election commitment to provide safety hubs in regional areas, and I am very pleased that this model is now operating at Gawler, Goolwa, Mount Barker, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Port Pirie and Whyalla.

The alternative structures I referred to previously that Deb set up would become familiar as women's services, or specialist women's services. These include not just the Women's Information Service but also the Working Women's Centre, the Rape Crisis Centre and the women's health centres, which we can all credit to Deb.

As we know, the first discrimination legislation in Australia was the South Australian Sex Discrimination Act, which was passed in 1975. Deb was excited about the opportunities it was going to open up because it was a piece of legislation that had teeth. She was later appointed to the Sex Discrimination Tribunal, holding that post until 1982. She was very active in a range of areas, and we are grateful for her service.

GORBACHEV, MIKHAIL

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:10): I rise today to speak on Mikhail Gorbachev. I stumbled across a speech he gave in 1987 to a World Women's Congress in Moscow, and I want to quote from that today.

Gorbachev, who passed away last month aged 91, was born to a peasant family of Russian and Ukrainian heritage on 2 March 1931. Despite his poor background, he became the leader of the Soviet Union, or the USSR as it was then called, from 1985 until that country's dissolution in 1991. The speech I came across was presented in Moscow 35 years ago, and his words would have set an optimistic tone for the future. He said:

Peace is not a utopia and if we, men and women of the earth, act energetically and together, we shall certainly uphold it.

Of one thing you can be absolutely sure: the Soviet people are deeply committed to peace and friendship among the nations...

Everyone is acutely aware that those words do not reflect the Russia of today.

Gorbachev was not a great believer in communism. Instead, as history tells us, he recognised that the Soviet Union needed to adapt. Although committed to preserving the Soviet state and its socialist ideals, Gorbachev believed significant reform was necessary.

He withdrew troops from the Soviet-Afghan war and embarked on summits with Ronald Reagan, then President of the United States, to limit nuclear weapons and end the Cold War. Gorbachev declined to intervene militarily when various Eastern bloc countries abandoned Marxist-Leninist governance in 1989 and 1990, and some of us in the chamber will remember witnessing, on 9 November 1989, crowds of Germans dismantling the Berlin Wall and the great sense of hope that followed with the unification of Germany.

Gorbachev's vision for a better future and his insightfulness about what is essential for the human race is evident in his following words:

As the third millennium draws near, humanity is obliged to assess the host of complicated problems...The dwindling of energy resources, the hunger and poverty of tens of millions, of hundreds of millions of people, ecological trouble which affects just about every country, old age and now formidable new diseases...The boys and girls of today will have to live and work tomorrow on one planet in even closer contact with each other than we do...

At the 1987 congress, Gorbachev expressed his admiration of and confidence in the ability of women's peacemaking role throughout the world. He said:

There is a growing understanding of the fact that danger can be forestalled merely by extending a hand to one another across the inevitable ideological, economic and political fences that separate states.

And I must say that it is women who perceive more fully and emotionally the absolute priority that preserving peace has over everything else...

For those of us with more knowledge than what is captured in the fragments quoted from this speech, and because of Gorbachev's efforts to make our world a better place, one can only imagine his sheer dismay at Putin's Russian invasion of Ukraine unfolding just before he died. Let us all not lose hope for the emergence of a new Russian leader with Gorbachev's wisdom and vision for peace.

PELVIC PAIN

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:14): I rise to speak on the importance of a silent issue which is taking its toll on thousands of women each day and, in particular, adolescent women. I am talking about pelvic pain, a condition that affects around one in five women, and one in 12 men, and yet a condition which garners little to no attention.

Following work in the period poverty space I recently had the pleasure of meeting with Kirsty Mead, the Executive Director from the Pelvic Pain Foundation of Australia. It became clear to me in discussing pelvic pain with Kirsty that this issue is not only rarely discussed but is also very misunderstood and subject to broad scepticism by many within professions, including the medical profession.

But pelvic pain is a very real condition. It is a debilitating human affliction which is not only worthy of mention but certainly needs more recognition within the funding and resource allocation setting. In fact, if it were not for the wonderful work that the Pelvic Pain Foundation of Australia is doing in advancing its mission to support, promote, educate and forge partnerships in advocating for pelvic pain awareness and supports, there would be little or nowhere else for people suffering from this condition to go for assistance.

Part of the mission is the foundation's Pelvic Pain Educational Talk Program, known as PPEP Talk, and that talk is an educational program designed to highlight and destigmatise pelvic pain by offering a new approach to educational health care. It is achieved by incorporating a modern understanding of the neuroscience of pain and introductory self-management strategies for those who have pain, and what those who do not experience pain can do to support those who do.

The program offers informational insight and guidance on how to seek professional medical help. It is free to public, private and independent schools, and has inclusive and modified programs suitable for boys, students with special needs and Indigenous students. Students attending the talk range between the ages of 12 to 19, with well-qualified and trained educators who are supported with medical advisers to ensure the information provided is accurate and helpful. The program has been running in South Australia for the past two years and during that span has already visited 170 schools with 100 per cent of schools who have participated requesting a return of the program.

Importantly, the talk program blends well with the National Action Plan for Endometriosis, introduced by the federal government in 2017, and has been funded by both state and federal governments since 2018. Structurally, the Pelvic Pain Foundation received federal government funding to execute the PPEP Talk program in each state, and there is an expectation that state governments match that funding. Here in South Australia there is a \$35,000 shortfall which is necessary for the continued expansion of the program.

The talk's primary goal is to have the program rolled out across every school in South Australia, including rural and regional schools with tailored programs to suit the needs of the area. Without that necessary state government funding it will be next to impossible for the foundation to achieve its mission in expanding the program to every school in the state. The importance of the program is very clear, the linking up of educational, accurate information about pelvic pain and how to manage that pain to accessible clinical facilities and allied health care and medical professionals, and it is essential and unique to this program.

An area of particular concern and interest is the growing number of young female students absent from school due to pelvic pain. Research commissioned by the PPFA highlights that an increase in student absenteeism is directly attributable to pelvic pain, which comes in a variety of symptomatic forms, as is the case with period issues more generally.

The importance of the program's expanded delivery will ensure that students experiencing pelvic pain are able to recognise symptoms and administer self-managed care and have the medical information necessary to guide them to appropriate professional care which, in turn, will lead to a decrease in absence from school and provide a heightened understanding at the school among teachers and students to adequately support students who are experiencing this pain.

The program is proving to be an invaluable education tool throughout the state, specifically in Indigenous and rural communities, but it does need more funding. We should all be doing what we can to promote the PPEP Talk program, educate our kids, educate our communities and ensure that it is reaching our students across the state in terms of its delivery.

Time expired.

Bills

NATIVE VEGETATION (REVEGETATION PROJECTS REGISTER) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:20): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Native Vegetation Act 1991. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak on this very simple but, I believe, important legislation that would establish a Revegetation Projects Register in our state. This is a vital step for conservation, and I hope that it stands as the very first step towards this parliament tackling the many serious gaps we have in our biodiversity legislation. On that, I do note the pledges of the incoming Malinauskas government made during the election campaign but echoed last night at the Environment Awards by the Premier himself.

To quote David Freudenberger in his study on the effectiveness of revegetation in South Australia, 'the past 30 years of restoration activities in Australia has been mere cautious fiddling in the face of continental-wide native habitat loss, fragmentation and degradation'. We need to be much more ambitious in the size and scope of revegetation projects in South Australia, and we need to keep track on whether or not they are improving local environmental outcomes.

One of the greatest threats to biodiversity in our state is past and ongoing clearing of native vegetation. Native vegetation provides essential habitat for our wildlife, filters water and keeps erosion and salinity in check. Well planned revegetation delivers many important benefits. It conserves, buffers and enriches native plant communities and wildlife habitat. Native plantings reduce the risk of wind erosion and improve livestock welfare and productivity through greater access to shade and shelter. We have a great deal to gain from re-establishing native vegetation throughout our state.

But unfortunately we cannot know the full story of revegetation in South Australia. We do not know how effective it has been. We do not know, long term, which ecosystems are doing better than they were, because governments have consistently failed to invest in long-term monitoring of revegetation.

Further, the scale of restoration activities has not met the scale of the monumental task ahead of us if we are to properly restore even a fraction of our native ecosystems. Existing revegetation projects provide many ecosystem services and benefits, but the quantity is insufficient. Past governments have done a great job of encouraging revegetation with native species, but the rhetoric has not been matched by the necessary investment, monitoring or management. A patchwork approach with little connectivity between projects and existing remnant vegetation has

been the norm for far too long, which means that we have failed to maximise ecological function when restoring native vegetation.

A Revegetation Projects Register would allow for more regional coordination of revegetation projects to suggest more ecologically useful approaches. It is an excellent tool to allow us to maximise the area of existing native habitat or restored fragments, joining isolated islands of habitat to increase connectivity, and create more efficient projects by combining otherwise independent proponents—e.g. adjacent landholders.

Successful revegetation relies on proper planning and preparation to produce the best results. Most revegetation projects in South Australia are not specifically linked to particular conservation outcomes. This needs to change, and having proper oversight over revegetation projects in our state is an essential part of that process. The proposed legislation before us envisions a Revegetation Projects Register that is operated by the Native Vegetation Council for the recording, management and prioritisation of revegetation projects throughout the state.

For the first time we could have an accurate record on the following of any revegetation project in South Australia:

- the proponent of the project;
- the area that is or will be revegetated;
- a list of species planted in the area described;
- the number of individual plants of each species listed;
- the manner and extent of any monitoring of the project that is or will be arranged;
- the cost of the project; and
- any other information that could be prescribed by regulations.

The register would be required to be publicly available online, and this could mean that anyone—particularly policymakers and researchers—could access and get a much more holistic picture of the state of revegetation and revegetated habitats in our state.

The aim of this would be to enhance collaboration between persons and bodies that are involved or interested in revegetation projects throughout the state. That could include statutory bodies, departments, councils, developers and NGOs, local communities and landowners, but beyond that it would also ensure that we take a long-term view on and an approach to conservation and revegetation projects in our state. This would ensure that their benefits are long lasting and actually deliver environmental benefits into the future.

I must also acknowledge that where protected and revegetated areas have increased, the capacity to manage those areas has not. It is not the best use of time and resources to undertake mass plantings and revegetation projects if they are then left unmanaged, unmonitored and unsupported to become properly established. The legislation would ensure that the Native Vegetation Council is properly resourced. Not only would this create and maintain this register but also enable them to carry out the rest of their duties.

If we are to get serious about revegetation in this state, and not just about conserving but actually improving our precious environment, this piece of legislation is a simple but necessary step. The areas of remaining habitat that we have can only support a certain number of species and, with native vegetation clearing still being approved at quite alarming rates, future species lost without active management and revegetation programs is inevitable. But our current ad hoc, haphazard approach to revegetation will not be good enough to address this problem.

For revegetation to recreate habitat lost through clearance it needs long-term planning, monitoring and maintenance. We need to stop treating revegetation projects as a box-ticking exercise for projects, either for offsets or as a replacement for native vegetation that has been lost to clearance. You cannot replace lost vegetation overnight, and of course a sapling planted will not provide the same ecological functions as a decades-old tree that it replaces. It will take many years—many decades sometimes—for that ecological gap to be filled, if it ever is.

Revegetated landscapes and those with remnant native vegetation do not necessarily offer the same benefits. That does not mean that revegetation projects are not worth it, but it does mean that we should be aware of their functions and what it takes for them to be successful. For example, revegetation often favours birds that forage in shrubby areas. In contrast, species that depend on older trees are less likely to be found in revegetated landscapes. This again demonstrates that we cannot use revegetation projects as blanket solutions to vegetation clearing.

A revegetation register will help us track the extent to which this is happening. I could go on, and my staff member certainly would like me to. I am sure that those in the conservation community will welcome this bill, but quite honestly it is a very simple idea whose time has come. We desperately need this to fix our approach to revegetation in our state and to improve biodiversity more broadly.

The environment sector has been crying out for years for improvements to our laws such as this, and there are certainly flaws in particular in our Native Vegetation Act. We have an opportunity here with this very small, simple bill to take that step—to start gathering evidence, collaborating on revegetation projects in our state and ensuring that we are improving their environmental outcomes.

I hope this can lead to a better, more informed discussion about improving biodiversity in our state, in particular on our approach to managing native vegetation habitats and ecosystems. I look forward to the further conversations on the area of biodiversity to come, and indeed far more complex legislation to come, but with that I commend this bill.

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

Motions

STAMP DUTIES ACT 1923

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:30): I move:

That this council calls on the Treasurer to—

1. Cause the Stamp Duties Act 1923 to be reviewed with reference to the appropriateness of residential stamp duty brackets.
2. Investigate options for modernising the stamp duty bracket system, such as:
 - (a) concessions and exemptions;
 - (b) an annual property tax in lieu of stamp duties.
3. Ensure conditions of the current South Australian land and housing market is appropriately reflected in the stamp duty brackets.
4. Ensure industry experts and bodies are consulted in any such process.

I am moving that the Treasurer cause the Stamp Duties Act 1923 to be reviewed, with reference to the appropriateness of residential stamp duty brackets; that the Treasurer investigate options for modernising the stamp duty bracket system, such as concessions and exemptions or an annual property tax in lieu of stamp duties, both of which are in place in other jurisdictions; that the Treasurer ensure that conditions of the current South Australia land and housing market are appropriately reflected in the stamp duty brackets; and that industry experts and bodies are consulted in any such process.

It is simple due diligence upon the Treasurer to review the residential stamp duty brackets, which have not been assessed for 15 years. Bracket creep is as real with stamp duty as it is with income tax and needs to be looked at. In South Australia right now, if you purchase a \$500,000 home you will pay \$21,330 in stamp duty. A property in the ACT with the same value would only attract a \$13,460 stamp duty, and in Queensland a \$15,925 stamp duty.

The ACT, New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland all have conditional exemptions or concessions for first-home buyers and pensioners. First-home buyers in New South Wales are exempt up to \$650,000 from stamp duty and then have a discounted rate of stamp duty on a home up to the value of \$800,000. Additionally, New South Wales homebuyers can also now choose between the stamp duty fee or an annual land tax fee. In Victoria, first-home buyers are exempt up to \$600,000 and pensioners exempt up to \$330,000.

Why should South Australians be left behind? Why should our first-home buyers not have access to the same stamp duty exemptions as interstate peers? Why should our pensioners not have concessions or exemptions to downsize out of large family homes now that the nest is empty? Why are we not doing everything we can with the current housing crisis to free up land and housing?

A review, which is what I am calling for, will show where opportunities and improvements lie. I call on the Treasurer to cause a review to be undertaken and a report of the review to be prepared and provided in relation to investigating options for modernising our stamp duty system, including an investigation of the introduction of a land tax option in lieu of stamp duty; investigating concessions and exemptions for South Australians, especially for first-home buyers and pensioners; investigating where the levels of residential stamp duty bracket should be in relation to current house and land prices; and considering mechanisms to keep any revised system up to date and relevant on an ongoing basis.

We are in the middle of a statewide housing crisis. I want a swift investigation into measures that can help improve the situation for ordinary South Australians. To not review the stamp duty brackets leaves the government appearing inattentive. I want all South Australians to have a chance at owning a home, but prices are rising much faster than incomes. The One Nation vision is to exempt first-home buyers from stamp duty up to \$600,000 and for older people to have access to a \$400,000 exemption to downsize and free up large blocks and big homes. This concept has recently been endorsed by a senior economist from the Australia Institute.

The party understands that home ownership increases personal freedom, creates communities and provides stability. The highest bracket of stamp duty is now well below the median house price in South Australia. As of May 2022, median expectancy is \$650,000; the highest stamp duty bracket is capped at \$500,000. Everyday families are paying the same stamp duty rate as those purchasing million-dollar houses. This bracket creep taxation is simply a lazy way of raising revenue. Plenty of industry advocates have called for this review. They call our current stamp duty model an archaic cash grab and that it damages housing affordability.

A senior economist for The Australia Institute publicly backed One Nation's call for exemptions for first-home buyers and for senior South Australians downsizing. The Housing Industry Association, a 75-year-old national regulator, called it Australia's most ineffective tax. The Real Estate Institute has said that the tax was unforgiving to first-home buyers and that bracket creep is a major consideration as sale prices increase and the Property Council of Australia said it was a handbrake on the economy.

Everyday South Australians deserve housing security and fair market access. They should not be penalised for the government not keeping pace with the realities of inflation. Hardworking South Australians deserve a chance at owning a home, but prices are rising faster than incomes and we need mechanisms to fix this. Other states are attempting to improve the system for their constituents and so should we. I commend this motion to the house.

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

PHILANTHROPY

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:35): I move:

That this council acknowledges the importance of philanthropy and community service to our society, and recognises the philanthropic and charitable endeavours of Her late Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Philanthropy is the giving of money, time, goods and services, information, voice or influence for the betterment of society and humanity. It is in this way that I wish to pay honour to Her late Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and reflect upon her impact on the philanthropic and community service sectors. With privilege comes a responsibility to give back to the best of one's ability. Queen Elizabeth demonstrated this unwaveringly throughout her long reign. Admired for her generosity, empathy, humour, kindness and diligence, I thank her for being a role model to the world.

I would like to acknowledge her philanthropy and commitment to the non-profit sector. The Queen was a patron to over 600 charitable services and good causes. In all her public duties, she demonstrated that those with ample means are well placed to assist those who are actively pursuing making the world a better place. Such support for the not-for-profit sector is commendable.

In a 2022 survey, 25 per cent of UK respondents suggested they may not have heard of a particular charity or supported them had it not been for royal patronage. A 2012 evaluation by a charity sector research group estimated that Her Majesty was responsible for raising \$1.4 billion Great British pounds in the first 60 years of her reign as the Queen. The visibility Her Majesty afforded to a broad range of groups cannot be underestimated. As one organisation that was fortunate to benefit from Her Majesty's patronage put it:

The Queen, through her faith, led by example. In carrying out her royal duties with grace and dignity she has been a symbol of inspiration for many both within the United Kingdom, across the Commonwealth and in many other countries.

She was an excellent role model for us in this chamber with a position of responsibility to our community. I do not expect my colleagues in this place to support over 600 charities and not-for-profit groups over the course of 70 years of uninterrupted service; Her Majesty was exemplary. My inference is that we should all do what we can, when we can, to help those without a voice trying to make a difference.

Not everyone is blessed with an equal start in life, but to rely on government to fix everything is not a realistic expectation. Those of us with privilege must take ownership of our responsibility to give back. We all need to find causes that work with our skill sets, means and interests, whether that be homelessness, education, environment, mental health, sports or the arts—anything in our community that makes South Australia a thriving society in which to live.

In South Australia, our peak body for volunteering, Volunteering SA/NT, notes the unfortunate decline of volunteering in our community over the past few years. They recognise the need to reinvigorate volunteering, modernise it, so that many more can participate. There are several contributing factors possibly affecting participation: people working longer and not retiring into community service; the COVID factor, with many people minimising face-to-face community contact; the continued rise of dual parents working; and people having to work multiple jobs to make ends meet, resulting in less free time to give back.

We should still be proud that, in a state of 1.8 million people, 50 per cent, or over 900,000, have volunteered at least once within the last year, according to Volunteering SA/NT figures. The value of that volunteering is estimated at over \$5 billion to our state.

As for the philanthropic sector, South Australia is home to 3,311 charities registered with the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission. These organisations employ approximately 95,000 South Australians in paid work and support many thousands more as volunteers. These registered charities accounted for \$341 million in donations in 2021.

The generosity of South Australians is evident, despite the tough times many are currently facing. Many charities and organisations across South Australia could not operate without support. The existence of the recently opened Carrington Cottages, a 26-bed emergency accommodation facility for rough sleepers in Adelaide, would not have been possible without an anonymous donor matching the \$1.2 million secured funding for the project.

It is imperative that young people are educated in the importance of giving back. Many schools offer volunteer opportunities for students to engage with their local communities. This helps to foster philanthropy within our young people. Our youth need to understand that not all children are given an equal start in life, and it is important to raise each other up.

Families may often engage in acts of community service together through their local place of worship, community sport or recreation club, CFS or SES location or other neighbourhood endeavour. If you look back far enough, you will note that our state was founded on philanthropy, in an era where no government handouts existed and the community helped each other for the betterment and at times, survival, of the colony. Large or small, every one of us can and should make a difference. It is our duty to contribute to the continuous improvement of South Australia. We need not rely on hefty, overbearing government if we contribute appropriately where we see need and purpose.

Queen Elizabeth II was an incredible woman, and I give my condolences to His Majesty King Charles III and his family. I thank those South Australians who have the opportunity to contribute to our community through the means of service or philanthropy.

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

AUSTRALIAN SOCCER

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:41): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates Australia's men's football team, also known as the Socceroos, on qualifying for the sixth time for FIFA's World Cup tournament to be staged in Qatar from 21 November to 18 December 2022;
2. Acknowledges the contributions made to the team and to the code in Australia by their coach, Graham Arnold; his assistants; and the sport governing body, the Football Federation of Australia;
3. Wishes Australia success in their group D matches against France, Denmark and Tunisia;
4. Extends its appreciation and congratulates the emirate of Qatar and the organising committee for FIFA Qatar 2022 in staging the iconic four-yearly global event, and held in a Middle Eastern country for the first time; and
5. Notes that the FIFA Women's World Cup will be jointly staged for the first time in Australian cities, including Adelaide; in regions; and in New Zealand from 20 July to 20 August 2023.

Who can ever forget that stunned look of joy on the face of bushy bearded Andrew Redmayne when he saved a decisive penalty against South Americans Peru that lifted all of Australia, sending the Socceroos to their fifth consecutive World Cup appearance—and their sixth overall—in Qatar? The sheer joy was reminiscent of that night in Sydney in November 2005 when Adelaide's John Aloisi slotted a penalty to deny Uruguay, sending Australia to its first World Cup, in Germany, since 1974.

I was fortunate to be there with my sons Mark and Alex and 85,000 other Aussie fanatics, and there was hardly a dry eye in the house, such was the elation and relief that was felt by ardent supporters of the beautiful game in Australia because there had been so much heartbreak in between when hopes had been so high.

As a reporter I was lucky again to make it to Germany in 2006 to see our team, known as the golden generation, in action against the world's best. They made it to their best ever finish, the round of 16, only to lose to a controversial penalty that was awarded late in the game to Italy, the eventual tournament champions. Australia was back again in 2010 in South Africa where it just missed out on making the second round on goal difference after its poor start against a rampant Germany in Durban. The Socceroos qualified again in 2014 in Brazil and Russia in 2018 but were eliminated in the first round.

The tournament in Qatar kicks off in just over 50 days, when the Socceroos face another massive challenge, the tournament favourites France, in their opening game on 23 November, then follows Tunisia and Denmark, equally tough opponents. But if there is one thing I have learned in following the game and our national team, they are not easily intimidated, and like so many of our sports men and women, they are renowned for their fighting spirit, right to the end.

There is no other sporting tournament like the World Cup of football. It is the biggest game on the planet. I have been to four, and I can say that the atmosphere generated beats any of the Olympics I have covered, except perhaps the Sydney 2000. There is no experience like being in a full stadium, with Australia's national anthem blaring out, and seeing every Aussie in the crowd sing their lungs out. It really does give you goosebumps.

I do not recollect hearing our national anthem sung with as much gusto anywhere else or at any other sporting fixture as when our Socceroos line up for a World Cup fixture in front of a global audience of millions. In Qatar I am sure our fans will try, ousting the French, who are just as passionate with their stirring national anthem, La Marseillaise. This occasion will have added significance for the Australian national team, which is celebrating its centenary year.

The difficult journey Australia has taken this time around cannot be underestimated. Many qualifying matches were played on foreign soil and during the worst of the COVID pandemic. Home

ground advantage was lost. Players had to fly in from all corners of the globe to prepare for their games, played in mostly empty stadia, with hardly an Aussie supporter in attendance.

Australia won 11 consecutive qualifying matches in a single campaign, a FIFA World Cup record. What looked like being a cakewalk through to Qatar then took a bumpy detour, with Australia missing out on a top two finish in its group, then having to go through the play-offs and then finishing up with a nailbiting game against Peru, again played in Qatar with little fan support.

It was here that Australia's coach, Graham Arnold, showed his tactical genius. Aware that regular first-choice goalkeeper Matt Ryan was not confident against penalty kicks, he rolled the dice and replaced the skipper with big, burly and scary Redmayne, who successfully struck fear into the nervous hearts of the Peruvians with his trademark body movements. Following the game, an ecstatic Arnold told media that nobody back home expected Australia to qualify. Well, not quite everybody.

It is a testament to Arnold's unwavering dedication and fierce loyalty to his country that stretches all the way back to his playing days, first in the old national soccer league and then in professional leagues in the Netherlands, Belgium and Spain. Not just a great club player, where he amassed more than 450 appearances and netted 161 goals, Arnie, as he is affectionately known, ranks in my book is one of our greatest Soccerroos, always ready to pull on the green-and-gold strip and play his heart out. He made 54 team appearances, scoring 19 goals. He is also an Olympian, not just as a player but also as an assistant coach and a senior coach, taking in the games in Athens, Beijing and Tokyo.

He has also had great success as a coach, winning two A-League titles, with the Central Coast Mariners and then with a classy Sydney Football Club that swept all before them. It is a mark of Arnold's character that he engenders strong loyalty and support from his playing groups. Unlike the furore we are hearing about from AFL scandals, Arnold nurtures his players, especially the younger ones and those who have come from underprivileged backgrounds, like refugee Awer Mabil, who started his playing days with Adelaide United and is now a dynamic professional in Norway and will undoubtedly be a key player in Australia's World Cup attack.

Hopefully, we will see other South Australians selected in Arnold's final squad, including Riley McGree, who grew up in Gawler and played with the Gawler Eagles and is now with Middlesborough; Ryan Strain, who began with the Modbury Jets and is now in the Scottish premier league with St Mirren; Ryan McGowan, who is also in the Scottish premier league; and Adelaide United striker Craig Goodwin.

There is also another important South Australian connection with the World Cup. Tony Vidmar, an Adelaide City and Soccerroo legend, is Arnie's assistant and has also taken over our Olympic team. Tony cruelly missed out on his lifelong dream of playing in a World Cup when a heart condition ruled him out of the squad that went to Germany in 2006 after he had played such a critical role in the 2005 qualifiers. He has now established himself as a skilled coach.

Arnold's achievement in making this World Cup, his first as senior manager, under the toughest challenges for his players, his assistants and also the governing body of the sport in this country, the Football Federation of Australia, is to be commended for the way that the governing body has managed the team's commitments, along with other national and international responsibilities during the pandemic era.

Next year, Australians will get a taste of what it is like to experience the excitement a World Cup tournament generates when we host the FIFA Women's World Cup with New Zealand. This will be huge and we will all wish our women's team, known as the Matildas, every success in being able to lift the trophy as one of the tournament favourites. Matches will be played in capital cities and regional centres, including Adelaide, where Coopers Stadium at Hindmarsh is currently undergoing a refit.

I would also like to extend the council's appreciation and congratulations to the emirate of Qatar on its preparations for this year's tournament. It was a shock when they were announced as hosts in 2010, because no country in the Middle East has hosted the tournament and it had very little in the way of the type of facilities required, particularly being such a small country. What is more,

because of the climate challenges the traditional time frame of world cups from June to July had to be changed to late November to mid-December to accommodate for the heat. It meant that major leagues around the world would need to be disrupted for a period.

However, the Qataris have defied their critics by building the most amazing infrastructure. It has become a veritable football oasis in the desert. There will be eight magnificent stadiums that are airconditioned to 25° so that spectators and players can be comfortable. After the tournament, they will be dismantled and generously donated to other countries that need world-class facilities.

There will be another strong Adelaide business connection at the World Cup in Qatar. Peats Soils has won a contract to have its innovative BiobiNs at all the stadia that will process all the waste from the World Cup stadiums, and that compost will then be used in the surrounding deserts of Qatar in greening projects. It is a wonderful achievement for Peats. I think it is the only Australian company that has won a contract from FIFA at the World Cup.

I am very much looking forward to this tournament and the attention it will undoubtedly get globally and, of course, in this country. I commend the motion to the chamber.

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

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STEALTHING AND CONSENT) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:52): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, the Criminal Procedure Act 1921 and the Evidence Act 1929. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased, once again, to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Stealthing and Consent) Amendment Bill. Members who were here at the time might recall that following the last time this bill was introduced its provisions were subsequently incorporated into the former Attorney-General's bill, which made a number of other additional changes, but the long and short of the way that that bill progressed through this place was with bipartisan support, and that is certainly what I am hoping for once again.

It has been almost a year since I first introduced that similar bill, and much has changed on the national landscape in terms of sexual consent. Laws pertaining to consent and sexual assault have been and continue to be scrutinised and updated in line with modern thought and expectations and, as the Attorney would know, we have certainly had lots of discussions around issues pertaining to those matters.

The Queensland and New South Wales law reform commissions both published reports reviewing their respective consent laws in 2020, and the Victorian Law Reform Commission published its 600-page report last year. I understand there is a body of work being undertaken by the Attorney's department, particularly in reviewing the work undertaken in those jurisdictions, but I see no reason why we cannot act in the interim to clarify our laws in relation to stealthing, and complement that work.

Again, in the previous parliament everyone's position, in terms of the major parties, was quite clear in regard to their support for this. It can be a standalone piece of legislation. We do not need to wait for the other work that is being done by this government or taken up in terms of what was done by the previous government: we can just get this effectively done. That is the purpose of this bill.

Since I last spoke, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania have joined the ACT in expressly criminalising stealthing. We should already be on that list but, unfortunately, we did not get there before parliament was prorogued. They joined a growing list of jurisdictions around the world to legislate against this very disturbing yet common modern practice. For those members who were

not here at the time, new members who have joined us since who may not be as familiar with this as others, 'stealthing' is the contemporary term given to the non-consensual removal of a condom during sex when consent has been given only for sex with a condom.

The bill seeks to amend section 46 of the Criminal Consolidation Act 1935 to expand the list of factors that can negate consent to include non-consensual condom removal. Without consent to a sexual activity the act is rape or compelled sexual manipulation, with a penalty range from 10 years to life imprisonment.

The bill includes two further amendments that were actually part of the previous Attorney's bill subsequent to mine last year, which sought to further strengthen the provisions we had originally proposed. The first amendment is an amendment to the Evidence Act to broaden the jury directions that must be given in cases involving a sexual offence where consent is in question, and the second is an amendment to the Criminal Procedure Act 1921 to require the defendant to disclose an expert report which considers the issue of consent well in advance of trial, as is already the case for the prosecution.

Clauses 4 and 6 are transitional provisions confirming the amendments to the Evidence Act and the Criminal Procedure Act prior to proceedings to an offence commencing after the commencement of those parts, regardless of when the offence occurred. The bill makes it very clear, in no uncertain terms, that consent for one form of sexual activity, that being sex with a condom, is not automatic consent for all forms of sexual activity, namely sex without a condom.

As I have previously outlined, data collected by the Medical Sexual Health Centre in 2018 highlighted just how common the vile act of stealthing really is. Of more than 2,200 women and men aged 18 and over who presented to the clinic and who agreed to participate in the Monash University study, 32 per cent of women and 19 per cent of men reported being stealthed on at least one occasion. While in that particular study, at least, sex workers represented a big cohort of female victims, this is not a contemporary phenomenon unique to sex work. According to statistics, stealthing is prevalent in modern dating.

Of course, stealthing does not happen just to women either: 67 per cent of male respondents to that university study reported experiencing stealthing after meeting their partner online on dating forums. Quite frankly, it is irrelevant whether you are on a date, whether you are working, or whether you have met someone and you find yourselves in that intimate moment: stealthing is an appalling thing to do to any person.

This bill will give the victims the confidence to come forward, because we know that a majority of them have suffered in silence in the past. Only 1 per cent of victims reported to the Monash study that they had made a police complaint. Even victims themselves are left confused or helpless, so it is time we set the record straight.

Many people I have spoken to have been just as horrified as I have and inevitably ask, 'Why would somebody stealth?' Perhaps it is prioritising their own sexual gratification over the other person, or an act of degradation. Perhaps these people lie to themselves about what they are doing and think that it does not make it a criminal offence and does not make them a rapist. It is time that we spell it out for them.

The very existence of this law will draw a clear line in the sand: if you cross that line, you will be committing a very, very serious crime. If you cross that line, you are facing rape charges and a maximum penalty of life in prison. Let us make it abundantly clear to all those who feel justified in their head that it is not a big deal, because we know that rape does not have to be a forceful or violent act for it to be rape.

Stealthing is a vulgar practice with potentially serious consequences for the victim, both physical and psychological. From a public health perspective, the consequences include the possibility of contracting sexually transmitted infections and unwanted pregnancies. From a mental health perspective, the consequences can obviously include anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder and worse.

We, as lawmakers, indicated previously in this place our intent to send a very strong and clear message to the community that acts like this could see you go to prison. It is my sincere wish

that we now fulfil those commitments and that new members in this place have the opportunity to consider the debate that was had previously, and the bill that is before them, and to clear up once and for all this very blurred line so that it exists no longer. We do not need to let this issue linger unaddressed. I think it is time we got on with it.

If there are other issues that this government or the Attorney wants to pursue in this area then we can do so, but I think that this is a bill that warrants a swift passage through this place, a standalone bill which makes it clear that this behaviour will not be tolerated. With those words, I look forward to the support once again of this place for this most important piece of legislation.

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

Motions

PROHIBITED PERSONS REGULATIONS

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No.7: Ms Bonaros to move:

That the regulations made under the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016, concerning prohibited persons, made on 3 February 2022 and laid on the table of this council on 3 May 2022, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:03): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

YOUTH JUSTICE

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 9: Ms Bonaros to move:

That the miscellaneous regulations under the Youth Justice Administration Act 2016, made on 3 February 2022 and laid on the table of this council on 3 May 2022, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:03): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

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

A quorum having been formed:

PARTHENON SCULPTURES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the Parthenon in Greece is an iconic monument of significant Greek cultural heritage and of outstanding universal value as a World Heritage site.
2. Recognises that the Parthenon sculptures—integral parts of the Parthenon—were illicitly removed in an act of archaeological destruction and theft by Thomas Bruce, the 7th Earl of Elgin, from 1801-1804, transported to London and then sold to the British Government in 1816.
3. Does not recognise the British Museum trustees and the British government's claims of legal title to the sections of the Panathenaic frieze, pedimental sculptures and the metopes originally belonging to the Parthenon and which were looted by the Earl of Elgin.
4. Recognises the UN General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution introduced by Greece in December 2021 for the return or restitution of cultural property to the countries of origin.
5. Supports the recommendation of United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation's (UNESCO) Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation (ICPRCP) in May 2022, calling on the United Kingdom to urgently enter bona fide dialogue with Greece to reach a satisfactory settlement to return the priceless sculptures.
6. Supports the Greek government, the International Association for the Reunification of the Parthenon Sculptures and other groups and innumerable individuals from around the world, including Australia, demanding the British Museum returns and reunites its sections of the

Parthenon sculptures with those parts on display in the Parthenon Gallery in the magnificent Acropolis Museum, in proximity to and within view of the Parthenon.

7. Calls on the President of the Legislative Council to write to:
- (a) the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the Rt Hon Boris Johnson;
 - (b) the Lord Mayor of London, the Rt Hon Vincent Keaveny; and
 - (c) the Board of Trustees of the British Museum;

to express the views of this council and request that the British Museum and the government of the United Kingdom, in an act of universal goodwill, forthwith take steps to permit the reunification of the Parthenon sculptures to their legitimate permanent historic home, Athens, Greece.

(Continued from 6 July 2022.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:08): I place on the record that the government will be supporting this motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:08): It should come as no surprise to members that I support this motion not only in my capacity as an SA-Best member—and I thank my honourable colleague for doing so—but also as someone who is very proud of her Greek heritage and culture and knows how important this is to her community both here and abroad. I once again thank my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo for raising this issue. Maybe I should have thought to do so, but I did not.

I note that in more recent times there have been all sorts of discussions taking place around this issue and one of those I read recently—I am not sure whether or not my colleague referred to in his contribution—was this notion of sharing our iconic monuments and perhaps having a split arrangement between Greece and the UK in terms of where they live. I think overwhelmingly it is acknowledged and there is very broad support for those monuments to be returned to their rightful place and rightful place of heritage, and that movement has progressed in terms of ensuring that that happens.

I note in the motion that that also includes writing to the Prime Minister of the UK, writing to the Lord Mayor of London and writing to the Board of Trustees of the British Museum to express the views of this council (and in supporting this motion that is what we are supporting) and requesting that the British Museum and government of the UK, in an act of universal goodwill, takes steps to permit the reunification of those sculptures to their legitimate, permanent historic home, namely, Athens, Greece. That is certainly something that I welcome and support overwhelmingly. I know it is something that Greek Australians are very passionate about, as are Greeks in Greece. People all over the world are passionate about seeing those items reunified with their historic home in Greece.

With those words, I again thank my colleague for putting up this important motion and look forward to its passage through this place. As part of my contribution I will move an amendment standing in my name, namely:

Paragraph 7, subparagraph (a):

Leave out 'Boris Johnson' and insert 'Elizabeth Truss'.

We are changing the name of one Prime Minister with the name of another.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:12): I rise today on behalf of the opposition to speak to the private member's motion moved by the Hon. Frank Pangallo about the Parthenon sculptures housed at the British Museum in London. I acknowledge that the Hon. Frank Pangallo is very passionate about this issue and is calling on the Legislative Council to express its support for the reunification of the Parthenon sculptures and demand their return to Greece.

While considering the comprehensive contributions by the Hon. Frank Pangallo and other honourable members, I would like to particularly highlight the South Australian connection to this international issue and acknowledge that the Parthenon in Greece is an iconic monument of significant Greek cultural heritage and of universal value as an outstanding World Heritage site.

In October 2014, the Foundation for Hellenic Studies in South Australia created its first social media campaign to raise awareness about the dispute between Greece and the United Kingdom

over the Parthenon sculptures, or the Parthenon Marbles. The Foundation for Hellenic Studies advocated for the return of the Parthenon Marbles with the #returnthemarbles campaign, which received an overwhelming response on Facebook and social media.

As part of the campaign, the foundation also backed a very creative billboard advertisement just a few hundred metres from the British Museum in London. The billboard highlighted the contributions Ancient Greece made to modern democratic life and showed the image of a naked male statue with a strategically placed message saying, 'Please give us back our marbles.' In October 2015, the foundation successfully worked with the Greek government to secure 14 replica pieces to be displayed for 100 days at the Adelaide Festival Centre during the Festival of Arts 2015.

It is important for us to acknowledge that the dispute regarding the Parthenon sculptures remains an emotive and passionate pursuit for the Australian Greek community. On behalf of the Liberal Party, I would like to thank the many community leaders and organisations, such as the Foundation for Hellenic Arts, for their advocacy on this important topic.

I thank the Hon. Frank Pangallo for moving this important motion. I wish to indicate that the opposition will be providing multipartisan support for this motion. We call on the federal Albanese Labor government to join the growing international movement demanding the return of the Parthenon sculptures to Greece.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:15): I would like to thank the two honourable members for their contributions to this motion: the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Jing Lee.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, of course, sorry. It was so memorable I forgot.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: My apologies to the Hon. Clare Scriven.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I thank both Labor and the opposition for their support for this motion. Somebody remarked to me, 'Why should we care about what's happening thousands of miles away?' There are reasons we should care. This motion is not only about the Parthenon sculptures, it is actually symbolic of the return of relics that had been seized by colonial occupiers—not just in European countries, but in Africa, South America and elsewhere.

We are now starting to see a growing movement where museums and large institutions are beginning to return items that had been taken illegally, stolen, or even bought by collectors, to their rightful homes. It does not get much publicity here, but I have been reading quite a bit about it. In fact, in the United States a wealthy philanthropist who had Greek treasures worth millions of dollars has agreed to have them returned to Greece.

We have seen the Benin sculptures, as I mentioned in my speech, which are now being returned by various countries in Europe that had them. More recently, there was a demand from the Egyptians that the Rosetta Stone be returned to its rightful home. There is a growing movement around the world for relics to be returned.

We also saw—and it was heartening, welcoming and tragic of course to see this had happened more than 100 years ago—the remains of our First Nations descendants that had been transported to museums, particularly in the United Kingdom, have now been returned to Australia. This is heartening to see, and it is just another indication of the way things have changed and the attitudes have changed about relics that have been taken, whether artistic ones or even human remains. I think that particular example, where the remains of thousands of Indigenous people have now been returned to Australia, is perhaps an indicator of why we should be supporting motions like this, and many others.

In closing, I will say that in a month I will be meeting with Professor Stampolidis, who is the General Director of the Acropolis Museum in Athens, to convey the Legislative Council's support for

the return of the sculptures. Professor Stampolidis is well aware of what we are doing here today, and they are extremely appreciative and supportive of that. With that, thank you very much.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

WORLD TOURISM DAY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:21): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that 27 September is World Tourism Day;
2. Supports the sector's strategy to increase South Australia's visitor economy to an annual \$12.8 billion by 2030; and
3. Commends the Marshall Liberal government for its investment in infrastructure and marketing to encourage the sector's continuing growth and to help it manage the disruption caused by the loss of international and interstate visitation during COVID-19.

I am delighted to rise today to move this private member's motion to acknowledge World Tourism Day 2022. World Tourism Day is held every year on 27 September by the United Nations World Tourism Organization. UNWTO is a leading international organisation promoting tourism as a driver of economic growth, inclusive development and environmental sustainability. The UNWTO offers leadership and support to the tourism sector in advancing knowledge and tourism policies worldwide.

This year, the theme for World Tourism Day is Rethinking Tourism, highlighting the opportunity to look to the future and challenge traditional tourism models. Rethinking tourism means putting people and the planet first and bringing stakeholders from governments, businesses and local communities together around a shared vision for a more sustainable, inclusive and resilient sector.

We all know the incredible challenges and stress that the global COVID pandemic played on the tourism sector over the last few years. As shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, I am grateful for the opportunity to meet with stakeholders and operators from across the sector and hear firsthand the challenges and opportunities as they see them on the ground. Sustainability, inclusivity and resilience are key themes that are constantly raised as we continue to focus on rebuilding and rebounding from the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic.

It is absolutely fantastic to see the latest figures from Tourism Research Australia, released yesterday for the year ending June 2022. The report shows that South Australia's recovery is well ahead of the national average. It is important to give credit where credit is due. Thanks to our hardworking tourism sector in South Australia and the policy settings and initiatives established by the former Marshall Liberal government, we are able to have these encouraging results.

The industry praised the Great State Voucher and Regional Visitor Strategy as key initiatives that provide incentives for South Australians to travel and for operators to have the road map for navigating the challenges out of the pandemic. These important measures the former Liberal government invested in help deliver continuous dividends, as total visitor expenditure in South Australia came to \$6.2 billion, up from a COVID low of \$4.4 billion in March 2021. Recent results show the international visitor spend has also increased to \$272 million. We have seen the best interstate spend since the beginning of the pandemic at \$1.9 billion and the intrastate spend remained strong at \$2.5 billion.

These are all heartening results and certainly make for a wonderful celebration of World Tourism Day in South Australia; however, we still have a long way to go before reaching our pre-pandemic high of \$8.9 billion. South Australia has an ambitious target for growing our visitor economy to \$12.8 billion by 2030, which is set out in the South Australian Visitor Economy Sector Plan.

This comprehensive plan was launched by the SA Tourism Commission under the former Marshall Liberal government in August 2019, with broad consultation and comprehensive input from the tourism industry. The South Australian Visitor Economy Sector Plan harnesses resilience, adaptability, innovative thinking and collaboration that will help to build the prosperity of regional tourism.

We know that tourism is one of the world's most important economic sectors, employing one in every 10 people on earth and providing livelihoods to hundreds of millions more. The tourism sector is just as important in South Australia, as it is a key driver of our economy, particularly in our regions. Much of the economic benefits it brings to the state flows to regional communities and has a positive impact on other industries, such as agriculture, wine, retail, education, real estate and transport.

We should take this opportunity today to commend the former Marshall Liberal government for its significant investment in South Australia's tourism industry, supporting businesses, protecting jobs and increasing marketing to boost the number of visitors to our state, filling our hotels, restaurants and shops. Reflecting on what the former Liberal government has achieved, for instance, within two years of coming to government, annual tourism spending had increased from \$6.8 billion to \$8.1 billion, employing over 40,000 people across 18,000 local businesses.

The Marshall Liberal government built new tourism infrastructure and supported private tourism investment through initiatives such as the \$20 million Tourism Industry Development Fund. Through this fund we worked with industry stakeholders and operators which supported a total of 114 regional tourism development projects. Our investment in tourism helped unlock \$82.7 million worth of new and improved tourism infrastructure.

Under the leadership of the Marshall Liberal government we also doubled the state's event bid fund to \$90 million over four years, enabling South Australia to strategically attract new and more lucrative events to our wonderful state and establish a new and exciting arts festival called Illuminate Adelaide. During the COVID-19 pandemic we stood shoulder to shoulder with businesses, providing millions in direct financial support, and the Great State Voucher scheme saw almost \$65 million flow into the pockets of our hardworking operators.

As we know, there are many small businesses operating within the tourism and hospitality sectors. I commend the Marshall Liberal government for scrapping the payroll tax for all small business in South Australia. Our policy benefited more than 3,200 small businesses and more than 135,000 microbusinesses and sole traders in South Australia. We helped businesses to have the confidence to take on more staff, create more jobs, knowing that they will not be hit with extra tax as soon as they employ more South Australians.

While we celebrate the success and aspirations of our fantastic tourism industry on World Tourism Day, it is a timely reminder that we all can do our part to support our dynamic and resilient tourism and hospitality sector to rebuild, to rethink and to reimagine and to have ongoing evaluation and agreement on critical priorities for regeneration and growth in South Australia.

As shadow minister for tourism and hospitality I would like to thank our hardworking and resilient tourism and hospitality sector for their incredible contributions to South Australia. I look forward to being able to continue working closely with our tourism industry to realise opportunities for our state that are outlined in the South Australian Visitor Economy Sector Plan and to rethink how we can work together towards a more sustainable, inclusive and resilient sector. I commend the motion.

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

ASSANGE, MR J.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

1. Recognises Julian Assange is an Australian citizen and a journalist with WikiLeaks who aided in exposing possible war crimes and civilian casualties in the release of documents which included Afghanistan War logs in 2010 and Guantanamo Bay files in 2011, supplied to WikiLeaks by Chelsea Manning, a former U.S. Army intelligence analyst.
2. Acknowledges Mr Assange genuinely believed his actions were for the purpose of:
 - (a) government accountability, transparency and integrity; and
 - (b) the broader public interest and for the interest of justice.

3. Notes that since the publication of those documents, Mr Assange has been forced into isolation or imprisoned over the course of 10 years, resulting in the serious deterioration of his health and mental wellbeing.
4. Recognises Mr Assange's impending prosecution by the United States of America constitutes a serious attack on the fundamental democratic freedoms of the press.
5. Questions the legitimacy of prosecuting Mr Assange in the United States through that country's Espionage Act of 1917, carrying a penalty of up to 175 years imprisonment; and whether the act should be applied to non-US citizens either living and/or working in other countries, at the time of any alleged offending.
6. Calls on the President of the Legislative Council to write to:
 - (a) the President of the United States, Joe Biden, expressing the Legislative Council's desire that he show clemency by intervening in the extradition and prosecution of Mr Assange; and instruct the US Attorney-General and US Department of Justice to withdraw all charges on medical and humanitarian grounds;
 - (b) the Prime Minister of Australia, the Rt Hon. Anthony Albanese, and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Hon. Senator Penny Wong, requesting they write to the President of the United States and the US Ambassador to Australia, Ms Caroline Kennedy, to express the concerns of the Legislative Council regarding Mr Assange's prosecution.
7. Notes a poll conducted by the *Sydney Morning Herald* in January 2022 which showed 71 per cent support for Mr Assange being returned to Australia.

(Continued from 7 July 2022.)

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:29): The state government notes that Julian Assange is seeking to appeal the UK Home Secretary's decision to extradite him to the United States. However, the government will not be supporting this motion. It should be noted that the Australian government has been clear in its view that Mr Assange's case has dragged on for too long and that it should be brought to a close. The South Australian government understands that the federal government will continue to express this view to the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States.

The South Australian government understands that the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade will continue to offer consular assistance to Mr Assange, noting that Australia is not a party to Mr Assange's case and nor can the Australian government intervene in the legal matters of another country. It is certainly the case that the federal government will continue to convey expectations that Mr Assange is entitled to due process, humane and fair treatment, access to proper medical care and access to his legal team.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:30): I rise to place on the record some comments in relation to this motion. We follow the same position as our federal colleagues, so I note the comments of the Hon. Simon Birmingham, shadow minister for foreign affairs, who has made the following comments already:

The Australian Government will continue to monitor Mr Assange's case closely, as it would for any Australian citizen in detention overseas. However, beyond providing consular assistance, it is important to note that Australia has no standing in Mr Assange's legal proceedings and is unable to intervene.

Whilst there is a crucial role for whistle-blowers and free speech, there are also instances of importance where sensitive information is kept secure, including to protect the lives of others.

I appreciate that some members of the public feel very strongly about Mr Assange's situation, nevertheless I believe that Australia should respect the rule of law in countries like the UK and the US.

Therefore, the Liberal Party will not be supporting this motion.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The PRESIDENT: Members of the gallery will remain silent, or they will be removed.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:31): I rise to speak briefly in support of this motion. I note, for those here in the council and those who may pay attention to either *Hansard* or the broadcast of these proceedings, that this motion does several things.

Firstly, it recognises that Julian Assange is an Australian citizen and a journalist with WikiLeaks who aided in exposing possible war crimes and civilian casualties in the release of

documents, which of course included Afghanistan War logs in 2010 and Guantanamo Bay files in 2011 that were supplied to WikiLeaks by Chelsea Manning, a former US Army intelligence analyst.

It also acknowledges that Mr Assange genuinely believed his actions were for the purpose of government accountability, transparency and integrity and for the broader public interest and the interest of justice. It also notes that, since the publication of these documents, he has been forced into isolation or imprisonment over the course of 10 years, which has resulted in the serious deterioration of his health and his mental wellbeing.

The motion recognises that Mr Assange's impending prosecution by the United States of America does actually constitute a serious attack on the fundamental democratic freedoms of the press. It questions the legitimacy of prosecuting Mr Assange in the United States through that country's Espionage Act of 1917, carrying a penalty of up to 175 years of imprisonment. It also questions the legitimacy of whether that act should be applied to non-US citizens living and working in other countries at the time of any alleged offending—indeed, the legitimacy of an American espionage act applying to every other citizen of the globe. It is extraordinary.

The motion also calls on the President of the Legislative Council, in this place, to write—write a letter or an email—to the President of the United States, currently Joe Biden, expressing the Legislative Council's (that is us, elected members of the South Australian parliament) desire that he, as President, show clemency by intervening in the extradition and prosecution of Mr Assange and instruct the US Attorney-General and the US Department of Justice to withdraw all charges, on medical and humanitarian grounds.

It also instructs the President of the Legislative Council to write to the Prime Minister of Australia, the Rt Hon. Anthony Albanese, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Hon. Senator Penny Wong, requesting that they write to the President of the United States, as well as also communicating with the US Ambassador, Ms Caroline Kennedy, to express the concerns of this Legislative Council, should this motion pass, regarding Mr Assange's prosecution. Further, it notes that a poll conducted by the *Sydney Morning Herald* in January this year showed 71 per cent of people supported Mr Assange being returned to Australia.

I start by noting that just last year the then opposition leader, Anthony Albanese, now Prime Minister, at the time called for Julian Assange's urgent release from jail. He said he cannot see what is served by keeping him incarcerated. The Greens could not agree more, yet sadly he cannot agree with his own words, with deeds to follow them up once he is in a position to do so.

As the director of WikiLeaks, Julian Assange received information from sources, and he published that information online. By doing so, he exposed the war crimes of the United States to the world. The crimes here are the war crimes of the United States that were exposed to the world. That is the criminal behaviour. What is not the criminal behaviour is the journalism. If the United States is allowed to pursue charges against Julian Assange, it will have devastating consequences on the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press not just here in Australia, not just in America, but across the globe. We have a responsibility to do all we can to ensure that that does not happen.

It is clear that there is widespread public support for Julian Assange to be returned to Australia. Across the nation, thousands of people continue to organise and rally to bring him home. My Greens colleagues, such as Senator Janet Rice, Senator Peter Whish-Wilson, Senator Jordon Steele-John and Senator David Shoebridge, have all been tireless in their advocacy for Julian Assange in the federal parliament, and I note that previous Senator Scott Ludlam certainly was similarly staunch in his work on this issue and continues to be.

Unfortunately, though, now that Mr Albanese is Prime Minister he seems to have fallen silent. He has claimed that he does not wish to exercise megaphone politics and, while I am not averse to holding a megaphone, if that is his imperative that is fair enough. If that is his style, that is fair enough. What is not fair enough is for him not even to pick up the phone or put out a press release once he is Prime Minister to reaffirm the views that the people of Australia voted for, thinking he believed and would take them from opposition to his role as Prime Minister.

He must get on the phone and tell President Joe Biden in no uncertain terms that the US must end this abuse of power and drop the charges against Julian Assange, but so far we have seen no action. Perhaps there has been some, but we have certainly seen none. I have to say that silence has been the great weapon in this now over 10-year debate. In fact, the government's official response now is that they have 'noted' the extradition order and that they would like to see his case 'brought to a close'. Well, so would we all. However, with silence that close does not draw closer; it gets further away.

The deeply troubling conclusion is that their intention to bring it to a close by doing nothing or being silent does nothing to prevent the charging, prosecution and potential conviction in a US court of Julian Assange and, as I say, it does nothing to prevent him potentially being sentenced for up to 175 years in jail, for the crime of telling the truth, of reporting the truth, for the supposed crime of espionage for reporting on a war crime. I can see who the real criminals here are and they certainly are not Julian Assange.

Julian has spent the last three years in maximum security in Belmarsh prison in the United Kingdom, and if he is convicted he will potentially spend the rest of his life in solitary confinement. All the evidence indicates that his health has deteriorated from the years of arbitrary detention that he has been forced to endure.

No less than the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment has concluded that 'in addition to physical ailments, Mr Assange showed all symptoms typical for prolonged exposure to psychological torture, including extreme stress, chronic anxiety and intense psychological trauma'. That was obviously also picked up most recently by the UK magistrate in the High Court, who accepted the expert testimony that if his extradition to the US were to become imminent, he would have the urge to take his own life.

Julian Assange cannot be left to die because our leaders think it is politically expedient to allow our so-called allies to exact revenge on a journalist who exposed their war crimes. It is as simple as that. We must intervene immediately and decisively to end this injustice. Writing a few letters or emails seems the least we can do as the elected representatives of the people of this state.

As WikiLeaks wrote in their statement responding to the extradition news, Julian Assange's freedom is coupled to all our freedoms. The Greens will always support a journalist's right to speak truth to power, and we will always continue the fight to bring Julian home. Indeed, I wish a few more people in power were willing to not just speak the truth but protect the truth.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:41): I rise today to speak briefly to my colleague's motion in support of the intervention to bring Julian Assange home, and also acknowledge the Greens' work in this space, both at a state and of course a federal level.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge Mr David McBride, who is here with us today. He is a former ADF lawyer and captain of Britain's elite Special Air Service who, in 2011 and 2013, served in Afghanistan as a military lawyer to the Royal Australian Regiment and the Australian Special Forces respectively.

Some in this place may know Mr McBride for his courageous act in speaking an inconvenient truth about war crimes committed by members of Australia's Special Operations Taskforce group in Afghanistan from 2011 to 2013. In 2014, Mr McBride reported his findings through the chain of command to no avail, after having seen the rule of law and rules of law being pushed to one side. In an act of courage he offered his findings to a journalist at the ABC in 2016, the material now known as 'the Afghan files'.

He is now looking down the barrel of a secret federal prosecution for the act of reporting a crime. It sounds counterintuitive to say those words, but that is, plain and simple, what is happening to Mr McBride. It should never be a crime to report a crime, yet here we are and here Mr McBride stands—just like Mr Assange. David stands tall in the face of a 50-year prison sentence if convicted for blowing the whistle on the ADF, having been charged in 2018.

Perhaps the greatest injustice is that despite the 2020 Brereton report, which published allegations of ADF involvement in cruelty and 39 unlawful killings in Afghanistan, he is the only one

to be prosecuted, and remains the only one to be prosecuted—the only one, despite those acts of cruelty and unlawful killings.

In 2021, a Senate inquiry report into the freedom of the press found that the Director of Public Prosecutions 'urgently reconsider, on strong public interest grounds' whether to continue the prosecution of Mr McBride. The press freedoms inquiry made a total of 17 recommendations, with Nos 7 and 8 involving a recommendation that would require a prosecution to establish unauthorised disclosure was not in the public interest rather than the onus be upon journalist defendants to establish that it was.

The public interest is at the heart of this motion. We have already seen the Attorney-General withdraw the prosecution of Bernard Collaery, citing that to do so is in the national interests and the proper administration of justice. Just like Bernard Collaery's case, the prosecution of Mr McBride represents a clear instance where the injustice of the prosecutions is strong and is clear justification for the Attorney to again use his discretion under the relevant legislation to discontinue its prosecution.

David's show of courage to take the step to defend our most sacred of values—freedom of speech, free press and the protection of human rights—and to hold to account an institution as powerful as the Australian government, also exemplifies right from wrong, and the power of standing up for what is right—the same, precisely the same as what Mr Assange has done. In David's own words, 'If not me, who? If not now, when?'

David takes pride in being a beacon of hope that fundamental reforms to whistleblowing reform are on the horizon. The Australian government is using the catch-all cry of national security to take away the public's right to know what our government is doing, and to remove their accountability to the people who elect them. Julian Assange is the example of what can and will happen to people who uncover or discover criminal behaviour in the depths of government administration.

Perhaps, like many of you, people have differing views about Mr Assange and this issue but, as was pointed out today, I think it is important to remember that this is not about the individual, this is about the principle and what we will allow or not allow to happen to Australians. We are seeing how governments will behave to ensure that the right to speak to the truth, to its corrupt, harmful and unethical conduct, are silenced and that the hardline prosecutions of whistleblowers, like Julian Assange, like David McBride and like Richard Boyle, are a result of speaking out.

I said earlier today that it strikes me as ironic that in this place we would be in a position to table and speak to the same documents leaked by Mr McBride or Mr Assange with immunity under privilege for the purposes of advancing a complaint into a wrongdoing, and assessing if an investigation is appropriate but, meanwhile, people like Mr McBride face 50 years for doing so outside of these walls for reporting to journalists in the name of public interest.

Like Julian Assange, David is being held to a criminal standard for the crime of reporting a crime, and the prosecution of the evidence will be done in the dark behind the thin veneer of national security. This is where democracy dies in darkness. We should be speaking up and we should be loud and clear that reporting crime should not be a crime.

To suggest that I am disappointed with the position of both major parties today is an understatement. What we have seen today are two major parties that do not have the backbone, that do not have the same courage as Mr McBride and Mr Assange, that do not have the intestinal fortitude of people like Mr McBride and Mr Assange, who have demonstrated that they will do what is right for the public good, and that the rights and liberties of Australians will stand first and foremost in terms of their actions.

As Tammy Franks has stated, they do not have the courage to tell the truth. That is an indictment on all politicians in this place who will not stand up for these individuals. In terms of where our political parties sit, and where the Labor Party sits on this issue, it is all well and good to say one thing in opposition and then, when your turn comes to shine and to do the right thing, you lie. You lie to voters as a result because there are many voters who would have supported you on the basis that that is what they thought you would do if you came into power. It is that plain and that simple.

Mr McBride has said publicly that he is not afraid of going to jail, but what he cannot and should not have to tolerate—like Mr Assange, Mr Boyle and others—is having his name, and his very good name, his career and his reputation smeared and dragged through the mud for telling the truth. None of us can begin to appreciate the effects that this would have had on those individuals, on Mr McBride, on his life, on his family's life and on the lives of his loved ones.

These things do not happen over a number of days. Anyone who has been the subject of any secret trial or investigation or inquiry ought to know that these drag on for years. They are destructive and they are soul-destroying. They impact each and every aspect of your life and they make it extraordinarily difficult. You become the victim of something that you are not responsible for. You become the victim of telling the truth. That, in my mind, is completely and utterly unacceptable.

I will end by saying, in terms of my other profession, that I think it is important to note that, as lawyers, we take oaths and we swear to uphold the rule of law and to conduct ourselves in a way that is consistent with those laws, without fear or favour. As lawyers, we have professional responsibilities that go above and beyond the responsibilities that apply to other members of the community.

When you raise issues, crimes or whatever the case may be, and you take those to your superiors and you try, in vain, to get some responses from them but you can see that nothing is being done with the information that is provided to them, then there really is little other option than for you to think about whether or not it is appropriate, whether it is in the public interest, in the public good, to disclose that information—to disclose information that pertains to criminal acts of violence—in the name of accountability and transparency. You do so not only because you do not want to be part of the cover-ups but also because you know that you have a duty and a responsibility to do just that.

As I said, I am extremely disappointed with the stance of both major parties. If one thing can be said today, it is that this is the first time this motion has been put up in South Australia. I suspect, knowing my colleagues, that it will not be the end. I suspect, knowing the fierce advocates who have supported Mr Assange, and others like Mr McBride, this will not be the end and we can expect to see the same until those injustices are corrected.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:53): I would like to thank the honourable members who made contributions today—the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Michelle Lensink and in particular the Hon. Tammy Franks and my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros—for their impassioned words of support and the way they have articulated what the issue is here and what is at stake. I thank them for their contributions today and also thank the Greens federally.

To say I am disappointed in what I have heard today from Labor and the Liberals is an understatement. I am actually disgusted—absolutely disgusted. It is just a pity that they have not channelled the spirit of the late Hon. Terry Cameron, who was commemorated today, because Mr Cameron was a member who stood on his principles and what he thought was in the best public interest. This is all about public interest journalism.

The Liberals' spineless position does not really surprise me. We have seen their indifference to other Australians who have been wrongfully detained, going back to David Hicks, who was held in Guantanamo Bay, and Kylie Moore-Gilbert, held in an Iranian prison for 800 days. Had it not been for the constant pressure from the media, who knows what her fate would have been. Right now in China, journalist Cheng Lei is being held, and we do not know why she was arrested or why she has been detained, and the overtures from the Australian government, past and current, are really hollow.

We are also witnessing swift about turns from the Malinauskas government compared to their words when in opposition, or even to the very principles on which the labour movement was founded. We are seeing state Labor kowtow to orders of their federal masters, those in South Australia—Senator Don Farrell and Senator Penny Wong, the foreign minister—just as they did with other motions moved in this house. If it did not fit with the position of the foreign policies of the new Albanese government, 'Don't go there, don't upset us, don't embarrass us. Don't worry about the principle, just don't embarrass us.'

The Prime Minister and the foreign minister, unfortunately—and I was surprised that I would see this so early in the piece—are now behaving like lap dogs to the United States instead of standing

up for human rights, the rights of an Australian being extradited for exposing corrupt conduct by the United States, instead of standing up for his democratic human rights, for freedom of speech, freedom of the media. They are happy for Mr Assange to be the convenient scapegoat, to be punished for exposing heinous crimes of murder, for doing what any journalist would be expected to do: tell the truth, expose corrupt conduct, demand transparency, report without fear or favour.

Sadly and shamefully, even my own profession is not prepared to stand up for one of their own in this country. They are reluctant to challenge our government and call out the US for what it is trying to do. The hypocrisy from the Albanese regime, the arrogance of the Biden administration, is so deafening that it is chilling. They will call out war crimes and atrocities committed by Vladimir Putin's army in the Ukraine, but when the spotlight is turned on Australia or the US for their war crimes, it is deathly silence and inaction.

I will hail Julian Assange as a hero of the fourth estate, a man who had the courage to blow the whistle on egregious conduct by a nation that is actually built on liberty. It is even enshrined in their constitution. It is outrageous that the United States can wield such significant influence on its allies that it feels it is justified in pursuing foreign nationals anywhere in the world under one of its own laws, the Espionage Act, which we do not even recognise here.

I want to thank the organisers of a rally supporting Mr Assange at parliament house today, led by Jodie Sard, who may be here today and I acknowledge her, and also the speakers who spoke so passionately about the injustice to Mr Assange. As my colleague has pointed out, David McBride is probably one of the most courageous people I have met, who is prepared to go to jail for a long time for doing what Mr Assange did: blow the whistle on war crimes by Australians in Afghanistan.

Other speakers included lawyer Stephen Kenny—an acclaimed human rights activist who is representing Mr Assange—the Hon. Tammy Franks and former Senator Rex Patrick. These are tireless campaigners for government transparency and the wrongful pursuit and persecution of whistleblowers. And of course, my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros.

I am actually going to ask for a division here today, so Australians will know which members have little conscience for an Australian being wrongfully detained and the lack of support for the principles of free speech, a free press—the foundations of our democracy. Journalism is not a crime.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes5
 Noes.....12
 Majority7

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Franks, T.A.	Game, S.L.
Pangallo, F. (teller)	Simms, R.A.	

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.	Curran, L.A.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B. (teller)
Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M.	Wortley, R.P.

Motion thus negatived.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO 2) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:06): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to

amend the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015 and the Youth Court Act 1993. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:07): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Mr President, the Bill I introduce today is the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) (No 2) Bill 2022.

From time to time, an Attorney-General's Portfolio Bill is required to rectify minor errors, omissions and other deficiencies identified in legislation committed to the Attorney-General. Given the minor or technical nature of these amendments, it is often more efficient to deal with such matters in a single omnibus bill rather than in a separate amendment bill for each Act.

This Bill makes amendments to two Acts within the Attorney-General's portfolio, being the *Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015* and the *Youth Court Act 1993*, to address issues which have been identified by the Judicial Conduct Commissioner and the Judge of the Youth Court.

Turning to the substance of the Bill, Part 2 of the Bill makes two separate amendments to the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act.

Firstly, clause 3 of the Bill inserts new sub-section 11(4) into the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act. The amendment provides that delegation by the Commissioner of a function or power, because of a pecuniary or personal interest that conflicts, or may conflict, with the Commissioner's duties, does not constitute taking action in relation to the matter that is the subject of the delegation.

The Commissioner has requested that this amendment be made to ensure that complaints can be delegated in a timely and effective manner, noting that a similar delegation provision applies to the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner under section 77(4) of the *Legal Practitioners Act 1981*.

Secondly, an amendment is made to section 12 of the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act to clarify that the Commissioner cannot receive a complaint from a person who has been declared to be a vexatious litigant by the Supreme Court exercising its inherent jurisdiction.

Mr President, section 12(2) of the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act currently provides the Commissioner cannot receive a complaint from a person who has been declared as a vexatious litigant pursuant to an order made by the Supreme Court under section 39 of the *Supreme Court Act 1939*. However, it is unclear whether this prohibition would extend to include persons who have been declared as vexatious litigants by virtue of Supreme Court exercising its inherent jurisdiction.

For the avoidance of doubt, the amendment clarifies that vexatious litigants cannot make a complaint under the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act, regardless of whether they have been declared to be a vexatious litigant by virtue of an order of the court or under its inherent jurisdiction.

Mr President, Part 3 of the Bill makes amendments to the Youth Court Act to allow for the Judge of the Youth Court to delegate a judicial function, conferred on them under the Youth Court Act or other Act, to a Judge of the District Court, including a person who has been appointed to act in the office of Judge of the District Court on an auxiliary basis.

Section 22(2)(b)(i) of the Youth Court Act provides that an appeal against an interlocutory judgment lies to the Judge of the Youth Court. Prior to 1 January 2017, the Youth Court Act provided for multiple Judges of the Youth Court. However, since 1 January 2017, there has only been a single Judge of the Youth Court. Accordingly, all appeals from interlocutory judgments must be heard by the Judge of the Youth Court.

There is currently no power in the Youth Court Act for the Judge of the Youth Court to appoint an auxiliary judge or to delegate their judicial functions to a Judge of the District Court. As a result, the Judge of the Youth Court has been required to hear all appeals from interlocutory judgments, including proceedings in which they have had prior involvement and where there may otherwise be a reasonable apprehension of bias.

To address this issue, the Bill inserts new sub-sections 10(7a), 10(7b) and 10(7c) to allow for the Judge of the Youth Court to delegate their judicial functions to a Judge of the District Court, including a person appointed to that office on an auxiliary basis. This will allow for a Judge of the District Court (including an auxiliary Judge) to hear and determine appeals pursuant to section 22(2)(b)(i) of the Youth Court Act in circumstances where the Judge of the Youth Court may otherwise have a potential or actual conflict of interest.

Mr President, that concludes the measures that are the subject of this Bill. While the Bill contains a relatively small number of amendments, it addresses important issues to ensure that our justice system continues to work efficiently and effectively for our community.

I commend the Bill to the chamber and seek leave to insert the Explanation of Clauses into Hansard without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015*

3—Amendment of section 11—Delegation

A new subsection is inserted to provide that delegation by the Judicial Conduct Commissioner of a function or power because of a pecuniary or other personal interest that conflicts or may conflict with the Commissioner's duties does not constitute taking action in relation to the matter the subject of the delegation.

4—Amendment of section 12—Making of complaints

The class of persons who may not make a complaint under the Act is broadened to include persons prohibited from instituting proceedings by the Supreme Court under its inherent jurisdiction.

Part 3—Amendment of *Youth Court Act 1993*

5—Amendment of section 10—Court's principal judicial officer

Provision is made for the Judge of the Court to delegate a judicial function conferred on the Judge of the Court under the *Youth Court Act 1993* or another Act to a Judge of the District Court (including a person appointed under the *Judicial Administration (Auxiliary Appointments and Powers) Act 1988* to act in the office of Judge of the District Court on an auxiliary basis).

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:07): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991 and the Sheriff's Act 1978. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:08): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Mr President, I rise to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Civil Enforcement) Bill 2022.

The Bill amends the *Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991* and the *Sheriff's Act 1978* to implement a number of recommendations of a review undertaken by the Courts Administration Authority into civil enforcement processes in South Australia.

The Courts' review was undertaken in 2017 by a review panel, which included representatives of the judiciary and the Courts Administration Authority, representatives of the Sheriff's Office, the then President of the Law Society, representatives of the Attorney-General's Department and relevant solicitors with expertise in civil enforcement proceedings. A supplementary report was also prepared by the Sheriff's Office.

The Courts undertook the review with the intention of modernising and streamlining civil enforcement procedures in this State, in line with other Australian jurisdictions.

An earlier version of this Bill was passed by the Council last year, but lapsed in the other place. The Bill differs from the 2021 Bill in two important respects to afford protection for vulnerable judgment debtors, a matter on which I expressed my concern when I spoke to the 2021 Bill in the last Parliamentary term. These additional protections for judgment debtors, as I will explain, sensibly and equitably balance the interests of debtors and creditors.

The reforms progressed by this Bill are as follows:

The Bill inserts a new provision into *the Enforcement of Judgments Act* to enable a judgment creditor to serve a notice, to be termed an 'investigation notice', on a judgment debtor prior to an investigation summons.

Where monetary judgment has been ordered by a court against a judgment debtor, section 4 of the *Enforcement of Judgments Act* allows for the court, upon application by a judgment creditor, to investigate the judgment debtor's means of satisfying the debt. The investigation hearing is usually the first stage of enforcement proceedings and requires the court to issue a summons for the debtor to appear before the court for examination and to produce any documents relevant to assessing the debtor's capacity to repay the judgment debt. Failure to appear for an investigation hearing may render the debtor liable for arrest.

The Courts' review of civil enforcement procedures considered the use of investigation hearings to be unnecessarily adversarial and an inefficient use of the court's time and resources as the initial stage of the enforcement process. It was recommended that investigation hearings be replaced wherever possible with an informal process to allow creditors to attempt to directly obtain information about the financial circumstances of the debtor without the need for court attendance.

The proposed investigation notice is modelled on Part 38 of the *Uniform Civil Procedure Rules* of New South Wales. Unlike the New South Wales 'examination notice', the investigation notice will not be a compulsory first step before a court summonsed investigation proceeding. Rather, the incentive for debtors to comply with the informal notice will be reduced court costs, since the costs of formal court investigation proceedings are otherwise added to the amount of a judgment debt under section 3 of the *Enforcement of Judgments Act*.

It is anticipated that introducing this investigation notice option will encourage a collaborative approach to resolving the judgment debt, reduce costs of parties and the use of court resources, and expedite the enforcement process.

The Bill will also amend the *Enforcement of Judgments Act* to expand the scope of garnishee orders as a means of enforcing judgment debts, but with further threshold protection for judgment debtors.

Sub-section 6(2) of the *Enforcement of Judgments Act* only permits garnishee orders to be made against a debtor's salary or wages with the debtor's consent. The Courts' review considered this requirement to be outdated and inconsistent with current civil enforcement procedure in other jurisdictions, noting that South Australia remained the only jurisdiction to still require a debtor's consent to a garnishee order attaching salary or wages.

In relation to concerns about potential financial hardship being caused to low-income earners and welfare recipients as a result of garnishee orders, section 6(4) of the *Enforcement of Judgments Act* requires the court, before making a garnishee order, to take into account evidence of the necessary living expenses of the debtor and any dependents, and of any other liabilities that may affect their means of satisfying the debt. It is appropriate that section 6(4) be retained to preserve the court's discretion to set an appropriate amount for a garnishee order, which has regard to the individual circumstances of the debtor. However, to provide additional threshold protection for a judgment debtor (in circumstances where the requirement for their consent to the garnishee order is removed) the Bill provides that the debtor must be left with an amount that is at least 90 per cent of the 'national minimum weekly wage' as fixed from time to time by order under the *Commonwealth Fair Work Act 2009*. Since the national minimum weekly wage is a before tax amount, the Bill provides that the threshold protected amount is 90 per cent of that amount, in order to approximate the after tax equivalent amount. This is an improvement on the 2021 Bill, and one that will provide that the most vulnerable members of our society, where they find themselves judgment debtors, with a baseline level of protection.

A further amendment is made to section 6 of the *Enforcement of Judgments Act* to make it clear that garnishee orders may be made against funds held in a term deposit account, regardless of whether the term deposit has matured. While the Bill makes it clear that a garnishee order attaches to the term deposit account at the time of making the order, it also provides that payment of the garnished amount need not be made before the term deposit matures. This is the second variation from the 2021 Bill. Early maturation of term deposits often attracts fees or penalties, which in some instances are quite significant. If judgment debtors' term deposits were required to be matured early and incur significant fees and penalties, this could amount to undue hardship.

Section 6(5) of the *Enforcement of Judgments Act* allows the court to authorise the garnishee to retain an amount from the money subject to a garnishee order as compensation for the garnishee's expenses in complying with the order. This will ensure that in cases where a financial institution (the garnishee) incurs costs in terminating a term deposit early, the financial institution is able to recover the costs of complying with the order.

These provisions strike the right balance in respect of section 6—clarifying that the garnishee orders can attach and so giving certainty to judgment creditors, but staving off the unduly harsh effects that forced early maturation of term deposits could visit on judgment debtors.

The Bill amends section 7 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act to empower the Sheriff, by written notice, to require a judgment debtor or third party to provide relevant information or documents disclosing the interests of third parties in real or personal property subject to a warrant for seizure or sale.

Section 7 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act enables the court, on application by a judgment creditor, to issue a warrant of sale authorising seizure and sale of a judgment debtor's real or personal property (or both) to satisfy a judgment debt. However, before a warrant for sale can be executed, the Sheriff must establish the extent of the defendant's interest in the property and the proprietary interest of any other third parties, as well as their written agreement as to the proportions in which the net proceeds of the sale will be divided.

Despite these requirements, the Sheriff has advised that financial institutions (for example, a bank which holds a mortgage over the property) are increasingly refusing to provide details of their proprietary interests due to breach of privacy concerns. This has made it extremely difficult for the Sheriff to establish the judgment debtor's interest in the property subject to the sale order. This amendment to section 7 should address this problem.

The Bill also amends section 7 of the Enforcement of Judgments Act to clarify and broaden the Sheriff's powers to eject persons from, and proactively direct persons not to enter, land where the Sheriff is exercising a warrant for the sale of the land to enforce a judgment.

Presently, section 7(3a) authorises the Sheriff to eject a person not lawfully entitled to be on the land but does not authorise the Sheriff to issue a direction to prevent a person from entering the land that has been seized for sale. The Sheriff advises that this has led to situations whereby the Sheriff, having already ejected a person from the land at the time of the seizure, has been unable to lawfully direct a person to stay off the land or remove the person from the land until the person has re-entered the land, for example during an open inspection. These amendments will address this deficiency in the Sheriff's powers.

This Bill also amends the Sheriff's Act, as requested by the Chief Justice, to give the Sheriff an express power to request the Commissioner of Police to provide assistance with respect to any enforcement of judgment.

The amendment, inserting a new section 9DA into the Sheriff's Act, will also provide for a police officer rendering such assistance to have all the powers of a sheriff under the Enforcement of Judgments Act.

While reservations about the Sheriff's Office have been expressed in this place in the past, the new Sheriff and State Courts Administrator have my confidence. The new reporting practices of the State Courts Administrator to increase accountability, transparency, and visibility to Parliament have gone a long way to throwing light on the practices of the Sheriff's Office. I have confidence that the new leadership team will continue to work to restore trust in the Sheriff's Office, which provides a vital service for South Australia.

The amendments in this Bill will impact positively on the administration of justice, and are long overdue. They strike the appropriate balance between judgment creditors who have had their day in Court and won, and judgment debtors who may be in perilous financial situations. The efficiencies and modernisations that the Bill offers will contribute to the swift and effective operation of our Courts.

I commend the Bill to Members and I seek leave to have the Explanation of Clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991*

3—Insertion of section 3A

This clause inserts proposed section 3A into the principal Act.

3A—Investigation notices

Proposed clause 3A makes provision for an investigation notice requiring a judgment debtor to answer material questions and provide for inspection by the judgment creditor of specified documents.

4—Amendment of section 6—Garnishee orders

This clause amends section 6 to provide for the making of certain payments (including in the form of salary, wages or money held in a term deposit) to the judgment creditor.

5—Amendment of section 7—Seizure and sale of property

This clause amends section 7 of the principal Act so that a warrant may include a requirement for the judgment debtor to provide the sheriff with information relating to the interests of third parties in property owned by the debtor as well as a requirement for any such third party to provide relevant information to the sheriff.

The proposed amendments to section 7 also set out a series of powers (including powers of direction) that the sheriff may exercise in relation to a warrant.

Part 3—Amendment of *Sheriff's Act 1978*

6—Insertion of section 9DA

This clause inserts proposed section 9DA into the principal Act.

9DA—Sheriff etc may be assisted by police officers

Proposed section 9DA provides that the sheriff or deputy sheriff may be assisted by a police officer in the performance or exercise of their statutory functions. Proposed section 9DA makes specific provision for a police officer to be taken to have the powers of the sheriff under the *Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991*.

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

COURTS ADMINISTRATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:09): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Courts Administration Act 1993. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Mr President, the Bill I introduce today is the Courts Administration (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2022.

The Bill implements three of the recommendations made in the report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee following its inquiry into the State Courts Administration Council – Sheriff's Office. It:

- Repeals section 21B(4b) of the *Courts Administration Act 1993* to allow the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment to monitor and report on the observance of public sector principles and code of conduct by the Courts Administration Authority.
- Provides for the appointment of two non-judicial members of the State Courts Administration Council who can bring expertise in human resources management, finance, or administration to the State Courts Administration Council.
- Prescribes additional information to be included in the Courts Administration Authority's annual report including a report from the Sheriff on the operations of the Sheriff and security officers.

An earlier version of this Bill was introduced by the former Attorney-General in the other place last year, but it did not progress beyond the second reading stage before the conclusion of the Parliament. The Bill differs slightly from the 2021 Bill. I will explain those differences as I explain the Bill below.

Recommendation 4 of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee Report proposed repeal of section 21B(4b) of the Courts Administration Act which prohibits the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment from exercising functions under section 14(1)(c) or (f) of the *Public Sector Act 2009* in respect of the Courts Administration Authority.

Section 14(1)(c) and (f) enable the Commissioner to monitor and report on the observance of public sector principles and code of conduct and employment determinations and provide advice on and conduct reviews of public sector employment or industrial relations matters respectively.

Repeal of section 21B(4b) will mean the Commissioner can undertake those functions, and staff of the Courts Administration Authority will be reassured that the Commissioner has oversight of employment practices within the Authority.

The Statutory Authorities Review Committee proposed, at recommendation 6 of their report, that the Courts Administration Act be amended to provide for the appointment of two non-judicial members of the Council with extensive experience in human resources management, finance, or administration.

The 2021 Bill provided for 'up to' two non-judicial members to be appointed. This Bill *requires* two non-judicial members with extensive experience in human resource management, finance, or public administration to be appointed. Because of that difference, there are some consequential amendments to this Bill that differ from the 2021 Bill, relating to the appointment of deputies for the new non-judicial members, and to clarify the quorum and decision-making requirements of the Council.

The requirement for two non-judicial members with experience outside of the law is a fitting way to bring a diversity of views to the Council.

Finally, the Statutory Review Statutory Authorities Review Committee noted that recent annual reports of the Courts Administration Authority did not provide adequate information about important aspects of its operation, and was lacking in detail about worker's compensation, occupational health, welfare and safety, training, and human resources information. They also noted there was no report on the work of the Sheriff's Office, and an absence of a dedicated section for each division, as had previously been included in annual reports of the former Courts Services Department. To address these concerns (reflected in recommendation 5 of the report), the Bill prescribes this type of information to be included in the annual report of the Courts Administration Authority.

The 2021 Bill included a requirement for the Coroner (along with similar requirements for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Chief Judge of the District Court, the Chief Magistrate, and the Youth Court Judge) to provide a report to the Administrator about the operation of their Court for inclusion in the Courts Administration annual report and requires a report from the Sheriff. However, the Bill does not require the Coroner to provide a separate report for inclusion in the Courts Administration Authority's annual report.

The Coroner already has a requirement to provide an annual report pursuant to s39 of the *Coroners Act 2003* directly to the Attorney-General, which is then required to be laid before Parliament within 12 days of receiving it. This requires the Coroner to report on the administration of the Coroner's Court and the provision of coronial services, and must also include all recommendations made by the Coroner's Court under section 25 of the Coroners Act (that is, the recommendations made following an inquest).

As the Coroner must include information about the non-court related functions of that office, it is appropriate for that report to continue to be made separately. It is also appropriate that the Coroner's annual report continue to include both types of information in a single annual report, rather than splitting them up. For this reason, I have not included a requirement for the Coroner to prepare a separate report to the Administrator for inclusion in the annual report of the Courts Administration Authority, although this does not preclude general information about the operation of the Coroner's Court being included.

Further, both the Coroner's and the Courts Administration Council's annual reports are required to be provided to the Attorney-General on or before 31 October each year, and both must then be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 12 days, meaning that it is likely that both reports can be easily viewed together if that is necessary.

In addition to addressing the recommendations of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, the Bill clarifies the process for appointing and removing the State Courts Administrator. This is to remove any uncertainty about this process. It makes clear that the appointment is by the Governor on the recommendation of the Council and clarifies that the Administrator cannot be dismissed by the Council alone but must be dismissed by the Governor with the concurrence of the Council.

The efficient, effective, and accountable administration of South Australian Courts is an important part of the governance of this State. The reforms in this Bill will further refine the operation of the Courts Administration Council and Authority to ensure that justice can continue to be done, and be seen to be done.

Mr President, I commend the Bill to the chamber.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Courts Administration Act 1993*

3—Amendment of section 7—Composition of the Council

This clause amends section 7 of the principal Act to require an additional 2 members, having extensive experience in human resources management, finance or public administration, to be appointed to the Council, and makes related procedural provisions.

4—Amendment of section 9—Proceedings and decisions of the Council

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 9 of the principal Act.

5—Repeal of section 13

This clause repeals section 13 of the principal Act.

6—Amendment of section 14—Additional reports

This clause deletes 'further' from section 14 of the principal Act to clarify the operation of the section.

7—Amendment of section 16—State Courts Administrator

This clause amends section 16 of the principal Act to require the recommendation of the Council in relation to the appointment of the State Courts Administrator.

8—Amendment of section 21B—Application of Public Sector Act and Superannuation Act

This clause repeals section 21B(4b) of the principal Act.

9—Insertion of Part 4A

This clause inserts new Part 4A into the principal Act, providing for annual reporting by the State Courts Administrator.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Annual report

This clause makes a transitional provision applying new section 23A in relation to the whole of the financial year in which clause 9 of this measure comes into operation.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL 2022

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 September 2022.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:11): I would like to thank all speakers who have contributed to the second reading stage of this bill and look forward to it passing so we can finalise the bill and make sure we have money for the running of the state and the people who work for the government.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PRIVATE PARKING AREAS (SHOPPING CENTRE PARKING AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

Second Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (18:14): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Today I am pleased to introduce the Private Parking Areas (Shopping Centre Parking Areas) Amendment Bill 2022, which amends the *Private Parking Areas Act 1986* to prevent paid parking at shopping centres with a gross lettable area of 34,000 square metres or more.

The introduction of this Bill not only meets this State Government's election commitment to introduce a Bill into Parliament to prevent paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre, but it also seeks to assist both consumers and shopping centre workers more broadly across all of South Australia.

The *Private Parking Areas Act 1986* as it stands currently provides for control to be placed on parking areas (time limits, disabled car parking spaces, etc.), as well as for breaches of those controls to be prosecuted as a summary offence. Amending this Act is therefore considered the most appropriate mechanism to prohibit paid parking at shopping centres.

As it is currently drafted, the Bill provides that 'the owner of a regulated shopping centre parking area must not, without the approval of the chief executive officer of the council for the area in which the regulated shopping centre parking area is situated, charge a person a fee for the parking of a vehicle in the regulated shopping centre parking area.' Before the chief executive officer grants an approval, the council must consult with its local community and subsequently pass a resolution recommending that the approval be granted.

A regulated shopping centre parking area is defined as, 'an area provided on land by the owner for the parking of vehicles used by persons frequenting a major retail shopping centre', with major retail shopping centre meaning 'a retail shopping centre where the total of the lettable areas of all the retail shops (whether leased or available for lease) in the retail shopping centre is 34,000 square metres or more, but does not include a retail shopping centre within the Adelaide CBD'.

The benchmark for size of a major retail shopping centre for where the prohibition of paid parking will apply has been set to 34,000 square metres. This benchmark will capture the majority of shopping centres that are zoned Urban Activity Centre.

The Bill does not apply to a major retail shopping centre located within the Adelaide CBD to prevent businesses that provide car parking as their core business (UPark, Wilson etc) from being captured by the new provisions for providing parking for persons frequenting major retail shopping centres within the Adelaide CBD, such as the Myer Centre.

The definition of a regulated shopping centre parking area may capture owners of land who are not the owner of the major retail shopping centre (such as smaller shops). This is required in an attempt to prevent owners from restructuring their organisation to circumvent the prohibition. Should this present an issue, it is envisaged that an approval could be issued by the chief executive officer of the relevant local council that allows for fees to be charged.

I commend the Bill to the Council.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Private Parking Areas Act 1986*

3—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts certain definitions into section 4 of the principal Act for the purposes of the measure and amends existing definitions to include references to regulated shopping centre parking areas.

4—Insertion of section 13

This clause inserts new section 13:

13—Regulated shopping centre parking areas

This section prohibits the owner of a regulated shopping centre parking area (being an area provided for the parking of vehicles used by persons frequenting a major retail shopping centre) from charging a fee for the parking of a vehicle in such an area without the approval of the chief executive officer of the relevant council.

The chief executive officer may not grant an approval unless the council has recommended the granting of the approval by resolution.

Before passing a resolution, the council is required to consult with the community of the council on whether it is in the community interest for the proposed resolution to be passed.

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

NATIONAL ELECTRICITY LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (CONSUMER DATA RIGHT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

Second Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (18:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The energy sector is constantly evolving, including the range of energy products and services available to consumers. This range includes products and services such as solar PV panels and battery storage, energy efficiency audits and electricity plans.

In order for consumers to maximise the benefit they receive from the market, it is important that they have the necessary access to their information so they can easily compare these products and services.

In some cases, consumers may wish to have their information provided to a trusted third party to undertake such comparison for them. Consumers should be confident that this can be done in a safe and secure manner.

In 2017, the Commonwealth Government announced the introduction of a Consumer Data Right regime in Australia, initially in the banking, energy, and telecommunications sectors. This was in response to several government reviews which recommended that Australia develop rights for consumers to access and transfer their information in a usable format.

In 2019 the Commonwealth implemented the Consumer Data Right through changes to the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth)* (Competition and Consumer Act). Under the Act, the Commonwealth Treasurer has the power to designate sectors and datasets under the Consumer Data Right.

The Consumer Data Right provides residential and small business consumers with the right to efficiently and conveniently access specified data about them held by businesses. It also authorises the secure disclosure of that data to accredited data recipients on their behalf.

Accredited data recipients are businesses that the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission has accredited to receive a consumer's data from a data holder – only after the consumer has given their consent.

In 2020, the Commonwealth Treasurer made the energy sector designation instrument, specifying the data sets and energy data holders to which the Consumer Data Right applies.

The Consumer Data Right Energy data includes data such as generic and tailored tariff data, Distributed Energy Resource Register data (including details on batteries and solar panel installations), billing data, customer provided data and metering data.

In the energy sector, the Consumer Data Right will enable consumers to access a broad range of their energy data and authorise accredited data recipients to access this data on their behalf.

By giving consumers more control over their data and allowing them to share it with accredited data recipients, the Consumer Data Right for energy will allow them to identify better deals on energy products and services.

Energy retailers are the primary energy data holders for the Consumer Data Right for Energy. The Australia Energy Market Operator is the secondary energy data holder.

In 2021, the Commonwealth implemented the Consumer Data Right for Energy through amendments to the Consumer Data Right Rules, made under the Competition and Consumer Act. This included establishing a peer-to-peer data sharing model for the energy sector.

Under the peer-to-peer model, a consumer can direct a data holder to provide their Consumer Data Right Energy data to an accredited data recipient, in a compliant format.

Energy retailers, as primary data holders, are responsible for disclosing all requested Consumer Data Right data to the accredited data recipient. This means that where a retailer receives a Consumer Data Right request that

captures data held by the Australian Energy Market Operator (being the secondary data holder), the retailer must request the data from the market operator.

When an accredited data recipient receives a consumer's Consumer Data Right energy data, they will use it for the purpose that the consumer has requested. These purposes may include tariff comparison, energy efficiency audits and sizing of PV and battery storage.

As access to energy data has traditionally been governed under the National Electricity Law and the National Electricity Rules, Energy Ministers have agreed on amendments to this framework to support implementation of the Consumer Data Right for Energy.

The *National Electricity Law (South Australia) (Consumer Data Right) Amendment Bill 2022* I present to you today, seeks to implement these amendments, by making changes to the National Electricity Law to:

- add Consumer Data Right functions to the Australian Energy Market Operator's statutory functions, allowing it to perform these functions and to recover the costs of its Consumer Data Right obligations from energy market participants through participant fees.
- allow South Australia's Energy Minister, using the minister-initiated rules power, to make the National Electricity Rules amendments. This will ensure consistency between the Consumer Data Right Rules and the National Electricity Rules, removing barriers to the smooth functioning of the Consumer Data Right for Energy, and will ensure data can be provided (as per Consumer Data Right requirements) without breaching the National Electricity Rules.
- give the Australian Energy Market Commission, as rule maker under the national energy laws, the head of power to amend the National Electricity Rules for any future changes required.

I commend the bill to the Chamber.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provision

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *National Electricity Law*

4—Amendment of section 2—Definitions

Certain definitions are inserted for the purposes of the measure.

5—Amendment of section 49—AEMO's statutory functions

Provision is made conferring any functions of a data holder under the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* of the Commonwealth for CDR data relating to a designated energy sector on AEMO. The other amendment is technical.

6—Insertion of section 90AB

New section 90AB is proposed to be inserted:

90AB—South Australian Minister to make initial Rules relating to consumer data right and further Rules relating to disclosure of data

The South Australian Minister is authorised to make the initial Rules relating to consumer data right and further Rules relating to the disclosure of data.

7—Amendment of Schedule 1—Subject matter for the National Electricity Rules

An additional subject matter on which National Electricity Rules may be made is inserted into Schedule 1 of the Law.

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

At 18:16 the council adjourned until Tuesday 18 October 2022 at 14:15.