

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 21 February 2023

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

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers and questions without notice to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Bills

FIRST NATIONS VOICE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 February 2023.)

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (11:01): It is with great pride that I rise to speak in favour of this bill. In this nation's ongoing journey of reconciliation, governments have taken a number of meaningful steps in the direction of justice and fairness for Australia's first people. This legislation will see South Australia take one of our most powerful steps to date, one with which this government hopes to make a permanent and transformative impact on the lives and futures of South Australia's first people and their communities.

It is a big step and it is a reasonable one, but it is clear, from both public discourse and from the views of members in this place and the other, that there are South Australians who take issue not only with this piece of legislation but also the ideas and beliefs that underlie it. I address my remarks on this bill to those people in the hope that they will consider the perspective that I wish to put forward here today.

In doing so, I ask you to envisage your idea of home. Think of your family, your children, for whom, undoubtedly, your heart radiates with indescribable love. Think of your parents, your grandparents, your aunts, your uncles. Think of your dearest friends and your closest neighbours and their children and their families. Think of the land and the waters that have surrounded and sustained you. This is your place, it is the place you know and that you love. It is the place where you belong deeply and fundamentally.

Imagine that strangers turn up one day, strangers who speak to each other and sometimes to you in a language you cannot understand. At first, there are only a few of these strangers but their numbers quickly grow. Soon it becomes clear that these strangers intend to make your place their place. They are determined to stay on the land that has nurtured you and your family and the families around you since time immemorial.

They occupy more and more of the land that you have always known to be your place. They flatten great swathes of the natural landscape and start growing unfamiliar plants; they start grazing unfamiliar animals. More strangers keep arriving in alarming numbers. They are rapidly turning your home into a place you can no longer recognise, and there is absolutely no way for you to stop them,

because in the event that you try you are met with a violent response. Their tools of violence are swift and lethal. Your tools are no match.

Over time, these people take all of your place. It is now, they reckon, their place. Then they start taking your children. You do not know where they are, and you will never see them again. The colonists of this state and nation treated First Nations people like vermin who stood in the way of the free enjoyment of the land they stole. Those they did not exterminate they removed. Those who would not be removed they found other ways to alienate and disenfranchise.

Such a campaign of eradication is not just monstrous and inhumanly cruel, it is genocide. The colonising forces perpetrated a devastating genocide on the First Nations people of this land. They did it in other parts of Australia and they did it here in South Australia. There are those who say it was not that bad, but everything I have just described is fact. There is no other group of people in Australia to whom all of this happened, and it happened based on the colonisers' ignorant belief, extreme by any modern standard, that it is morally justified for one culture of people to be subjugated by another.

The colonising forces set South Australia up to look at our world through that frame of understanding, and over the past 187 years it seems we have failed to reframe our communities' understanding of that. This legislation proposes a pathway towards bridging the divisions of culture and identity that our past has created and that we have allowed to persist for so long.

The Voice to Parliament invites First Nations Australians to finally participate formally in the system of government that was imposed on them without their consent by the people who stole their land, massacred their families and took their children. It gives them an opportunity to help government shape the policies and the programs that have thus far largely failed to make enduring impacts towards improving education, health and economic outcomes for Aboriginal South Australians.

We clearly need that help, because all sides of politics agree that too much of what we have done thus far has not worked well. So much time and money wasted on good intentions, when all along we could have just chosen to ask Aboriginal people how they thought we should go about things. Aboriginal South Australians know what they and their communities need. We just have to be willing to listen to what they tell us.

That is not a big ask, unless you think Aboriginal South Australians do not know what they and their communities need. And frankly, if that is your position, then you share that view with the colonisers, and I reckon your turn is over. It is time to try another way. For the rest of us, a Voice to Parliament is an eminently reasonable proposition.

It is unfair to say that this proposal affords privilege to a group of people who are profoundly, structurally disadvantaged by the systems that were imposed upon them. What it does give them is a proper seat at the table when it comes to decision-making that affects them. That is not privilege. It is not even restitution. It is simply an opportunity and a dignity that governments have for far too long denied.

While this is a meaningful reform, it is not a radical one, it is not a world-leading initiative. There are longstanding First Nations' advisory bodies in plenty of other global jurisdictions. What is the alternative? To continue to refuse to listen to Aboriginal South Australians in any formal and meaningful way? Nothing will change. This government seeks to take the steps outlined in this bill because there is every reason to believe a formal elected Voice to Parliament will help create lasting positive change. It is impossible to dispute that change is needed.

A view has been put to this chamber that perhaps the desired change might come from bringing Aboriginal South Australians down from remote areas and resettling them in the city. Asking Aboriginal South Australians to leave their land and culture behind to move to the city and integrate—that is not my word, it is quite offensively used by others in this context—gallingly devalues the proud history and contributions of Aboriginal people to this state and this nation, and denigrates the cultures that First Nations Australians have preserved and sustained for tens of thousands of years.

Furthermore, plenty of non-Aboriginal people living regionally across many areas of our state experience lower economic opportunities and poorer health and educational outcomes compared to

their metropolitan counterparts, yet I do not hear many people telling them to move to the city. On the contrary, I hear people justifiably standing up in this parliament and calling for increases in the allocation of resources and greater efforts put towards improving outcomes for those people. Telling only Aboriginal South Australians that if they want a better life they should move from the regions to the city, sounds to me suspiciously like division of regional people on the basis of race.

Another view has been put that legislation such as this should be based on need. To that I can say nothing other than this: no group of people in South Australia is in greater need of deliberate, well-considered and a legally enshrined mechanism to drive structural change than Aboriginal people. I do not feel the need to spend time here reciting statistics. We should all be familiar with them already. From health outcomes and life expectancy, to incarceration rates, to university matriculations, to hiring decisions made by employers, our First Nations people are being let down at every turn.

The idea of opposing a moderate mechanism like this one aimed at providing Aboriginal South Australians an avenue of formal participation in government, in decision-making that they should have been afforded long ago, represents a disappointing misunderstanding of what was taken away from our First Nations people 187 years ago. It is such a saddening abrogation of a moral responsibility to do right by those who have been wronged for so long, those who are, remarkably, still willing to extend the hand of friendship and walk together with us.

As Prime Minister Paul Keating, I think, so poignantly observed of First Nations Australians in his Redfern speech:

They are there in the wars. In sport to an extraordinary degree. In literature and art and music. In all these things they have shaped our knowledge of this continent and of ourselves. They have shaped our identity. They are there in the Australian legend. We should never forget—they have helped build this nation.

Whenever we ask First Nations Australians to be there for us, they are. Imagine how patient, how generous of spirit you would have to be as a people to keep turning up for those who continue to decline to turn up for you.

Enshrining a Voice to Parliament in law is just about the bare minimum we can do to begin turning up for Aboriginal South Australians, affording them the opportunity to be formally heard by this parliament. To suggest that the Voice to Parliament is not about need is an idea based on the grotesque moral indulgence of ignoring how South Australia's history has unfolded.

This bill is absolutely about need. Every aspect of this bill is about recognising, understanding and addressing need. When there is need in a community, sometimes that need has a relationship to culture and identity. That does not invalidate the need. The concept of a First Nations Voice to Parliament finds a very welcome ally in veteran journalist Chris Kenny. He recently said that it is:

...wrong to claim this is a racial or racist measure—it proposes a representative body for Indigenous people not based on racial characteristics but on the simple reality that they are the descendants of the original inhabitants.

Nor does it confer special privilege; it allocates only an opportunity to offer advice on matters affecting Indigenous people.

It is advice we have done ourselves the grave disservice of failing to seek for so long. The shocking level of need that we see among First Nations people today is a direct result of decade after decade of misunderstanding, maltreatment and moral indifference. It was the colonisers who first consigned Aboriginal South Australians to a position of need, and it was successive governments, and their policies of displacement, of exclusion, of erasure, or of direct or deliberate harm, that kept them there.

It has been the failure of even well-meaning governments to take suitably effective steps in the direction of empowerment and elevation of First Nations people that has allowed that position of need to persist for so long and become ever more entrenched. This parliament has used our laws to disenfranchise Aboriginal South Australians, to make sure that they have no chance of clawing their way back out of the hole that we pushed them into. Every time we have had the opportunity to use our laws to help them get out of that hole, we have failed to ask them what gear they need to make the climb.

By stealing their land, polluting their waters and demolishing their culture, we destroyed Aboriginal people's ability to be self-sufficient. We trampled their human right to be self-determining

and now we might call them weak or lazy for not succeeding by the standards that we continue to impose on them. Some people in our community, even plenty in this chamber, are evidently happy to deny them that opportunity to claim back just a sliver of the self-determination they lost when we knowingly took it away.

Our history is riddled with injustice and cruelty towards Aboriginal people perpetrated by non-Aboriginal people, and now we want to talk about not making it about race? Too late. We made it about race 187 years ago. You want to talk about practical action? How about getting some advice from the people on whose behalf you seek to act. But for the ignorance and prejudice of those who came before, we could have spent the last 187 years respecting culture and identity and belonging, advancing understanding and meaningfully addressing need. The opportunity to do that in a way that actually matters, in a practical way, in an effective way, is before us now.

The Voice is a liberal concept and a fair idea. The idea of consulting people who are the subject of special laws and policies is the only liberal solution. Those words are not my words. They are those of Liberal Senator Andrew Bragg of New South Wales. This legislation offers us a chance to make the laws of this parliament better, to make them work better for those they intend to support, and to begin to repair the damage that longstanding injustice has wrought.

On 3 December 2020, Dr Roger Thomas, as then Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, provided a report on the achievements of his office to the South Australian House of Assembly. This was an historic event because it was the first time an Aboriginal person spoke formally on the floor of the House of Assembly—the first time in the 166 years of existence of the bicameral parliament that was built on land that belonged to Aboriginal South Australians for thousands of generations. There is no other group of people in South Australia whose voices we have worked so hard over the centuries to silence, and all that this bill asks the parliament to do is to let Aboriginal voices be heard. What person could deny such a request, such a modest request?

We should be thankful that Aboriginal South Australians are, after all this time, still willing to take part in the processes of this parliament, despite the unthinkable horrors that our policies and laws have forced them to endure. Inviting the voices of South Australia's First People into this parliament cannot harm us, it can only help us make sure that our future offers the compassion, the opportunity and the dignity that our past has so long denied them. It is my profound honour and privilege to be here now passing this bill when we finally begin to listen.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (11:22): I rise today feeling proud to speak on the First Nations Voice Bill 2023. I want to begin by providing a brief history about the Aboriginal Tent Embassy because of the significant connection it has to this bill. The Aboriginal Tent Embassy was the site of the longest protest for Indigenous land rights and sovereignty in the world. In 2022, it celebrated its 50th year of occupation. The opening paragraph of an essay, initially published on thecoversation.com/au website, gives a powerful introduction, and I quote:

The Tent Embassy began its public life on 26 January 1972. On that day Michael Anderson, Billie Craigie, Bertie Williams and Tony Coorey...drove to Ngunnawal Country (Canberra) where they planted a beach umbrella, opposite what is now known as Old Parliament House.

They erected a sign that said Aboriginal Embassy. The term Embassy was used to bring attention to the fact Aboriginal people had never ceded sovereignty nor engaged in any treaty process with the Crown.

As a collective, Aboriginal people were the only cultural group not represented with an embassy. According to Aboriginal activist and scholar Gary Foley the absence of an Aboriginal Embassy in Canberra was a blatant indication Aboriginal People were treated like Aliens in their own land.

Do we as a nation want our First People to continue to feel alienated? Parliamentarians and leaders in this state have a great opportunity to amend this sorrow.

The South Australian parliament has acted and introduced this bill to make sure we begin a new chapter and a new journey with our First People. This bill will recognise the unique perspective our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander brothers and sisters can offer. It will reflect the diversity amongst First Nations people. It will reflect the issues within our regional communities and give a voice to males, females, elders and future generations.

For the first time in history, this bill will empower Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to be involved in making the decisions that affect their lives in each of the prescribed regions in South

Australia. The functions of our Local First Nations Voice will be specific to each of these regions for the purpose of this act. To support Local Voices being heard, electoral boundaries will be established and people will be elected to speak on behalf of First Nations people living in each of the prescribed regions. The regulations pertaining to this act will specify and prescribe the number of regions.

To deliver change that embodies the diverse Indigenous cultures in our state, we must include the grassroots voices from South Australia's regions so that real and practical advice occurs. The functions of this parliament's Local First Nations Voice in each of the prescribed areas will:

1. Consider and discuss matters of interest to First Nations people;
2. Promote, encourage and help First Nations people to communicate their views on matters of interest;
3. Receive the views of First Nations people in its prescribed region and pass those views on to the State First Nations Voice;
4. Liaise and collaborate with the State First Nations Voice on matters of interest to First Nations people in each of the specified regions; and
5. At the discretion of the Local First Nations Voice, engage with local governments and with other organisations on matters of interest to First Nations people in its region.

Our local South Australian First Nations people will enlighten all South Australia about our history and heritage through the establishment of a Voice to this state parliament. I am aware that education in Australia has had limited teaching about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. I am sure there are members in this chamber who may feel this way about their own education experience. I think we can do a better job in educating our nation about the history and culture of our First Peoples than we have done in the past.

While students in Australia are currently taught all the basics of Indigenous history and can engage in various reconciliation activities, such as NAIDOC Week and Sorry Day, there is not enough focus on educating our students about their local First Nations communities. By improving our curriculum in this area, we will be giving our students a richer and more well-rounded education. In fact, this bill will put us all on a path of developing greater respect and understanding for our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander brothers and sisters.

First Nations people have developed over 60,000 years of rich cultural traditions that they express through songs, dances, stories, rituals, visual arts and other media. These traditional cultural expressions enjoy a great diversity among different regions: from burial practices to gods and goddesses that each tribe believes in, to the Gunditjmara oral histories, which includes the oldest Aboriginal story ever told about an ancient volcano eruption, and to Bora, the initiation ceremony for young boys being welcomed to adulthood.

While attending a service in the Pilgrim Uniting Church with many of my parliamentary colleagues recently, I was handed a brochure that was developed by a group named Walking Together as First and Second Peoples Group. Inside this brochure it described the 2017 Uluru Statement from the Heart:

...as a generous gift of reconciliation from the First Peoples to the Second Peoples of Australia.

In Australia, we will soon have an opportunity to vote to continue the process and journey of reconciliation by changing our national constitution, a change at the highest level and one which finally recognises the prior sovereignty of the First Peoples and the importance of a Voice to Parliament about matters that directly affect them.

As the story of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy tells us, Treaty between governments and First Nations people has been a very long time coming. In countries that have a history of injustice, there has been a process of truth-telling. Truth-telling about Australia's colonial history and the treatment of our Indigenous people does not mean that non-Indigenous Australians should feel guilty for the past injustices that make up our country's colonial history. However, it does require that Australians learn about the confronting dispossession of land, the unjust treatment and horrendous crimes that were carried out by some individuals and many levels of government.

More than 30 years ago, former Prime Minister Paul Keating said that the process of truth-telling:

...is a fundamental test of our social goals and our national will.

The truth of our First Peoples history is an important opportunity for Indigenous Australians to record evidence about past events and share their culture, heritage and history with the wider non-Indigenous community. It is time to acknowledge that history is calling out to us, not just here in South Australia but nationally. We have thousands of years of history and cultures that Australia must embrace, protect and speak about.

Our Premier, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas MP, when speaking on ABC radio recently about this bill, said:

I think it presents an extraordinary opportunity to do something profoundly good, a significant progress in the operation of our democracy, not too dissimilar to what we achieved in South Australia back in 1894 when we were the first place anywhere in the world to give women the right to run for parliament and vote. So I think this will be something that we will look back on in due course and say no harm done and even potentially a lot of benefit will come from it.

As the Premier reminds us, South Australia was the first jurisdiction to give women these rights. In the context of what life was like in 1894, this would have been 'out of this world' 130 years ago. Back then, questions were being asked, such as, 'What good would it do for women and their families?' and 'Women have husbands and children to care for, and this won't solve poverty and other social problems.'

However, history shows us that giving women the right to vote and stand for parliament not only created future policies that improved their lives but also made our society better and fairer. With this bill, the lives of our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander brothers and sisters will improve too, and Australia will be a better place and more inclusive.

I began with reference to the Aboriginal Tent Embassy, which is certainly a sustained symbol of protest and self-determination. It is a protest that stood firm in its rejection of the deceit and insincerity of successive governments. Here in this chamber we are leading the way as we transcend this story and change forever an oversight of such magnitude it is difficult to describe.

The Voice is not based on race or racist measures; it is based on the reality that our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are the descendants of the first inhabitants of this country. It has been a very long journey, and hopefully the whole of Australia, not just South Australia, can begin to look forward to continuing on that journey together. I proudly commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (11:36): When we acknowledge failings in our history and accept the wrongs of the past, we go a long way to fixing them and moving forward. The wrongs inflicted on the Aboriginal people are as shameful as they are well documented. The First Nations Voice to Parliament is one way of acknowledging and addressing those issues. It is a long path, but this initiative is a good place to start.

Nobody with any knowledge of our history would dispute the setbacks and discrimination the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have endured since colonisation 245 years ago. Even in South Australia, First Nations people have endured poor and often cruel governance for almost 200 years. Australian history is full of wrong and misguided decisions made for Aboriginal people, without their involvement.

The stolen generations are a prime example of this. Not every decision made in what has become a shameful scar in our history was done with cruel intent. Sometimes the administrators thought they were doing the right thing, but the outcome was just the same. The point is that, whether or not we had the best intentions, the sheer fact that we made decisions on behalf of people whose culture we are still learning about was always doomed to fail. It was based on a flawed logic—sometimes sheer racism, sometimes just ignorance—and we are well past the time where we need to start setting things right.

While many would argue that we have made significant advancements in the 56 years since Aboriginal people were belatedly recognised as full citizens with the right to vote, we have a long way to go. The 1967 referendum was a landmark in Australian history, but it still means Aboriginal

people were denied a vote for far longer than they have been afforded that right in the years since Federation. Denying Aboriginal people the right to vote for so long reflects just one aspect of how poorly the First Australians have been treated since colonisation.

Aboriginal people still endure worse health, education and employment outcomes than other Australians. In 2022, the life expectancy of First Nations people was about eight less years than non-Indigenous people in cities and up to 14 years less in remote areas. These figures are not just staggering, they are tragic and they show that we need to change. Whatever the reasons for those outcomes, our health system is not addressing the often specific healthcare needs of Indigenous people. Health and life expectancies are vital issues but just part of the reason we need a First Nations Voice to Parliament.

It is absolutely appropriate and necessary that Aboriginal people have a voice to this parliament. For so long, they did not even have one representative voice within parliament. It was not until 70 years after Federation that Senator Neville Bonner became our first Indigenous politician. There have only been 15 members of parliament at the federal level in our history and, sadly, South Australia has had only one, my respected MLC colleague Kyam Maher. It means that not one Aboriginal person has ever been elected to an electorate in this state—and people wonder why it is so important for Aboriginal people to have this voice.

The Voice will help Aboriginal people influence laws, policies and programs that affect them. It will inform decision-makers at the highest level and provide them with essential knowledge before making their decisions. The First Nations Voice Bill 2023 will put in place measures to enable First Nations people in this state to speak directly to parliament and have a voice at all levels of government. Under the bill, each region of South Australia will have its own First Nations Voice. Each region will be equally represented by male and female members. They will be elected by First Nations people—which, after the initial election, will coincide with state government elections—and will meet at least four to six times a year.

The state's First Nations Voice would make an annual address to parliament and would have a say in all bills of interest to the First Nations people. The Voice will allow First Nations people to speak with ministers and relevant chief executives about matters such as budget and policy within government departments. Instead of somebody sitting in Parliament House or in a government office high above Adelaide making decisions that will affect and impact Aboriginal people in remote areas, country towns and out in the suburbs, they will have input from the people who know best. Who would know more about the specific needs of Aboriginal children in outlying regions—their parents, families and local community or an executive who may never have been there?

We have to address the specific issues and often hardships impacting Indigenous Australians. Giving First Nations people a voice can only help. In 2019, a study found that type 2 diabetes was 18 times more prevalent in Aboriginal children. It also found that Aboriginal children were more likely to develop kidney disease and obesity. It is fair to say that the European health model may have tried to address Indigenous health issues, but it has not succeeded. Our best minds, whether we are dealing with health, education, jobs or infrastructure, can only succeed if they have the right information. The Voice will help deliver that information. Members will inform decision-makers, including Indigenous decision-makers.

In view of our problematic history, having Indigenous voices assisting with the decision-making process is not only preferred but is vital. Consider the Bringing Them Home report. This was tabled in federal parliament in 1997 and contained 54 recommendations on redressing the wrongs imposed on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders by a raft of race-based laws. That report, of course, led to the national apology that was stubbornly rejected by long-term coalition Prime Minister John Howard before Labor MP Kevin Rudd made it a priority in 2008.

The apology, of course, was the right and mature thing to do, but it remains a concern that some of the recommendations within that Bringing Them Home report have yet to be actioned 26 years later. These were wrongs done to Aboriginal people through legislation handed down by decades of government that were supposed to be there for all Australians. They were race-based laws that we shudder to imagine today, yet we still have not dealt with them properly.

The report shows that people of the stolen generation—that is, children forcibly taken away from their parents—have endured ongoing hardship. They are 50 per cent more likely to be charged by police, 30 per cent less likely to enjoy good health and 10 per cent less likely to have a job. It shows that more than 50 years after the stolen generation essentially ended, descendants of those people taken away from their communities are still impacted and they are still suffering. The Voice will go a long way to addressing those recommendations. It will also help deal with issues that have come up since and make this country a better place for all Aboriginal people. That, of course, makes it a better place for all Australians.

Just as Kevin Rudd did with the National Apology, it is time to acknowledge the wrongs of the past and to take responsibility for them, even if we did not actually and personally create them. Current generations could not have possibly caused that harm, but we can go a long way to correcting it. It is time to correct the wrongs of the past, and the Aboriginal Voice to Parliament is one major step in the right direction. It is far too easily dismissed that the Voice to Parliament could create further division between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people.

I reject that. Divisions already exist, racism exists, and it is not being rectified quickly enough. Sweeping it under the carpet and pretending that it does not exist will not fix anything. To suggest things are going okay and let them take their natural course is both wrong and deeply arrogant. Aboriginal people need to have a say in decisions that are made for them, just as every South Australian has a right to be represented. They need to have a voice, and this parliament needs to listen. A First Nations Voice to Parliament will ensure that we do listen, that the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are met and that all South Australians move forward on a journey together. I support the bill.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (11:45): I would like to start my speech with a very big naa marni. Marni naa pudni. Ngai nari Emily Bourke. Kurna miyurna ngadlu. Kurna yarta tampinhi.

One of the first things I did when coming into parliament, after going to a number of events, was to contact an Aboriginal elder to learn the Kurna language. At many of the events I was going to I was taking the time to learn the language of the multicultural event that I was at, but I was upset at myself because I did not understand the culture and the language our very First Nation, the oldest living culture in the world, that of our local Aboriginal people. It is something I am really proud that I have taken the time to do, and something I have learnt a lot about along the way, not only the language but the culture and history about our area that we all now call home.

I rise to speak in support of the First Nations Voice Bill and to congratulate the Attorney-General and his staff, and the Commissioner for First Nations Voice, Dale Agius, and all Aboriginal people who have contributed to the development of this bill. We cannot go back in time and change the wrongs of the past but we can and we should do everything in our power to make amends for those wrongs. Giving the First Nations people of this state a Voice to Parliament and government, a direct say in shaping the policies and laws that affect them, is an important step in making amends for the past wrongs. I am so proud to be part of a government that is prepared to do what is right, even though it might sometimes be difficult, because that is what leadership looks like.

As a government, we are committed to implementing the Uluru Statement's three principles: Voice, Treaty and Truth. This bill is a very important first step. While all Australians will have their say later this year in the referendum to change the commonwealth constitution, we do not need to wait to make that change in our state. If this bill is passed we can all be proud that South Australia will be the first state in the country to establish a Voice to Parliament and government for First Nations people.

The bill is the result of substantial consultation, and again I congratulate the Attorney-General, who I know has spent countless hours on this for many, many years, with the Commissioner for First Nations Voice, Dale Agius, leading two rounds of community consultation and engagement between August 2022 and January 2023. This includes both face-to-face discussions with Aboriginal people throughout South Australia and feedback through written submissions.

Following the first round of engagement, a draft First Nations Voice Bill was developed, and a second round of consultation sought feedback on the draft bill. As a result of community

consultation several amendments were made to the bill, and the result is a model that has broad support and where Aboriginal people had genuine input—just the way it should be.

It must be said that not all legislation that comes through this place is exciting or inspiring, but with this bill we are making history. The preamble to the bill is beautiful in its simplicity. It is simplicity in recognising the first custodians of this land, the harm that has resulted from colonisation and that our First Nations people have the right to have a say about the laws and policies that affect them.

It is a shameful fact that Aboriginal people are the most disadvantaged people in our community. They make up 19 per cent of the prison population, yet are only 2 per cent of the general population. While the gap is closing, the life expectancy of Aboriginal people is still eight years less than of non-Aboriginal people. Around 25 per cent fewer Aboriginal students finish secondary school than non-Aboriginal students. We need to do more. A Voice to Parliament and government is one way we can address some of this disadvantage.

When this bill was introduced by the Attorney-General, the gallery was full of Aboriginal people who had come to witness that historic moment. The emotion and joy in the chamber expressed by many was unmistakable. In this chamber we have the opportunity to do something for the betterment of not just Aboriginal people but all of us. This will help our community come together, and it will help us in this place be better lawmakers. It is above politics. Please do not waste this opportunity. I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (11:50): I rise to make some remarks on the record in relation to this piece of legislation. I would like at the outset to thank the Attorney-General and Mr Dale Agius for the opportunity to examine this piece of legislation. Mr Agius is someone I have worked within government, and he is someone who is greatly respected and has done some wonderful work. I would also like to acknowledge Professor Roger Thomas in his role and thank him for his ongoing advocacy for Aboriginal people over many years in his informal and formal roles.

There has been a history of a lot of great bipartisanship in relation to Aboriginal rights and progressing Aboriginal rights, based on the history of what has taken place in South Australia and Australia. I would like to acknowledge all of those who have acknowledged that. Indeed, the Attorney-General, in his second reading explanation, acknowledged that there have been advancements from both sides. These include land rights, constitutional recognition, the apology, the establishment of statutory rights for the APY lands and Maralinga Tjarutja land rights and the like. These are all things that we support and are important in ensuring that Aboriginal people have their rightful place within our community and in respect of their country and their traditions.

In principle, the Liberal Party supports an Aboriginal representative body. I would like to refer to the second reading explanation from the then Premier the Hon. Steven Marshall when he introduced a bill on 13 October 2021. He spoke on a range of issues, including Closing the Gap and the Uluru statement from the Heart. He said:

The national discussion about the needs for a First Nations' voice speaking to government and parliament has been gaining momentum, especially since the Uluru Statement from the Heart in 2017. There is a clear call for government at all levels to better engage with Australia's First Nations peoples and to find ways to formally include their voice at the highest levels of decision-making.

That particular bill has been reintroduced by my colleague the Hon. Josh Teague and is on the *Notice Paper* in the House of Assembly. It is a fairly detailed piece of legislation. I think it is worth reflecting on the preamble, which includes nine clauses, compared with the three that are within the bill before us. Part 2 of that bill has the following purposes and principles of the act. This is clause 7 of the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill:

- (1) The main purpose of this Act is to provide Aboriginal persons with a voice that will be heard by the Parliament of South Australia, the Cabinet, State authorities and other persons and bodies.
- (2) This Act also has the following additional purposes:
 - (a) to provide Aboriginal persons with an ongoing right to a seat at the table in respect of decision making by the State where the decision affects Aboriginal persons;

- (b) to improve the social, economic and cultural lives of all Aboriginal persons by providing formal means for the advocacy and direct representation of their interests to the Parliament, Cabinet and government;
- (c) to encourage Aboriginal cultural values to be included at the forefront of the way in which the business of Parliament and government is conducted in South Australia;
- (d) to support Aboriginal persons to realise their aspirations to determine their own destiny.

That is the position of the Liberal Party, very firmly, so I think that needs to be placed on the record. Of course, that model is different from the one which is before us. As well as establishing the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement in statute, it has very extensive clauses in relation to a committee which would have been the mechanism by which a lot of that consultation would have taken place.

For those of us who have spent any time in this parliament, the committee system is very useful. It can examine things in a depth and a breadth that sometimes is not captured by a lot of the debates that take place on the floor of the parliament. Largely for that reason, we are unable to support the version which is before us today, because it does not contain the same level of depth and breadth going forward.

In relation to consultation, I make no reflections on Mr Agius in this respect but the feedback that I have had is certainly that the model that the Attorney-General came up with last year was very much the one that was going to be presented to this parliament. I have had significant concerns expressed to me that this piece of legislation has been rushed. I know through my own experience with our Aboriginal housing strategy that that took a lot longer than we had hoped. Indeed, I note there was criticism from numerous Labor members in relation to the Marshall legislation that was tabled in October 2021, and the claim there was that that particular process was rushed.

I think for the parliament to be dealing with this legislation effectively within a few days of parliamentary sitting time is inappropriate in order to give due consideration to it, and the consultation on the legislation itself is disappointing. We have had Labor members say that this has broad support but I think there is feedback to dispute that.

In relation to our Aboriginal housing strategy, that was a process, as I have mentioned, that took a lot longer than we expected. We were hopeful that we would have been able to bring all the parties together and that took a significant amount of yarning, and lots and lots of consultation with all the communities to ensure that we reached a landing on that, and that was released, I think, in May 2021.

I say that because I think it is worth taking the time to get these models right. My concern is that this model is not the right model. I suspect, and the Attorney may well address this in his closing remarks in due course, that this has been brought on because it will place South Australia in history, but sometimes it is worth taking the time to get it right and letting history be determined by other timetables.

I would also like to raise the concern that has been placed on the record by SA Native Title Services. The criticisms that they have of this model, I think, would potentially also apply to the Liberal model of the legislation, but there is concern that the persons who are elected to these bodies in this bill which is before us might not have cultural authority. That is a huge concern because I think if we are talking about a Voice, most people consider that the Voice should be as much as is possible a consensus view, and one which has the support of the majority of Aboriginal people.

In the letter that has been written by SA Native Title Services, there are a lot of concerns that have been raised, including in a 10-page attachment, which I am not going to read in full, but which, I think more eloquently than I will ever be able to, presents a lot of concerns with this bill before us. It was written by a very significant number of bodies. On page 1, it states:

...the proposed model would establish a regional or Local Voice with no defined representation, linkages or accountability back to native title groups...

That is one of the principal concerns. It also states:

The proposed model will create new institutions, rather than investing in and strengthening the existing First Nations leadership.

We are also concerned with the proposed election process.

The letter goes on to outline that voting rules will limit Aboriginal people to voting within their region of residence, and goes into that in great detail. These are significant issues that have been raised. I do not believe they are addressed in this legislation. For those reasons, we urge the government to go back to a range of those groups and make sure that this model is one which does actually have the confidence of Aboriginal people in South Australia.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12:01): I rise today to speak on the First Nations Voice Bill 2023. According to section 8, this bill is expressed to be read in conjunction with and to complement the provisions of any other act that implements measures to progress Truth and Treaty, as identified in the Uluru Statement from the Heart. As such, most of what I have to say relates specifically to this bill but, contrary to how the government is presenting this legislation, we have walked down this path before.

One of the fundamental problems I have with this legislation is that it rests on the notion that parliamentary democracy is not capable of representing certain minorities. This is an attack on parliamentary democracy and principle. One of the foundations of political liberalism is that all citizens are equal in civic status, regardless of race, gender, religion, background and the like.

In fact, one of the South Australian Liberal Party's core values is to ensure that we will do everything in our power to ensure all South Australians have the same opportunities—a level playing field—no matter their geographical location, social background, race, religion, gender or any other factor. Effectively allowing a fourth arm of government, one where First Nations people will have a direct say on health, education, defence and other policy or pieces of legislation, is undemocratic. It goes against the heart of our democracy, that is, that all Australians are equal under the law.

As the Hon. Kyam Maher acknowledged during his second reading explanation, this is not the first elected Voice to Parliament. The concept of a First Nations Voice to Parliament is well known in our nation. It is well documented that back in 1973, the Whitlam federal government established the National Aboriginal Consultative Committee (NACC), otherwise known as 'The Voice'.

This consultative committee was similarly elected by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Maps were divided to provide electorates for the council and the council, when formed, was there to advise the then Aboriginal affairs minister, Mr Bryant, and his department on matters concerning First Nations people, similar to what is being proposed in this piece of legislation, although they did not include a provision to address parliament.

At that time, similar to today, the Voice was seen by some to be a step in the right direction to ensuring First Nations people could share in constructive proposals on matters affecting their communities and would be in a strong position to get things done. However, others had grave concerns about the plan. One person who had significant concerns about the proposal was Queensland Liberal Senator, Mr Neville Thomas Bonner, who was the first Aboriginal Australian to become a member of the Parliament of Australia. He warned that the government's plan for the Voice was apartheid. Senator Bonner stated that it was:

...going to divide Aborigines not only among themselves but also from the rest of the Australian Community. I would like to give warning that this is going to cause trouble in the Aboriginal Community.

This difference in opinion divided the nation at that time and continues to divide the nation today. Similar warnings are being made today by Indigenous leaders around the nation on a federal Voice to Parliament, representatives such as South Australian Senator Kerryne Liddle have raised concerns about its lack of clarity. Similarly, Senator Jacinta Price has accused Prime Minister Albanese of emotional blackmail after he called for people to consider Australia's international standing if a 'no' vote prevails.

Frankly, there are very few or no nations worldwide that can claim such moral heights in relation to their own histories that would entitle them to criticise Australia for rejecting the referendum. In any event, such opinions could not possibly be well informed when Australians have no details of the extent of the constitutional change or the real effect of the ill-defined powers of the Makarrata Commission.

Senator Price, an Indigenous Australian, is a strong advocate for the 'no' vote, just like Senator Bonner was in 1973. She has said, in relation to Prime Minister Albanese's comments, that:

His argument to suggest that the voice is actually a tool to bring people together is proving to be the exact opposite. It is a little bit insulting for a lot of Indigenous Australians to suggest that somehow we are going to be broadly upset if it is not successful. The truth is that Aboriginal people that I've spoken to—and there are many of them—would be quite happy not to have this over-arching extra gatekeep on top of all other bureaucracies that currently exist.

The vote for the National Aboriginal Consultative Committee took place on 27 September 1973, where 195 First Nations candidates stood for 41 seats. Soon after the vote occurred, on 3 December 1973, Mr Paul Coe, President of Aboriginal Legal Aid in Sydney, announced that he thought the NACC would not be successful, and I quote:

The NACC has no power of legislative review. It can only make recommendations, and there will be no guarantee that they will be implemented by the government.

Mr Coe said that the NACC was a 'good exercise in political propaganda' and that 'the Whitlam government is paying Aboriginals lip service'. What unfolded after this was a swift and severe fracturing in the relationship between the government and this elected body. In February 1974, the NACC made a move to change its title to the National Aboriginal Congress (NAC).

They sought to alter their remuneration to be above and beyond that of a sitting federal member of parliament. They sought to change their function from that of an advisory body to an executive status and demanded that the then Labor minister for Aboriginal affairs, Senator Cavanagh, give the NAC direct control of the \$117 million budget allocated to the Aboriginal affairs department. When this was refused by Senator Cavanagh, and he threatened to withhold delegate's salaries in the dispute of the future of the NAC, the NAC called for his resignation.

Relations between the congress, known later as the conference, and the commonwealth government progressively deteriorated over the course of its life, as its purpose did not align with the expectation of Aboriginal leaders, who sought self-determination and a representative body that would provide the mechanisms for this self-determination.

What started very clearly as a formal body or a voice through which Aboriginal people could make representations to the government, manifested into a fight over funding and autonomy. The conference was eventually abolished by the Hawke government in 1985. Since then, we have seen a number of statutory authorities, including the ADC (Aboriginal Development Commission), the AECD (Aboriginal Economic Development Corporation) and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC). ATSIC became a body known for its culture of mismanagement and flawed priorities to such an extent that its existence was abolished in 2004 by both major political parties.

History is critical, and it is always important that we acknowledge our past, that we learn from our past when thinking about the future so that we do not make the same mistakes. We must acknowledge the suffering of the First Nations people since 1788. We must do better when it comes to Closing the Gap and ensuring tangible, practical outcomes for Indigenous communities when it comes to health, education, safety and employment.

We must acknowledge that the Voice is not new and has been troublesome in its incorporation into government in the past, federally. Why would incorporating a similar Voice into the constitution, or empowering a South Australian Voice, produce a different result? Additionally, the current Voice proposal refers to Treaty and truth-telling, but they are not strictly defined. Treaties are agreements between sovereign nations and states.

There is only an oblique reference to a Makarrata Commission to supervise agreement-making. What sort of agreements? Why not clearly tell South Australians? Our first duty as parliamentarians is to preserve government sovereignty. We cannot in all conscience head South Australians down an unknown path that undermines sovereignty.

I think it is also important to note that including a provision to address parliament has the potential to impinge on parliamentary sovereignty and raises questions on who else should be allowed to have their voice heard. As Liberals, we believe in right-sized government. We believe in running an efficient government, one that provides essential services, a safety net and laws that form the basis for a free and fair society, without unnecessary bureaucracy or wasteful spending. The

functions performed by right-sized government are those things that are necessary to protect the life, liberty, property and sovereignty of the people.

I am predominantly against this bill because this piece of legislation will enable a fourth arm of government and create a fourth bureaucracy. It is another elected body that has the power of making a contribution to any piece of legislation that comes through this parliament. This is something that no other South Australian, except for those who are privileged enough to be elected to this place as part of the Westminster system, has the right to do.

This extra layer of bureaucracy will delay an already slow-moving government wheel, and it will do so because section 7 ensures the continuance of existing First Nation bodies around the state. This act will not reduce or replace already existing layers of bureaucracy. If you do not take my word for it, listen to the words of former ABC journalist and now InDaily columnist Matthew Abraham, who said about the Voice:

The 36-page bill reveals an expensive—\$10 million allocated over the first four years—and on paper at least, cumbersome and bureaucratically dense structure.

...The government will dispute this, but it is creating a fourth tier of government in South Australia, one that is far less accountable than our elected state, federal or local governments. It is hard to read the Voice Bill in any other way.

As Matthew Abraham points out, it is a well-known fact that big government leads to more taxes, more inefficiency and fewer practical outcomes.

The reality is that a Local First Nations Voice cannot be directed or controlled by the state or by the minister, as stated in section 10. At its own discretion, according to section 15, it may assist Public Service agencies in the development of policies and procedures. In other words, the obvious potential for debilitating disputes with government agencies will exist, and with it the enhanced probability of litigation. It will certainly slow down the functions of our state government.

Quite apart from my objection in principle, this bill establishes a cumbersome series of local and state bodies, plus at least four advisory bodies. Robert Gottlieb points to the dangers which lie within the Makarrata Commission to the property rights of non-Aboriginal voters. Will a Treaty remove these rights, either in whole or in part? And if a referendum succeeds, which body—state or federal—is going to have precedence in negotiating Treaty reparations? These are the questions that South Australians are asking and ones they deserve to know the answers to.

As a member of parliament, I also believe in the power of community consultation, and therefore I cannot understand why the Malinauskas government is pushing this legislation through both chambers before allowing the people of South Australia to have their voices heard in the referendum. I have heard the Leader of the Government's reasoning for pushing forward on this legislation. He does not want the risk of it not occurring, but is that not our job as members of parliament: to listen to the voices of all our community, not just a chosen few?

I have grave fears that this legally tortuous, costly, uncertain and divisive bill will not have any effect on or make any difference to Indigenous circumstances. History suggests this. Worse, I fear that this bill will destroy the concept of equality of citizenship. Every member of this parliament, in both chambers, on both sides, indeed all but a handful of prejudiced Australian voters, will commit themselves to any action that will positively close the gap. I enthusiastically join them in this honourable objective. Sadly, this proposed legislation is not the way to achieve this essential goal.

The views I have expressed are not founded in the luxury of an air-conditioned parliamentary office but are shaped by my experiences as a resident living most of my life less than 10 minutes' drive from the Gerard Indigenous community at Winkie in the Riverland. Winkie remains my primary place of residence. Some of my primary school education was spent at a school where Indigenous families made up approximately 75 per cent of the students, and I am very familiar with the initiatives undertaken by the Gerard community over my lifetime.

At their insistence and their local voice, a substantial art gallery, featuring Indigenous art, was established at Glossop and at the community's suggestion, the commonwealth invested almost half a million dollars in the construction of a commercial yabby farm. The list of well-intended and

locally embraced proposals goes on. These people have always been heard and their concerns heeded.

Sadly, much remains to be done if we are to adequately address their needs, but self-evidently much has been done and will continue to be done without the passage of this legislation. What we are debating today will, I fear, be just another layer of bureaucracy and just another cost with very little practical outcomes for Indigenous communities in South Australia.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (12:15): I would like to start today by highlighting my disappointment with the rate at which the government thought it appropriate to rush through such a significant piece of legislation in this place. The legislation will impact every single South Australian and change the way in which our parliament and, more broadly, our democratic society will function.

The government introduced and gave its second reading explanation on the last sitting day and seeks to have all second reading contributions completed today and the bill passed by Thursday. I appreciate that the government may have the support of the majority of this chamber and that the bill is likely to pass, but members of this parliament and the broader South Australian community, frankly, deserve more respect than the government has afforded.

The ability for members of this place to be able to consult on the introduced legislation for more than a week would have been, I would have thought, a good place to start if the Malinauskas government is, in fact, legislating a Voice to Parliament for the betterment of all South Australians, in particular, for the improvement of lives for Indigenous South Australians. One has to wonder: why has there been such a rush?

Whilst I appreciate that the government has a mandate when it comes to this legislation, as it formed one of their long list of election commitments, I put it to this chamber that most South Australians were likely unaware of this commitment when they went to the ballot box in March 2022. I think they were probably more focused on the chalked ambulances and scare campaign that was run by the Labor Party and Ambulance Employees Association around ramping. The slogan 'Vote Labor like your life depends on it, because it just might' tends to have that effect.

We are around 11 months into the Malinauskas government's term and there has not been a delivery on their commitment to fix ramping. In fact, it is worse than it was then. Yet, here we are today with the now not-so-new Malinauskas government urgently forging ahead with a state-based Voice to Parliament with a limited engagement on the final bill with the public and the view to having this done and dusted by tea on the third day.

I note the federal government is moving to hold a referendum on their proposed Voice and it would have been beneficial for members of this place to see the results of any federal referendum, where the views and opinions of the public, in particular the South Australian electorate, are respectfully engaged before this legislation was brought to this place on such an important topic, which this parliament cannot afford to get wrong.

I recognise it has been said on both sides of the chamber, but the way in which members in this place vote on this bill will have a long-term impact for generations to come. The support or otherwise of this bill is not a decision to be made lightly or to be made under the emotionally charged belief that a novel idea such as that proposed in this bill is somehow the only mechanism to resolving what are deeply complex, varying and generational issues that have impacted the Indigenous communities in this state.

In my belief, a Voice to Parliament seeks to create an unfortunate divide in our state, based on race. An important pillar of our democracy is that we are all equal: one person, one vote. We, here in Australia, have the privilege of electing our members of parliament. The South Australian community has the opportunity to elect a member of parliament that they believe will best represent their interests to create a South Australia that they can be proud of, a South Australia where opportunities are created so that individuals and communities can prosper.

People of our state may not always be satisfied with the outcome of an election, but come the next one, South Australians are yet again given the opportunity to have their say at the ballot box. With respect to those opposite, the establishment of a Voice to Parliament undermines the very

premise of equal representation, giving greater weight to a vote of one group over another and creating barriers to representation, based on race.

It creates a situation where, if you are of a certain race, you get two votes on election day: one to the South Australian parliament and another to the Voice to Parliament. Generations before us have fought hard, and continue to fight for, the harmonious ideal that we are all equal before the law and that all votes should be counted as equal.

We are a country, or at least I hope we are, which believes that your race, ethnicity, sex or religion does not and should not determine what opportunities you have in your life. The premise that one person's voice is more worth more than another's or that someone would not be given the same opportunity, purely based on race, is not the Australia I know. I cannot stand here in this place, particularly in this chamber that represents and reviews the laws of this land for over 1.7 million South Australians equally, and support any bill that aims to legislate for the creation of what is effectively a third chamber, based on race, at the highest level: our South Australian parliament.

This parliament must lead by example. If we expect the broader community to not discriminate or limit one's opportunity, based on race, religion or gender, then tell me how establishing a Voice to Parliament teaches our children that we are all equal? We cannot expect our children to be inclusive in the schoolyard and then at the highest level, our parliament, seek to divide people on race by relegating one group to a third chamber to advise us what is good for them, when convenient.

We are a nation which strives to be a fair and tolerant society, and the parliament must be the place for all South Australians, whether from Indigenous communities or otherwise. Creating an expensive administrative third chamber of parliament for Aboriginal South Australians sends the wrong message. It wrongly tells South Australians that the parliament is not for all South Australians. Arguably, it wrongly tells Aboriginal South Australians that this parliament, in its current form, is not for them. This was highlighted by the second reading explanation of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, when he said:

Far too often in our history post-colonisation, it has been the practice of governments at every level not to invite, and quite often not to permit, Aboriginal people to be included in, or contribute to, the decisions that directly affect their lives. This means decisions have been made for Aboriginal people and not with them.

He says that the bill:

...ensures the voices of First Nations people in South Australia are heard directly by this parliament and by the South Australian government.

He also says:

We can become the first jurisdiction in the nation to legislate for a Voice to Parliament and a Voice to government for First Nations people, empowering them to shape decisions, instead of being subject to them.

I put it to you that Aboriginal South Australians already have a Voice. It is in this parliament; it is in every single one of us. It is in our Attorney-General and Aboriginal affairs minister, an Indigenous person himself. It is in our federal parliament, where they have great Indigenous representation: 11 MPs who identify as, or descend from, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, all of whom were able to achieve this through existing channels and without the need for a separate body of elected members. Here, in this parliament, is the best place for Indigenous Australians and their representatives—us—to champion for their communities.

So the question really is: why does the government feel they need what is essentially an expensive administrative third chamber of parliament to tell them what they should already know? Why not just get on with tackling the issues Indigenous communities are facing, while hearing the input they have already received from the numerous advisory bodies established in this state, which this Voice regrettably seems to ignore?

While I disagree with this legislation in principle, I hold concerns on the drafting of this bill, not limited to the costs, electoral processes, gender allocations and the effect of doubling up of advisory resources to government. The legislation has not provided a clear outline as to the anticipated remuneration, allowances or expenses for members, let alone what the overall costs will realistically be. Nor has the legislation provided a cap on how many committees can be established

of which members can be remunerated. I query whether this is a blank cheque South Australian taxpayers are being asked to write to the government to create a Voice to Parliament with limited transparency and information available to date.

While the same criticisms around transparency and particulars have been levelled at the federal government in the media in recent months at least that exercise will face the electorate via referendum later this year, with voters able to determine themselves whether they have enough detail to make an informed decision on whether that change should or should not be implemented.

I understand there has been \$10 million allocated to run this body over the next four years, which I note would go a long way if it were put towards some other tangible meaningful solutions, perhaps some extra resourcing to assist with the poor health and education outcomes often facing Indigenous Australian communities, better measures around children in the child protection system, improved prevention of family and domestic violence, tackling substance abuse issues amongst Indigenous youth and seeking to decrease the disproportionate adult incarceration rates amongst Indigenous communities—the list goes on.

The way in which our parliament legislates and provides funding must be needs-based, not race-based. I highlighted in this chamber in recent weeks that the Alexander report, published at the end of last year on a review of child protection in South Australia, highlighted that, in addition to a need for increased spending on early intervention measures, there needs to be a deliberate and vastly increased investment in early intervention and family preservation services for Aboriginal families. The report notes that spending on Aboriginal children and services should be proportionate to their representation in the system, not the population.

As reported, South Australia currently spends 3.4 per cent of the child protection budget on Aboriginal community-controlled organisations, which is lower than most other Australian states and territories. The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2020-21 report on child protection in Australia states that there are 18,187 Aboriginal children in South Australia, who make up 4.9 per cent of the 369,658 total South Australian children. Nationally, Aboriginal children make up 6 per cent of the total number of children. Although Aboriginal children make up 4.9 per cent of the total number of children in South Australia, they make up 34.5 per cent of the children who received protection services in 2020-21, yet only 3.4 per cent of the child protection budget is spent on Aboriginal community-controlled organisations.

I therefore query whether the \$10 million allocated over the next four years would make a more tangible difference to Indigenous communities if it was spent on issues like this one, rather than on an expensive administrative body. This is \$10 million spent before Indigenous communities see any additional funding or policies from initiatives of the Voice? In isolation, in my view, this body will really not be able to do much to improve the outcomes of Indigenous communities.

To be clear: I do not believe that simply splashing cash is the solution either, but where reports, such as the Alexander report, already highlight the issues out there in some of these communities, it is not clear how the government's proposed Voice aims to solve the matters already known.

Another concern, as relates to the drafting of this bill, is around the electoral processes proposed for the composition of the Voice, particularly as relates to the appointment of processes where a casual vacancy arises within 18 months of the Local First Nations Voice election. In no other elected position to parliament, to my knowledge, would a casual vacancy be filled by the next person who received the next highest number of votes to that election, putting aside the party-political appointment process members engage with here in this chamber.

However, on a state electorate basis, if there were a casual vacancy, either a by-election would be held or, in instances of the Legislative Council or Senate, a preselection may be held internally within the relevant political party, but ultimately the decision falls back to the South Australian community to have their say.

To appoint someone who did not have a quota and therefore arguably did not have the support and backing of their community is not in the best interests of their community or our state. To put that into context, that is like if an electorate voted for a Liberal member of parliament who

subsequently retired and that position was then offered to a person who received the next highest number of votes in that election—the other major party, Labor. They may have only received, say, 30 per cent of the votes after preferences and may clearly have different values and vision than that of the majority of their community, but with this logic they would be offered the role and appointed to same—something that their community may be unlikely to accept on the whole.

Whilst it may not be a contest between the major parties, there will naturally be competing personalities, community groups and family groups that may play a part in the First Nations elections, which runs the risk that flaws in the system may lead to unnecessary conflict and division within the electorate. The State Voice will not only have a legislated right to address both houses of parliament on any matter it wishes but also a guaranteed right to speak to the state cabinet and to CEOs of state government departments.

It is my understanding that currently, unless the houses rule otherwise, only elected members of parliament have the ability to stand on the floor of parliament to advocate for their communities. I am sure there are many South Australian community groups which would love the opportunity to stand on the floor of parliament, all of whom have an equally important message to share. Like all of us, such members must run for parliament to be able to stand on the floor of this place to speak on behalf of their community. This legislation acts to change the very way in which our parliament will function.

The most recent version of this bill has also implemented an eleventh-hour change before its introduction, a proposal to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Whilst I appreciate that, unlike its federal counterpart, the state constitution is simply an act of this parliament which can be amended by both houses, I hazard a guess that most South Australians would agree that perhaps a referendum, or in reality a plebiscite, might have been a more appropriate manner in which this government could have put such a significant, if only symbolic, change to the South Australian people to ask them what type of recognition they wish to have embodied in their state's primary governing document. Notably, in the amendment it states:

...through the First Nations Voice Act 2023, that voice will be heard, and will make a unique and irreplaceable contribution to South Australia that benefits all South Australians.

It would have been advisable for all South Australians to have had an opportunity to give their voice on the Voice's creation. Notably, not all South Australians will partake in the Voice, despite this amendment providing for all. Furthermore, this bill ignores existing engagement methods which could and should better be utilised but instead deliberately steers clear of those longstanding bodies. One has to wonder whether the long-term impact will be the watering down of the voices of the many existing methods of advice provided to the government of the day.

In an InDaily article written by Matthew Abraham on the First Nations Voice Bill on 10 February 2023, he shared an excerpt from the magazine *America*, which states:

Before we voice a preference on public policy, whether in the voting booth or talking with family members over dinner, we should consider one question with two parts.

First, what are the costs of choosing the wrong policy? And second, who would have to bear those potential costs?

If the wrong solution is chosen, a problem will likely persist as before or even be made worse.

Something about this question has stuck with me throughout the very short carriage of this debate and, in the short time I have had, I have pondered over my position on the bill and the message I think it sends, not just to Indigenous communities but to the South Australian community at large.

I think, like all South Australians, my firm belief is that Indigenous communities in South Australia deserve a seat around the table to speak up about the issues that impact their communities, often disproportionately in matters of great importance. Where I differ is that my belief is that the table should not be pushed off to the side and relegated to some third chamber funded on a discretionary basis by the executive government of the day and burdened by bureaucracy and symbolism.

The voice for these communities is and should be here in this parliament as representatives of all South Australian communities at large and within the existing framework of our great democracy

that treats every vote equally no matter who you are. The very people the bill seeks to assist may very well be the people it disadvantages the most. As members of this parliament it is our responsibility to make sure that the voices of all South Australians are championed in our parliament. I think it is time that we refrain from virtue signalling and just get on with the job. A Voice to Parliament is not the solution.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (12:39): There is no doubt that we must as a state ensure better outcomes for First Nations people. There is no doubt that every person in this place wants to perceive better outcomes right across the state: better outcomes across health, education and justice, and within other services for First Nations people. This bill, however, is not about outcomes; it is about adding another layer of government, another layer of bureaucracy.

There are so many unanswered questions and a significant amount of detail that is lacking in this bill, including the cost, the operations and, most importantly, the changes to be made to the constitution to enact this proposed bill. We must have a better method in place to achieve better outcomes within First Nations communities; however, this model has so many flaws and concerns that I cannot support it in its current form.

The minister mentioned transformative outcomes in his second reading explanation. I have many unanswered questions about how this will be achieved based on the proposed bill. This bill is not the right answer. As well as creating another level of bureaucracy, this proposed bill creates division. The measure of success of this bill must not be more talk. There must be meaningful action.

This bill has not had appropriate consultation and scrutiny. A bill like this deserves far more consultation, community engagement and time in this house to consider this legislation. The fact that when writing this speech I had questions on just about every clause is concerning. I flag now that I have a number of questions during the committee stage.

Changing the constitution without consultation with all South Australians also raises great concerns. Our constitution should not be changed without thorough engagement and consultation across the state. I assume this is why the federal Voice is going to a referendum—to allow the Australian people to have a say.

The consultation for this bill has not been sufficient. The First Nations Voice YourSAy survey went out on 17 November 2022 to 6 January 2023, a mere six weeks, including at least two weeks of Christmas and holidays. I would be interested to understand the level of engagement in this survey, given the timing. A bill to ensure transformative outcomes needs more time.

As a member of the Liberal Party, I believe in small government and democracy. I find this bill does not align to either of these important values. I have concerns about how the elections will be managed and how, logistically, one individual not elected by all South Australians will be able to come into the parliament and speak on any or every bill.

We here all have an incredible privilege of being elected to this place by all South Australians. We are very proud in this house to have all been democratically elected by universal elections by all South Australians. In 1894, when the South Australian parliament passed the Constitution Amendment (Adult Suffrage) Act that meant that all men and women over 18 could vote. There were no longer qualifications based on landholdings, wealth, race or gender.

We are very proud in this house to have all been democratically elected by votes from across South Australia rather than being appointed, like in the House of Lords. Our Westminster system is the envy of many countries around the world, even more so in South Australia, where South Australians have the opportunity to vote for their local member and the member of the Legislative Council as well.

The original Liberal Party bill, the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill 2022, allowed for engagement via a committee rather than in the parliament. Committees play a very important role within this parliament, and I strongly believe this would be the best way to incorporate First Nations opinions and views on legislation and to be heard in a constructive way to help with the development of such legislation.

In the proposed bill 60 people will be elected by a body to ensure better outcomes for First Nations people. We have seen the challenges getting enough people to nominate for council, especially in regional towns. I have concerns about the sheer number of people to be elected, and the complexity, including specific requirements relating to gender and location, will make the election process very challenging.

There is insufficient detail in the legislation to provide comfort that this process will be successfully implemented. What will happen if no-one nominates for a particular region, or no females or, alternatively, no males nominate? This entire process appears to be challenging and flawed. With 60 members of the First Nations Voice, by-elections are inevitable. What will the cost to taxpayers be? How will it be coordinated? Again, so many unanswered questions in this rushed legislation.

First Nations people have been let down for generations. How is the government going to ensure that this is different? This legislation does not suggest to me guaranteed better outcomes for First Nations people. Only this morning, the minister referred to this bill on radio as an 'advisory group' and highlighted the fact that the parliament has no obligation to take on the thoughts of the First Nation's Voice. How elections for the First Nation's Voice will occur still remains a mystery to many of us. I have many questions that I am told will be decided by regulation rather than legislation. This to me is very concerning.

The people of South Australia deserve to know the answers to these questions before it is legislated through the parliament. Logistically, how will 60 people be elected across the state, 12 people elected to a council, and only one voice in parliament be able to speak on any matter when it only meets four to six times a year? How will this not impact on the parliamentary system as a whole? How will this not delay the legislative process?

We have all seen how the Labor Party loves to carelessly rush through important legislation, with new bills such as return to work provided at the eleventh hour. How will members of the First Nation's Voice be given sufficient time to review legislation when they only meet four to six times per year? This seems tokenistic at the very least and ill-thought-out at the worst, but it will not improve outcomes for First Nations people. There are so many unanswered questions about the number of people involved, the fee paid to each member, the frequency of the meetings and how that will align to the parliamentary sitting calendar, and whether this will delay the passage of legislation.

I am very concerned that there is very little clarity about how the boundaries are established and whether there will be movement in boundaries as populations potentially change and move. Will there be a redistribution like in the state electoral boundaries? What are the quotas or number of First Nations people in each region who have allocated local representatives? This population mix will no doubt change over time. How will this be addressed by the Electoral Commissioner?

In section 10, the legislation states that each Local First Nation's Voice is a corporate body capable of suing and being sued, and can hold and acquire property. I have many questions on how this will operate. What is the personal liability for the Local First Nations Voice? Will they be legally liable or will the taxpayer be exposed to huge financial losses? Again, there are many unanswered questions.

Advisory groups are important. I do question the number of First Nations advisory committees and how these will operate in addition to the 60 local First Nations members. How will the voices from the advisory committee be fed through? There are more people in these groups than there are in both houses of parliament. I look forward to exploring this further during the committee stage.

Clause 39 states that First Nations Voices are to be notified of the introduction of bills. This is well and good but how does this work when they are only meeting four times, but not more than six times per year? By the time the bill has been introduced, it is likely to have already passed before the group meets again. I question if this is the Labor Party's view of sound and robust consultation.

Clause 40 outlines that the First Nations Voice is entitled to address parliament in relation to bills. Where do I start with this? The parliament has always been and should always remain made

up of representatives who are democratically elected by all South Australians. I strongly believe that this should remain the case.

I have many concerns surrounding this clause including logistically how it would work for the First Nations Voice to come into parliament, which house they would be speaking to, who is responsible for actioning the comments and recommendations made, how long they will be allowed to speak, and if they are only meeting four to six times a year how will they ensure their voices are heard on relevant, important legislation in a timely basis? I have concerns that this will become an ineffective advisory body. A committee structure is much more appropriate, as proposed by the former government bill.

In recent times, we have seen emergency declarations on multiple occasions. We have seen the recall of parliament for key pieces of legislation. How will members of the First Nations Voice be able to be involved if they are only meeting four to six times per year and limited to six? They require ministerial permission to meet more times than this. It seems very restrictive and tokenistic. What happens when the First Nations Voice speaks to a bill and then there are a significant number of amendments? Will they have the opportunity to speak again? Again, I look forward to exploring this further during committee stage.

Clause 45 outlines chief executive briefings. The opportunity to meet with any or all chief executives is an interesting addition to this legislation—a benefit that is often not afforded to any other member in the parliament. Again, I am keen to explore this further in the committee stage. With regard to clause 48—Resources, there is next to no detail in the legislation on what resources will be allocated to these appointments, on how many staff will be allocated or the cost of staff. If there are 60 Local First Nations representatives, will they each require a staff member? We get 1.6 staff members here as a full-time member. The lack of details on this legislation, which has been carelessly rushed through, is concerning.

Clause 49 outlines the use of public servants. The minister can also request public servants to assist. To me, this is quite incredible. As a member of the opposition, I am unable to speak to public servants without permission from the minister, yet the members of the First Nations Voice can request this at any time. How is this demonstrating a fair system?

Based on this, it is clear that the way this proposed legislation is currently structured to access ministers, cabinet, chief executives and public servants is far greater for the First Nations Voice than it is for a member of parliament. I fail to see how this will help with outcomes; rather, it will increase the amount of talk with no action. I see a great imbalance of power that Labor is harbouring.

The parliament has no obligation to action or take on what the First Nations Voice says. It is still referred to by the minister as an advisory body. I do not see why this cannot be done through a committee rather than through the house, which is the current system and procedure and has served us well.

Many South Australians are unaware that the constitution of South Australia will need to be changed with this proposed legislation. This appointment is elected by a portion of our society—not everyone—and will be able to speak in this chamber. No other minority group is able to do this. I find it very concerning. I still have many questions to ask and will address them during the committee stage.

I will conclude by saying that, as I have shown, this is extremely flawed and carelessly rushed legislation that will sell First Nations people short. We need to focus on outcomes, not a talkfest. The outcomes for First Nations people need to improve and I am not convinced that this legislation will do this.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (12:47): I would like to inform the chamber that my speech will go for probably around about 30 minutes, so I will need to seek leave to conclude at about 1 o'clock, when we break for lunch. I have spoken with the Attorney and he is comfortable with that. I am just giving everyone some notice of that. Also, my voice is not 100 per cent at the moment, so if the chamber can just bear with me. In my experience, if it appears to go, it will come back—so that is the good news.

Just some preliminary remarks, if I may. Listening to the other contributions, I approach this in a relatively unique way, and that is that I do not seek to be necessarily adversarial on this issue. I think we would all agree in here that this issue really is above politics and is the sort of thing that all members of this place, whatever party you happen to represent, would have a genuine interest in and, if I can put it this way, a genuine affection for seeing genuine improvement in this area. It is something that governments have struggled with on both sides for many, many years. Regardless of the amount of money thrown at the situation, improvement seems to be slow, even glacial at times, and I think that disappoints all of us.

In a way, I can understand why the government would seek to make a radical change, if you like, as this bill is, because, clearly, what is happening at the moment is not working. That is about as nice as I can be because after that I would have to say that I do not agree with this bill, I will not be supporting it, and I will explain why in some detail as I get to the body of my speech.

In one way, this bill represents a call to arms for all of us, in that this is a very significant issue and I think the Australian population has a right be disappointed in the progress of improvement. Aboriginal people certainly have not been neglected—it is through no lack of trying—but the outcomes have not been, I think, to anyone's satisfaction, and certainly not to mine. I imagine that is true for all of us in this chamber.

In terms of my formal contribution, I rise to speak to the First Nations Voice Bill 2023, which seeks to establish an elected body of Indigenous South Australian representatives, colloquially known as the State Voice to Parliament. This Voice would formally interact with our parliament and state government, including receiving notification of the introduction of every bill to state parliament and given the opportunity to address either chamber, although not both, with regard to any given bill.

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

I would like to start by acknowledging that I have no doubt that those who argue for this change do so with the best intentions. They see the challenges faced by the Aboriginal community and seek to provide a solution. This is admirable, and what is expected of us as parliamentarians. Equally, like every member in this place, it is of course my desire to see every South Australian, including Aboriginal South Australians, succeed and prosper in all aspects of life, and have access to education, health, employment and housing services, for example, in order to reach their potential and become thriving members of the community.

The difference between those who argue in favour of this bill and those who oppose it, as I do, is the method they seek to employ to achieve these improved outcomes for Aboriginal people. It is not in the desire to see these outcomes achieved that we disagree on, but rather how they are achieved. I see my role in this place as being an advocate for all South Australians, including Aboriginal South Australians of course. I am sure that every member of this chamber would seek improved outcomes for every South Australian, regardless of their race, culture or religion.

What we spend most of our time debating in this chamber is often not what we seek to achieve but rather how we seek to achieve it with finite resources. Whilst there can be debate about desired outcomes, it is the question of how to achieve common objectives that demands much of our energy and commitment. There is genuine difference of opinion on the question of how we do things, and I argue strongly that it should be expected and welcome when this is the case, as well-intentioned reasoned debate will almost always improve outcomes in my experience.

There is no doubt that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people face very serious challenges that cannot be ignored. The truth is, however, that they are not being ignored. I think it is entirely reasonable to say that both sides of politics, indeed all sides of politics, including the minor parties, have taken this issue seriously over many years, and have made repeated, ongoing and

genuine efforts via policy positions, very substantial funding allocations and other practical steps, to address Aboriginal disadvantage in South Australia and, more broadly, across our nation.

The success of these measures is able to be debated, but not the genuine focus on and attempt to address Aboriginal disadvantage that they represent. This has been genuine and even heartfelt, I would argue, in our nation for a very long time now. These are not hollow words, but in fact are supported by substantial evidence. According to the Australian Productivity Commission in its Indigenous Expenditure Report of 2017, of which I have a copy, the Australian taxpayers allocated over \$33 billion to Aboriginal-specific related matters in the tax year 2015-16 alone—just one single year. The report goes on to state:

In 2015-16, the estimated direct expenditure per person was \$44,886 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians, around twice the rate for non-Indigenous Australians (\$22,530)...

It has increased since then, of course. Furthermore, the parliamentary library informs me that the following organisations exist to advocate for First Nations people in South Australia in the parliament and the community, and connected to various organisations. There is quite an extensive list, and I will not read them all because it would take too long, but I will point out that the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations maintains details of every Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander corporation and keeps a register. It currently lists some 193 entries in South Australia alone on its register of Indigenous organisations that exist specifically to support our Indigenous population.

I will read some of them. Some of these names will be very familiar to members of this place: the Aboriginal Affairs Executive Committee, the Aboriginal Drug and Alcohol Council, the Aboriginal Education and Training Consultative Council, Aboriginal Family Support Services, the Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee—which of course is impacted by this bill—the Aboriginal Lands Trust, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and the Aboriginal Sobriety Group Indigenous Corporation, and on and on it goes. As I said, there are some 193 in total that are listed by the registrar at the moment operating in South Australia.

My point is, and I think it is undeniable, that there has been a really substantial effort from both sides of the parliament, indeed all sides of the parliament, to address Indigenous disadvantage. The issue is not whether governments want to address these matters and do governments want to intervene and see a substantial improvement in these issues. The debate is about how it should be done. Labor has presented a model today which I disagree with and in fact all my Liberal colleagues disagree with. The Hon. Ms Game is yet to speak, but from her media comments I suspect she will oppose the bill, and I am not quite certain of One Nation's position; that has yet to be revealed.

The bottom line is that all the members in this place on all sides of this parliament—I think I can say absolutely confidently—have a genuine desire to see an improvement in the state of the wellbeing of our Indigenous people in South Australia. I think the fact that there are some 193 organisations on the register that I have just outlined and some huge expenditure—double the expenditure to non-Indigenous Australians—demonstrates that conclusively.

It is something that in a way we should be proud of. There has been a real genuine attempt for some substantial length of time in our nation now and in our state to address these matters. I have been a member of this place, as people know, for coming up to 17 years next month, and in that time I have had literally hundreds of conversations over the years about this exact issue and how to address specific matters, usually quite detailed conversations that have, in my view, resulted in the impetus, if you like, for more positive outcomes. I have always taken those matters seriously, as I know my colleagues have in this place, Liberal, Labor or otherwise.

I think the first step in this debate is acknowledging that. The first step in this debate is acknowledging that Liberal, Labor and crossbench members, and any Independent member that I have ever had dealings with in this place, have all had a genuine concern for this matter and genuinely sought to improve the lot of Indigenous Australians, in this case South Australians. We need to acknowledge that initially. In the argument or the debate, the difference stands on how we do it; not what the desired outcomes are but how they should be achieved.

I think there has been unnecessary heat in this debate when this is really a matter, to me, that should be in many ways above politics in order that we provide the most reasoned possible outcome, which, as I say again, in my experience would normally lead to a better outcome. In this

case, a better outcome is certainly needed because we are dealing with a group of people who have had substantial disadvantage for some time. I make that point: it is about how to do it, not about the outcome. We agree on what we want as an outcome. What we do not agree on is how to do it. With that, I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:15.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Reports, 2021-22—

State Owned Generators Leasing Co Pty Ltd (SOGLC)

Fee Notices Under Acts—

Radiation Protection and Control Act 2021

Radiation Protection and Control Act 2021

Regulations under Acts—

Community Titles Act 1996—Resolutions

Education and Care Services National Law

Residential Tenancies Act 1995—Limit of Amount of Bond

Pregnancy Outcome in South Australia 2020 Report dated December 2022

Report and Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 1 of 2023—Correction—2022

Review of Remuneration of the Judiciary, Presidential

Members of the SAET, Presidential Members of the SACAT, the State

Coroner, and Commissioners of the Environment,

Resources and Development Court

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Regulations under Acts—

Burial and Cremation Act 2013—Voluntary Assisted Dying

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

District Council By-laws—

Flinders Ranges—

No. 8—Local Government Land (Public Facilities)

Regulations under Acts—

Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016—General—Temporary

Accommodation—No 2

Ministerial Statement

WATKINS, MR K.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:17): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in the other place by the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, entitled 'Vale Kevin 'Brakey' Watkins'.

*Question Time***AMBULANCE RAMPING**

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council on the safety of South Australians.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Yesterday, it was reported that nine people waited over 24 hours for a bed in hospital and 16 waited over 12 hours. With temperatures set to soar this weekend and another COVID peak on the horizon and our health system over capacity, my questions to the Leader of the Government are:

1. What action is your government taking to ensure South Australians receive medical care when they need it?
2. Given the predicted heatwave, what are you doing to prepare for the risk of increased ED presentations and the dangers of sitting in a ramped ambulance in 39° heat?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question and I will be more than happy to pass that on to the minister responsible, who sits in another place.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Supplementary question: if it was such a big issue before the election, why isn't it an issue now?

The PRESIDENT: It's not a supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I shouldn't have to stand up, but I will. Your second question, the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): I seek leave to provide a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the local government elections.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Last Thursday, the Minister for Local Government in the other place made a ministerial statement regarding the recent local government elections and the issues surrounding candidates and elected members not submitting their campaign returns on time. This has caused more than 40 elected positions, including mayors, to have been declared vacant. My question to the attorney is: when was the Attorney-General made aware of this issue?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for her question. From the best of my memory I was made aware when it became an issue in the media, but I'm happy to double-check and see if that's the case.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary: is the Attorney suggesting that the Electoral Commissioner did not inform him of the issue?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:34): As I said, I will check, but to the best of my

knowledge, no, not beforehand, because the Electoral Commission doesn't report to me, under the Local Government Act, on local government elections; it's the Minister for Local Government.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the minister responsible for the Electoral Commission of South Australia:

1. At any point after the local government elections did the minister request a briefing or information from the Electoral Commission of South Australia regarding any issues with the election process?
2. Does the minister believe that the Electoral Commission has failed in any of its obligations under either the Local Government Act or the Local Government (Elections) Act?
3. Does the minister have full confidence in the Electoral Commissioner?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her question. I don't have any reason not to have confidence in the Electoral Commissioner. I'm not aware of anything that would suggest that there's been a failure under any legislation of the Electoral Commissioner, and I have discussed this matter a couple of times with my colleague the Minister for Local Government.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary: did the minister request a briefing of information from the Electoral Commission of South Australia regarding any issues with the election process?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:36): As I said, I've discussed this matter with my colleague the Minister for Local Government.

NATIONAL APOLOGY TO THE STOLEN GENERATIONS

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister please inform the council on commemorations to mark the 15th anniversary of the national apology to the stolen generations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. Last Monday, I had the privilege to attend and speak at the 15th anniversary of the national apology held in Veale Park. I was pleased to be joined by the shadow minister in another place, the member for Heysen, Josh Teague, for that event.

It is a very important event and holds a special meaning to many in our Aboriginal community. It is sometimes hard to reflect and believe it has been 15 years since the then Prime Minister, the Hon. Kevin Rudd, delivered the national apology to members of the stolen generations. It was certainly a momentous day right around the country. In Adelaide I can remember joining members of the stolen generations in Elder Park, where the apology was played directly on a big screen. It was certainly a moving and poignant event for so many members of the stolen generations right around Australia who heard the apology in real time coming from Canberra.

This apology day event, commemorating 15 years since the apology, was an opportunity not only to reflect on that time but also a place where community members can come together and discuss and engage in healing and reconciliation. There were many members who walked from Victoria Square to Veale Park and many activities throughout the morning and afternoon.

The event commenced with a smoking ceremony, a Welcome to Country from Uncle Ivan Copley and entertainment from musician Nathan May, and the Tjarutja Dance Company entertained those who gathered. There was a community barbecue, Ngangkari healers, face painting, over 22 stalls and also a personal message on the big screen last Monday from Kevin Rudd.

The apology day was hosted and organised by Nunkuwarrin Yunti with assistance from Reconciliation SA, the Aboriginal Sobriety Group, Aboriginal Family Support Services, the Aboriginal Drug and Alcohol Council, Baptist Care SA, Life Without Barriers, Relationships Australia, Centacare, Uniting Communities and the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and proudly sponsored by the City of Adelaide and the Healing Foundation.

Similar commemorations were held across the country, including at Parliament House in Canberra. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all who were involved in organising and all who attended this very important community event.

MINISTERIAL TRAVEL

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, regarding government policy on travel expenses.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: Between 19 January and 27 January, the Treasurer, along with two other government representatives, travelled to Los Angeles, New York and Washington DC to seek state funding opportunities for future expenses and to refinance current state debt. According to a report in *The Advertiser*, that trip is estimated to have cost South Australian taxpayers \$78,000, or \$26,000 per person, almost \$10,000 per day of travel.

It has been stated by the government that the full calculations for the trip cost should be expected within the coming weeks. The Treasurer stated on radio this morning that his government's policy is to finalise costs of travel within three months, yet then offered no justification for the Premier's \$150,000 Japan and South Korea trip last October taking four months to report, largely by a media exposé. Our state needs to be promoted overseas and interstate and new business and financial leads needs to be sourced; however, my questions to the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, are:

1. Does the government's overseas travel expenditure policy consist of a recommended daily threshold and what is that recommended threshold?
2. Does the government acknowledge that its travel expenditure reporting policy is not timely or efficient, given modern business practices of digital receipting and invoicing?
3. Does the government agree that a lack of transparency and accountability on overseas ministerial travel expense is leading to lack of public confidence in prudent government spending, and that all interstate and overseas travel costs should be kept to a minimum?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for her question that was directed to the Treasurer and I am happy to forward it to the minister who was questioned and bring back a reply.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: Send it to where it belongs: the Treasurer.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley! The Hon. Ms Girolamo, you have a supplementary question arising from the answer.

MINISTERIAL TRAVEL

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:41): Absolutely, and directed to the Attorney as a minister.

The PRESIDENT: Just ask your supplementary question.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Just ask the question.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, I don't need your help.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Let me ask it. What is your party's position on travel costs, and do you think that taking three months to be able to have documentation is appropriate?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter has a point of order before I rule that supplementary question out of order.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Indeed. I will allow you to do that very quickly.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Are we going to have a conversation or are we going to have question time?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Enough! The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations regarding public holidays.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley! Continue, please, deputy.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The SDA launched their campaign on Sunday to have Easter Sunday declared as an additional public holiday. They are urging the Malinauskas government to use declaration powers rather than waiting for legislation to make Easter Sunday a public holiday in 2023. My questions for the minister are:

1. The government has ruled out this year, but the business community would like to know whether the minister will rule it out for future years.
2. If the Labor government makes Easter Sunday a public holiday in the future, will the government—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Girolamo and the Hon. Mr Wortley!

The Hon. J.S. LEE: —remove the Easter Monday public holiday or another public holiday to ensure that businesses do not suffer and, if so, which public holiday will the minister remove?

3. Will the minister please provide some clarity to the community on this matter?

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 question and for directing it to a minister in this chamber. It is a remarkable achievement for the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I can't hear the Attorney.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Notwithstanding that, there has been a YourSAy process to get community feedback about the public holidays in South Australia and that has just closed. The government will be considering those. I understand what the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition would like a government to do—and that was mainly the modus operandi of the former government—is to not even consider consultation and to go in and just make decisions without regard for what the people of South Australia have said. We saw that time and time again. We saw that with land tax, we saw that with shop trading hours. We saw it over and over again. We have a different way—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The YourSAy process is now closed. We will take into account what South Australians think—

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —and, in due course, come to a view and then consult further. We think that's a responsible way and we don't care if the opposition prefer us not to consult: we are going to do that.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:44): Supplementary—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Girolamo has a supplementary question arising from the answer.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: If the YourSAy just closed, does that mean that it won't be considering the public holiday on Easter Sunday then? It was only raised on Saturday by the SDA.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:45): No.

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: There we go; so it's pointless. So you are not consulting.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Girolamo!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It's not the case that we won't consult.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: To expand further, there were some many dozens, I think even some hundreds of contributions to the YourSAy website. We will consider all things that were put forward to that YourSAy website, including any suggestions about Easter Sunday.

FLOOD RECOVERY CHARITY MATCH

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the chamber about the Flood Recovery Charity Match that was played at Coopers Stadium this past Sunday?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his question—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and his very active participation in said event. This past Sunday, two teams, made up of players, shall we say, with varied experience and varied skill levels in soccer, were formed, one being the state government team, which included parliamentarians and state government representatives, and they played—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —against the Pick a Local, Pick SA team, made up of industry representatives. They went to toe to toe at Coopers Stadium for a curtain-raiser, before an Adelaide United versus Western Sydney Wanderers game. The South Australian Produce Market, Pick a Local, Pick SA, and Foodland, together with Bank SA and the state government through PIRSA,

partnered together for a very special cause: to raise funds to be collected by the Rural Business Support Relief Fund to support farming families who are doing it tough as a direct result of the South Australian River Murray floods.

I am delighted that state government and industry associations could partner together to assist regional communities during these challenging times. The event and subsequent funds raised would not have been possible were it not for the generosity of supporters, with major donors including the South Australian Produce Market, the Adelaide United Football Club, Foodland, Rural Business Support and Bank SA.

Mr President, as you know and since you were there and involved in a very positive way, players put their best forward in what was certainly a sunny day, if not sweltering conditions, though I think it's fair to say that most if not all players were very pleased to hear the final whistle blow. I want to thank members of this place for their participation in the event, including the Leader of the Opposition in this place, and I must say it was great to see her fully decked out in red for the event—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —as indeed, Mr President, it was wonderful to see you also so attired. Much to the surprise of I think just about everyone involved, the state government team were victorious, winning the game five goals to two. Indeed, from the start of the game, the South Australian government team maintained a lead position, but overall it was a fantastic game played in good faith with a strong sense of sportsmanship.

Nevertheless, it would be remiss of me to not remark that the member for Hartley, if he is ever looking for a career change, I am sure he has a career in acting after his eyebrow-raising attempt at a penalty call, which was ignored entirely by the referee. From this place, I want to thank you again, Mr President, and also the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and the Hon. Justin Hanson for their support and participation in the day. In the other place, I want to thank the member for Wright, the member for Waite, the member for Hartley, the member for Adelaide, the member for Gibson, the member for Davenport and the member for MacKillop.

These days do not simply happen. There is an enormous level of planning that goes into these events. I want to thank Angelo Demasi, the CEO of SA Produce Market, for the leadership that he has shown in initiating this event back in January and for assisting in putting together a very formidable and passionate industry team.

I also want to thank Brett Smith, the CEO of Rural Business Support, for the role that he played in organising the event, and especially Mon and the team also at RBS. Thank you, too, to Professor Mehdi Doroudi, the chief executive of my department, PIRSA, and my colleague the Hon. Reggie Martin in assisting to put together a state government team that went on to be victorious on the day.

On Saturday morning, I joined both Angelo Demasi and Brett Smith to announce that the state government would match all donations received dollar for dollar up to \$100,000. This is in addition to the combined federal and state \$194 million financial assistance package for flood-affected communities, businesses and households that have been impacted by this once-in-50-year event.

I am advised that in total so far the event has raised over \$155,000, which will go straight into flood-affected communities and support our resilient and hardworking primary producers. I pay tribute to all who were involved from this parliament. Sometimes it can be something of an acrimonious environment here, but in this sort of event we had the opportunity to band together to show real teamwork in support of a very worthy cause.

We can still donate to the cause via the Rural Business Support website, which is ruralbusinesssupport.gov.au. It is also important to thank Franklin dos Santos from Foodland for the very pivotal role he played, with Foodland being a major sponsor also. I encourage anyone who hasn't as yet donated to go to that website and support a very good cause. Well done to everybody.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General about the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: For almost 40 years, Derek Bromley has been in custody for a murder he maintains he did not commit. He is the longest serving prisoner in custody in Australia and easily the longest serving Indigenous prisoner. He was eligible for parole 14 years ago, but because he will not admit to his crime before the Parole Board he remains locked up and will remain there until he does or is successful in his appeal to the High Court.

On 14 February, I received a letter, also addressed to the Attorney-General, from Professor Bob Moles, in which he says the DPP has failed in his obligation to make full disclosure to the High Court to ensure it is not misled in his submission opposing Mr Bromley's appeal. I seek leave to table that document.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: In short, Mr Hinton does not intend telling the High Court that one of the Crown's chief witnesses, Dr Colin Manock, was unqualified when giving evidence at Mr Bromley's trial and was later discredited, which would most likely have rendered his evidence inadmissible. Instead, he asked the High Court to only rely upon the findings of the Court of Criminal Appeal in relation to pathological evidence and a cause of death. Professor Moles says that not to disclose this information is a serious breach of Mr Hinton's prosecutorial duties.

One of Australia's most senior criminal barristers agrees and is astonished how this information has been ignored and the implications it could have for the integrity of our legal system. As a postscript, Dr Manock's notoriety, misconduct and incompetent history as head of the state's forensic centre will be the subject of a national TV program on the nine network's *Under Investigation* tomorrow night. My question to the Attorney-General is:

1. As the state's senior law officer, do you have concerns the DPP refuses to comply with his legal obligations not to mislead the High Court?
2. Will you seek from Mr Hinton an explanation for his omission of information that may be vital in the High Court's final determination and present it to the chamber in the next sitting week as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in many areas of justice in South Australia. I am not aware of the DPP—and in fact South Australia has in general, and for a very long time, been served very well by independent DPPs in the duties they perform.

I am not aware of any suggestion that the DPP doesn't comply with their obligations and duties, but in relation to the specific matter the honourable member has taken up, I acknowledge that it is one of significant importance to him and he has raised these and other issues a number of times. I will take it up and bring back an urgent response for him in relation to this particular area.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:54): I seek leave to deliver a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about child protection.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Given the concerns raised about children absconding from residential child protection services, has the Attorney-General been briefed about legislative options which could be implemented to prevent children from leaving these properties?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for her question. Very strictly, the responsibility for child protection rests with the Minister for Child Protection in

another place, the member for Reynell, the Hon. Katrine Hildyard. I will have to check. I don't recall a specific briefing that was solely about legislative options in relation to people absconding from state care, but I am happy to check and see if there is anything that has come across my desk in relation to that issue at all.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:55): Supplementary question: while the Attorney is checking on that matter, can he also check whether he has received briefings on restrictive practices amendments in this area or other areas?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:55): I am happy to also check on that for the honourable member.

TEEN PARLIAMENT

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:55): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the minister tell the council about the recent Teen Parliament program facilitated by *The Advertiser*?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:55): I am very happy to answer that question and talk about the recent Teen Parliament, and particularly the Tjindu Foundation Aboriginal students who participated in that area and the remarkable work that the Tjindu Foundation does in the lives of Aboriginal children in particular.

Honourable members may have seen recent coverage in *The Advertiser* about a group of young South Australians sharing their ideas for the future of our state. Across education, health, the economy and many other areas, these young people have some innovative and creative ideas to build a better future for South Australians. This was part of *The Advertiser's* Teen Parliament program, held last week in this very building. The program brought together 25 high school students from across the state to put forward and debate topics they believe will help drive our state forward.

I had the opportunity to attend part of the program and watch some of the debates held in the other place. Like everyone in attendance, I was significantly impressed with the thoughtful and well-researched contributions made by many young people on a diverse range of topics from many different viewpoints.

One of the students, Tayah Coulthard-Todd from Sacred Heart College, spoke passionately about the importance of Indigenous education in schools, calling for the introduction of Indigenous education across the state. Tayah was one of a number of students sponsored to attend by the Tjindu Foundation, and it was great to see those students again after they visited parliament in the last sitting week to watch the introduction of the First Nations Voice Bill in this chamber. It was just one of the many topics brought to the debate. Many students shared their views on the education system and many other issues of importance to young people.

I know the member for Kavel, the Hon. Dan Cregan in the other place, who was presiding over the Teen Parliament debate as Speaker, was particularly pleased to hear passionate debate about things that affect his electorate as well as South Australia in general. There was a diverse range of ideas, and students came from right across the state. For example, Ashley Hunt joined the Teen Parliament all the way from Western Eyre Peninsula, where she attends Streaky Bay Area School, speaking on the floor on the day of her 17th birthday last week.

I would like to congratulate *The Advertiser* and others who have helped in the organisation of this event for putting together an excellent day, with students, a range of journalists and members of parliament in attendance and the debates livestreamed through *The Advertiser's* website. In closing, I would like to congratulate all those involved and, as I said on the day, I look forward to seeing some of them sitting on the red or green benches in years to come.

GREYHOUND RACING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister representing the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing on the topic of hot weather policy for greyhound racing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: On 27 December 2022, 10 greyhound races were run at Murray Bridge Greyhound Racing Club. The temperature in Murray Bridge that day reached 41.8° Celsius. *The Advertiser* printed earlier that morning that it predicted the weather to reach 43° Celsius, yet these races still proceeded. This week, we expect similar temperatures and indeed several races are scheduled to occur. Greyhound Racing SA's hot weather policy states the following:

Morning meetings on days for which the predicted temperature is forecast to be 40°C or above at 8am will continue as scheduled but may be called off, delayed, cancelled or abandoned at the discretion of the stewards and in consultation with the on-course veterinarian.

The wording of this policy, of course, implies that the stewards only have discretion to call the race off if the weather is forecast to be above 40° Celsius at 8am and does not consider the daily temperature prediction or the predicted temperature at the time that the race will actually occur.

An alternative reading of this policy then is that race organisers are to check the predicted weather at 8am and if it is predicted to be over 40° Celsius the race can be abandoned. However, the running of the races on 27 December indicates that those race organisers did not cancel this race and, I assume, others.

By contrast, in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia, scheduled racing events must be cancelled if the temperature is scheduled to reach 38° Celsius at any point during the day or during the event's scheduled time. Race meetings must be cancelled in the Northern Territory if the estimated daily temperature is to be 40° Celsius. Even in Queensland, where rules on hot weather are also lacking, the decision of whether to run the race or not is based on the temperature at the time of the scheduled race.

It is known, of course, that greyhounds can suffer from heat stress and if the dog's internal temperature gets too high, it can cause serious organ damage, damage to the dog's cellular health system and death. I note that I wrote to the minister on 10 January. I also wrote to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. I am yet to receive a response from the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, although I have received one from the other minister. My questions therefore are:

1. How many TAB greyhound meetings have been postponed or cancelled under Racing South Australia's hot weather policy in the last 10 years?
2. How many greyhound races have been run when the temperatures at the time of the race were over 38° Celsius?
3. Will this government ensure that greyhounds are not forced to run and race at temperatures over 38° Celsius, as we expect this week?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for her question. I do have some advice. I am advised that the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has recently written to Greyhound Racing SA asking them to consider reviewing their hot weather policy. I am advised her office has spoken to Greyhound Racing SA and have been told they have proactively activated their hot weather policy. In regard to this week's meets, they have been advised that they have been moved to the morning and there is still the chance some meets will be postponed.

In terms of the specific questions around number of cancelled or run events in those conditions, I will refer them to the minister in the other place and bring back a response.

PUBLIC SECTOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:02): My question is to the Attorney on South Australia's public sector industrial relations. Will the Attorney-General, in his capacity as Minister for Public

Sector and Minister for Industrial Relations, rule out incorporating a bonus for public servants who simply turn up to work appropriately dressed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for her question. One thing that we have said is that we will enter all negotiations with the public sector unions in good faith and not rule out a whole lot of things like the former government did and say that back pay is completely off the table, as the former government did.

We will absolutely enter into negotiations in good faith. There are certain allowances, in terms of education allowances, that will be negotiated and will be paid, but we will enter into each negotiation in good faith on their merits.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

PRIMARY INDUSTRIES SCORECARD

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the 2021-22 PIRSA Primary Industries Scorecard?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Primary Industries Scorecard 2021-22 has been released. It shows yet again the strength of our primary industries and their vital importance to the South Australian economy. The report shows that in 2021-22 primary industries and agribusiness revenue increased by 12 per cent on 2020-21 figures, totalling \$17.3 billion.

To put further context behind the often-stated importance of primary industries in our state, the sector supported 71,000 jobs throughout this period. Of course, challenges remain in terms of retaining workers and attracting workers, and in their training, as they do for many parts of the economy. It is something that will continue to be an important focus for government and industry.

Overseas exports of food, wine, agriculture and forestry products totalled \$7.5 billion, which was an increase of 24 per cent on previous figures and accounted for 51 per cent of South Australia's total overseas merchandise exports. Despite a 35 per cent fall in exports to China, it was still the largest overseas destination for South Australian products in agriculture, food, wine and forestry, accounting for 9 per cent of exports within those sectors. The other top trade export markets for our primary produce include the United States, Japan, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, the UK, Egypt, Bangladesh, South Korea and Belgium.

Field crops in South Australia continue to perform strongly, setting a record production of 12.1 million tonnes and a record farmgate value of nearly \$4.5 billion during the most recent harvest. The sector makes up the largest sum, in dollar figures, of our primary production industries, worth \$5.6 billion to our state's economy. Four sectors topped \$1 billion in revenue, namely, livestock at \$4.1 billion, wine at \$2.4 billion, horticulture at \$2 billion and forestry at \$1.4 billion, while our state's incredibly important dairy, seafood and wool sectors all topped half a billion dollars in revenue.

PIRSA's Primary Industries Scorecard gives us great insight into how primary industry sectors are travelling and highlights the value of these industries to our state in a very clear way. I look forward to having more to say about how individual sectors are faring and what the state government is doing to support the continued strengthening of our primary industry sectors.

WINE INDUSTRY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Supplementary: what is the minister doing to assist our wine industry and grapegrowers to expand export markets?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. She may be aware that the Department of Primary Industries and Regions is the lead

agency supporting South Australia's 680 winemakers and 3,250 grapegrowers from across the state's 18 wine regions.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The South Australian government has a formal relationship with the South Australian Wine Industry Association—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am trying to listen to the answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —supported by a \$1 million commitment over the next four years from PIRSA.

The PRESIDENT: Order, minister! A supplementary question has been asked. It's being answered; I would like to hear the answer. Minister, continue, please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, Mr President. I appreciate that you, Mr President, are interested in hearing the answer, whereas the opposition clearly are only interested in trying to hear their own voices. The funding that I just referred to, if the opposition heard, is referred to as Project 250. As I have mentioned previously in this place, it is in the first year of a four-year commitment given by the government to this critical industry for our state. The industry and market development program includes a range of activities that will support business skills development and ongoing business improvement of South Australian winery businesses.

Project 250 also supports initiatives at a state or regional level that continue to improve the capability and capacity of the wine industry across a range of areas from viticulture to customer service. Initiatives that are being delivered in this first year of the funding agreement include the following:

- the recent pop-up wine event, WineLab, at the University of South Australia's Museum of Design. There are further pop-up wine events scheduled for May and June in the Adelaide CBD;
- McLaren Vale wine region's trade-focused Meet Your Maker program, which focused on brand awareness in the domestic retail and hospitality trade;
- Clare Valley wine region's riesling trade events, which celebrated 21 years since the Clare Valley screw-cap initiative;
- support for the in-market activations of the Barossa wine region's international ambassadors and educators program;
- support in the Adelaide Hills for training and development of the region's cellar door staff members. The program also supported Adelaide Hills to be championed at the recent Mornington Peninsula pinot celebration, held earlier in February;
- the ongoing delivery of the Riverland Uprising program, which supports producers who champion the Riverland geographic indicator to be better known by consumers and trade;
- seven wine industry funds as part of the primary industries' funding scheme that supports Regional Wine Association's membership and program delivery in the Riverland, Clare Valley, Barossa, McLaren Vale, Langhorne Creek, Adelaide Hills and the Wine Grape Council of South Australia; and
- agtech demonstration sites developed in Nuriootpa and Loxton to showcase the latest technology designed to support grapegrowers to understand the opportunities presented by introducing agtech into their operations.

On that note—

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: You asked the question; that's the answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —I was pleased to welcome international delegates this week for the evoke ag conference, which is being held here in Adelaide for the first time, which is a wonderful achievement. Yesterday, I spoke at an event that involved putting entrepreneurs, developers and producers in contact with each other, as well as at the opening event yesterday evening at Adelaide Oval.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions was a key partner of the Australian Wine Industry Technical Conference also, which was held in Adelaide from June 26 to 29 last year. That conference attracted close to 1,200 delegates to Adelaide to learn about current business and consumer trends, the latest research and technology, and to experience a showcase of the newest and best equipment available to the grape and wine sectors.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Point of order: 186—

The PRESIDENT: I will listen to it.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: —relevance and also the member asked for new opportunities. Those were repetitive answers that were given before.

The PRESIDENT: Sit down. I'm listening intently to the answer. I'm sure that when you look at the *Hansard* tomorrow you will see that the minister is touching on exactly the question that was asked. I would—

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: Yes, I'm sure that's exactly what's happening.

The PRESIDENT: I don't need your help. I would prefer the minister conclude your remarks as soon as you can so we can move on.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, Mr President, and I'm sorry that those opposite are not interested enough to listen for a few minutes about the many and varied activities—

The PRESIDENT: Just conclude.

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: It's been going for a lot more than a few minutes.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —that are occurring. Incidentally, the conference that I mentioned that's happening this week here in Adelaide—

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —has attracted 1,600 delegates, so again an excellent opportunity to showcase all that South Australia has to offer, including our excellent wine.

MEALOR, MS C.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:12): My question is to the Attorney-General about his department chief executive officer, Ms Caroline Mealor. Can the Attorney-General assure this chamber that, considering former Marshall government Attorney-General the Hon. Vickie Chapman's statement in the other place that the chief executive officer of his department, Ms Caroline Mealor, was involved in discussions with the Director of Public Prosecutions regarding the laying of an ex officio information against former Renewal SA CEO Mr John Hanlon after the charges against him were dismissed in the Magistrates Court, Ms Mealor is not involved with Mr Hanlon's still outstanding application for reimbursement of his legal costs and that Ms Mealor is not involved, other than as a witness, in the investigation into the Hanlon prosecution by the new ICAC inspector?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his question, and I will raise those matters with my chief executive.

SERIAL SEX OFFENDERS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding serial sex offenders in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: After attempting to rape a 65-year-old woman in her Port Augusta home in 2002, Jacob Arthur Wichen was sentenced to 10 years in prison in 2005, but in 2011 was declared incapable of controlling his sexual instincts and was detained indefinitely. The recidivist sex offender will now likely be released on licence later this month, further to a High Court victory that overturned a Court of Appeal decision that upheld a Supreme Court decision not to release Wichen due to the fear he could not control his sexual instincts.

Parole Board SA chair, Frances Nelson, indicated the board was of the opinion that Wichen still represented a significant risk to the community. In reference to finalising the stringent conditions under which Wichen would be released, Ms Nelson stated:

We would recommend more conditions, but ultimately it is a matter for the court...There seems to be an expectation we can place (Wichen) somewhere he will have 24-hour supervision and that is not possible. We do not have those resources in the community...I will be speaking to community corrections to see what resources we do have and then try to recommend conditions that can actually be policed and carried out.

I am also aware of a convicted serial child sex offender, Darryl Martin Hore, who has won his appeal to the High Court as well to be considered for release on licence, a man who has previously declared that he was actually unwilling to control his sexual instincts. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Is the Attorney concerned that Wichen will be released when the Parole Board still considers him to be a significant threat to the community?

2. What additional resources will the state government provide to ensure Wichen and other recidivist offenders are adequately monitored in the event that they are released from prison but are still considered to be a threat?

3. Is the Attorney-General satisfied that necessary conditions for release on licence will be applied in each case and, if so, how, when the Parole Board isn't?

4. What other measures is the state government undertaking to ensure the community is protected from serial sex offenders?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his question and his regular and significant interest in the safety of the South Australian community. Rather than answer individual questions I can give a general answer. I am aware of the media attention—and I think it was in the newspapers over the weekend—about the Wichen matter, following on from the High Court decision and then the Supreme Court decision in the Wichen matter.

I am confident that the Parole Board has the experience and the tools to impose exceptionally strict conditions that will make the community as safe as possible in the circumstances in which Wichen will be released. I know that the Parole Board is very experienced in a lot of these matters and, as I said, I am confident that they will impose the conditions as strictly as possible to make the community as safe as possible and, also, if there are breaches, to ensure that the appropriate action is taken, including the possibility of returning this individual to prison.

We do take sex offenders and serial sex offenders exceptionally seriously. We have a number of electoral commitments, some of those have already been implemented and there are more that will be rolled out over the coming months in relation to making sure that serial sex offenders, particularly child sex offenders, spend longer in jail.

SERIAL SEX OFFENDERS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:16): Supplementary: does the Attorney consider that legislative change may be necessary in order to clarify matters that these people should not be released?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:16): We are always happy to look at legislative matters and we have done that in the past in terms of when there is a need to clarify things for community safety. There was the issue of the prescribed amount to be considered for serious drug trafficking offences due to, effectively, a gap in the law, that members in both these houses very quickly acted to rectify a loophole. If there are loopholes like that in the law we absolutely always will entertain them.

SERIAL SEX OFFENDERS

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:17): Supplementary question: does the minister believe that individuals who are deemed to be at risk of reoffending and incapable of controlling their sexual instincts should be allowed to be released into the community?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): We have legislation that is now under the Sentencing Act that makes those provisions, and it is up to a court to decide how they apply it to individuals.

ABORIGINAL LAW STUDENT MENTORING PROGRAM

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister please inform the council about the 2022 end of year celebration for the Aboriginal Law Student Mentoring Program?

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 and his interest in this area, a matter that crosses a couple of my portfolio areas in terms of the area of Attorney-General and Aboriginal affairs. At the end of last year, I was very fortunate to be invited to attend once more—after having attended a number of times—the Aboriginal Law Student Mentoring Program end of year function.

This program is aimed at providing mentorship and support for Aboriginal law students in their studies and professional development. The program matches Aboriginal law students with experienced lawyers who provide guidance, advice and support through the Law School journey and beyond. The objective of the program is to increase the number of Aboriginal lawyers in South Australia and to provide opportunities for Aboriginal law students to build relationships with the legal community and gain a better understanding of the legal profession.

This mentoring program is well known for its successes. Over a number of years, I have seen the positive outcomes of this program as year on year multiple students engaged in the program are successfully graduating.

As is custom at these events, there is an opportunity to hear a few words from each of the graduates from the Aboriginal Law Student Mentoring Program, and it is a highlight of these speeches to hear the thanks and the level of fondness each student has for their mentor over their journey and vice versa. This, in my view, is testament to the authentic relationship that has been developed over a number of years from students being involved in this program and from those who act as mentors themselves.

This year two graduates: Cindy D'Angelo, graduating from the University of Adelaide with a Bachelor of Laws, whose mentor was Magistrate Toni Vozzo of the Magistrates Court, and Mikeyli Hendry, graduating from the University of Adelaide also with a Bachelor of Laws, whose mentor was Lynn Valentine, a senior solicitor at the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. I congratulate both of the students who are graduating as part of the Aboriginal Law Student Mentoring Program and look forward to following their progress in the legal community.

REGIONAL BANK CLOSURES

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Regional Development on the topic of regional bank closures.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: In the last session of parliament I asked the minister what action had been taken to avoid the closure of the Coober Pedy bank branch. It has since been reported that Westpac and the Commonwealth Bank have paused some of their regional bank closures; however, this has not included closures in some of our South Australian regional communities. The bank branch in Cooper Pedy has now been closed, leaving that town without a bank, and another branch, in Taillem Bend, is still slated for closure.

Meanwhile, some of our big banks are reporting massive profits. The Commonwealth Bank reported a \$5.15 billion cash net profit after tax for the half year ending 31 December, a 9 per cent increase on the previous year. The National Australia Bank announced an 18.7 per cent increase in their cash earnings for the first quarter of 2023, and last November Westpac released data showing that their statutory net profit was up 4 per cent to \$5.69 billion for the full year 2022 compared to the full year of 2021.

My question to the minister therefore is: since the last session of parliament what action has she taken to ensure that no more regional towns are left without local bank branches?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for his questions. I do know, as we all do, that over many years now the larger banking organisations have taken resources out of regional areas, and quite rightly many people in those areas are upset. They rely on those banks and they rely on those services, and they have every right to be angry and upset. I think when large corporations take resources out of regional communities no amount of spin can make up for that. It can't take away from the fact that it does hurt regional communities and makes life more difficult and in many circumstances also makes business more difficult.

According to 2021 figures that I have—I have seen quoted on I think theregional.com.au, who take a keen interest in highlighting the plight of regional banking—apparently South Australia was amongst the worst impacted states in terms of regional bank closures. However, as most people are aware, these are corporate decisions that are very much independent of the government of the day. Closures happened under the former Liberal state government, and unfortunately they will continue to happen under future governments as long as profit is put before people by these corporates.

REGIONAL BANK CLOSURES

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:23): Supplementary: in light of that, what action has the minister taken to try to keep these regional banks open?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:23): As I mentioned, these are corporate decisions which are taken independent of the government of the day.

REGIONAL BANK CLOSURES

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:23): Supplementary: so the minister has done nothing; is that what she is saying?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I call the Hon. Mrs Henderson.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:23): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations regarding return to work. Can the minister, in this tough current economic environment, rule out any changes to ReturnToWorkSA legislation, operation of the scheme, that would result in an increase in cost to business?

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 her question. What I can say is that we have a commitment that was made in this chamber a number of times to

look at reforming the way particularly section 18 of the Return to Work Act works. That is something we have been consulting on a lot with both employee and employer groups.

The Return to Work scheme is designed to return people to work. In particular, section 18 of the act is the operative section that provides a mechanism to return workers to work, and we have been undergoing consultation, we will continue that, and we will have something in this chamber to try to make that better for both those people who represent workers and those who represent businesses. In this area there are things that can be done that can help both out, and returning people to work in a better, more efficient manner would be in the interests of both, so we will continue with that process.

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:25): Supplementary: can the Attorney please confirm if premiums are likely to go up in June?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:25): The honourable member, I think, is referring to the return to work break-even premium and the premium rates that are published by the board after the board makes its decision. I am not aware that the board has made a decision but I don't have any information that would suggest a significant rise in the premiums, and certainly that was the forecast when we had the debate almost a year ago in this chamber, but as soon as they are published I am sure the honourable member will become aware of what they are and will be here with questions about it one way or the other.

COUNTRY CABINET

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:26): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about her activities during last week's country cabinet on Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:26): I thank the honourable member for his question and I know that he shares the enthusiasm that all on this side of the chamber share for getting out into the regional areas and how important country cabinet is. The cabinet enjoyed an action-packed few days on the Yorke Peninsula and, from the outset, I want to note the incredible turnout at the community forum and also the barbecue that was held in Wallaroo where, like the last country cabinet that we had in Port Pirie, it was standing room only, with some tough but very considered questions asked of ministers.

What this shows is that regional communities really do appreciate the opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns in this format. Every time we hold a country cabinet, I am amazed afresh at the fact that the former Liberal government refused to do these. They refused to be available to regional members in this sort of forum and they refused to take the wonderful opportunities to get out there as a cabinet with the heads of their departments to actually listen to what country people wanted, to listen to their issues and to resolve many of them. Unfortunately, the former Liberal state government had no desire to actually interact on a real level with members of the public.

For myself, it was great to start my country cabinet visit at the South Australian Livestock Exchange in Dublin, followed by a visit to Natasha Westbrook and Belmont Beef and Lamb Farm at Clinton Centre. I was fortunate to head over to Paskeville and meet at the Yorke Peninsula Field Days site, where I was due to meet with CEO Peter Anderson, treasurer Rosalie Pearce and the team, who are getting ready for a huge 2023 set of field days from 26-28 September, which sadly for all of us in this chamber is a sitting week, so unfortunately we can't go. Interestingly, the Yorke Peninsula Field Days are acknowledged as the oldest field days event in Australia, established in 1894, I am advised. I am sure that 2023 will be another hugely successful event.

Another highlight, amongst many over those few days, was the announcement that the state government is expanding the Mobile Network Extension Devices Pilot Program to residents in councils that include Yorke Peninsula, Copper Coast and Barunga West. I enjoyed the opportunity to visit the Telstra store in Kadina with Michael Patterson, Telstra's Regional General Manager for South Australia, and also the member for Narungga, Fraser Ellis MP, to share this exciting

announcement. The member for Narungga had advocated for this previously and I was very pleased to be a part of the announcement that we were able to meet that advocacy.

It was a pleasure to visit Viterra's facility in Wallaroo with the Premier and the Minister for Trade and Investment in the other place, to talk about the record harvest worth almost \$4.5 billion to our state's economy and an industry of huge importance to our state and, of course, to the Yorke Peninsula, renowned as it is as one of the richest wheat and barley regions in the world.

I was incredibly proud to be part of an announcement alongside the Premier, Treasurer, Minister Champion and two of our state's dedicated regional paramedics for the very important establishment of the Office for Regional Housing. This is a fantastic initiative and a huge step towards addressing the critical problem of lack of housing in regional areas, which then has a flow-on effect throughout those regional communities and, of course, impacts on the ability to attract workers to regional locations. Workforce being one of the key issues raised with me as a minister, I am very pleased that this is one step towards addressing that.

The Office for Regional Housing will facilitate the development of key worker rental housing in regional South Australia, and, working alongside local government, employers and key stakeholders, support planning and implementation of housing projects that will have positive impacts on relieving the pressure on regional housing. The initial pilot program for the Regional Key Worker Housing Scheme will deliver approximately 30 new homes for police, teachers and healthcare workers in regions that include Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, the Riverland, Copper Coast and Ceduna.

Not only will this support the government services in regions that are critical to communities, but it will also ease the pressure on the private rental market. It is a program that can be scaled up quickly and I am sure will be of great benefit to many regional councils, businesses and, ultimately, regional people who need the security of a roof over their heads.

During country cabinet, I also visited Sunny Hill Distillery in Arthurton with Minister Brock. It's an incredible set-up that operators Sam and Olivia Colliver have created, with the lush green lawn out the front of the main building contrasting with the sprawling fields where the wheat and barley grow and ingredients for their vodka, gin, whisky, rum and liqueurs are sourced. It was also a great opportunity to catch up with Grain Producers SA CEO, Brad Perry, who discussed grain roads and their importance to the industry in moving their produce efficiently and safely.

Finally, I held a recreational fishing forum in Wallaroo with the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing in the other place, where we took questions from local fishos and met with Fishcare Volunteers as well as the Executive Officer of RecFish SA, Asher Dezser. It was certainly a very well spent few days in a great region of our state, something that we on our side will continue to do frequently because we value the opportunities that are available to us when we are at country cabinet.

COUNTRY CABINET

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:31): Supplementary: was the issue of bank closures raised by the community at country cabinet and what response did the minister provide?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I am not sure how that's arising from the answer, but you can have a crack.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:32): We had many and varied questions both at the public forum as well as individually as ministers, and, certainly, that issue wasn't raised with me.

Bills

FIRST NATIONS VOICE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:32): I will resume from where I left off prior to lunch. Just a quick recap: I was making a key point that I think on these sorts of issues it is important that we try to put our political stripes aside and debate the merit of the issue. The general point I was making is that I think it has largely been the case for some substantial time that the issue of Aboriginal affairs has been a bipartisan issue and, in fact, a multipartisan issue.

That does not mean there have not been disagreements about policy. Of course there have been disagreements about policy and, in fact, there is a disagreement about this proposed legislative change at the moment. I see no issue with that. I just think it needs to be acknowledged that some of these issues are of such importance that we need to ensure that the joint objective does not get clouded by some of the political argy-bargy which, to some extent, may be inevitable, but it is important that we all keep that in mind.

I made the point prior to lunch that I think the proof in the pudding, if you like, that Australians and South Australians have been committed to Indigenous affairs and improving the lot of Aboriginal Australians and South Australians is borne out in many ways, but the two ways I chose to highlight that was, firstly, through the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations, which maintains a register, which I outlined, of every Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander corporation that is available to assist Aboriginal people here in South Australia. It lists at the moment some 191 such organisations; I was quite surprised to hear it was that high. That in itself suggests a real commitment by the people of South Australia, who are funding them of course, to Aboriginal people.

Furthermore, I mentioned prior to lunch the, the Indigenous Expenditure Report the Productivity Commission produced in 2017, which outlined the expenditure for Indigenous people in Australia relative to non-Indigenous people, and it was roughly double. Again, I think that serves to add further justification to the point that this is an issue that is taken seriously by Australians and South Australians, and is something that I think the evidence bears out.

Along those lines, to suggest that Australian and South Australian citizens are not making a genuine effort, a very substantial effort, to improve the circumstances of Indigenous Australians is not supported by the facts. The obvious question becomes: to what extent will this bill do that? To what extent will this bill do what billions of dollars and all these organisations and institutions cannot? In that light, the debate becomes about how the parliament takes steps to improve the plight of Aboriginal South Australians; that is, how we actually do it.

Labor's proposed solution is contained in the bill before us. I say at the outset that I am of the firm belief that the measures proposed in this bill are not the answer to furthering the social inclusion and general wellbeing of Aboriginal South Australians. Although proponents of the bill may be well intentioned—I have no doubt they are—I am not at all confident it will achieve any better outcomes for Indigenous people in South Australia.

Legislating this one specific group unprecedented access to and influence upon the machinery of state, based solely on their race, will ultimately severely undermine the democratic principles that have served us so well, and may potentially lead to deteriorating outcomes. Of course, I am not arguing that is the intention—nobody is arguing that—but it is the risk, I feel. There are consequences here and potentially unintended consequences as well.

When introducing this bill the Attorney-General stated that Aboriginal people must have the ability to make representations to this parliament and to the government and to have a voice in that process, and I totally agree with that. The same should be said for all South Australians. Each of us elected as members are responsible for representing our constituents, including Indigenous South Australians. Every Indigenous South Australian, like every other South Australian, has access to the local members, state and federal, as well as senators and MLCs, who are well positioned to listen to and represent their views through deliberations within the parliament.

We also have a minister, of course, who is responsible for Aboriginal affairs in this state who, presumably, would ensure that Indigenous people have a voice throughout our processes wherever relevant in the same way South Australians with disabilities, domestic violence victims, veterans and children in state care have representation through their own dedicated ministers. Each of these groups will inherently at some stage be affected by the actions of this parliament and the state government of the day. However, I doubt there would ever be a suggestion that these other sectors

of the community have the same direct and exclusive participation in the democratic process as is proposed for Indigenous Australians in this bill.

It is feasible that the passage of this bill could be the catalyst for other minority groups to demand the same rights and access to the parliament, the executive and the bureaucracy as this bill proposes for Aboriginal Australians. What chance does any of us feel that any other group would have in achieving special legislation creating these privileges for them? I suggest no chance at all, as it would be seen as a violation of important democratic principles, yet that is exactly what is being proposed by this bill and is my primary reason for objecting to it.

I am of the implacable view that every person should have equal opportunity to have their voice heard by their elected representatives. That is an essential and foundational principle of democracy. We do not have need for a Jewish, Italian, Irish or German voice to parliament, because there are longstanding mechanisms in place for every individual to have input throughout our processes on an equal footing. This is as it should be. Indeed, this is as it must be, because in my view the proposal of giving one group of people rights and privileges that others do not have will lead to disharmony and unrest, and will ultimately prove divisive, which risks declining outcomes rather than improved ones.

Again, I stress that I am not suggesting this is the intention—I know it is not, in fact—but I believe it is certainly a risk. I have always had a friendly working relationship with the Attorney-General and, although we are clearly from opposite ends of the political spectrum, I believe it is fair to say we have worked together positively and cooperatively, whether in agreement or fierce disagreement. For that reason, I respectfully take issue with some comments made during his second reading speech, where he proclaimed that:

Campaigns like these do come at a cost, and it is one that is borne most heavily by those whom bigoted and hateful people are already inclined to denigrate and vilify.

Many South Australians who object to the implementation of the Voice, or this model of the Voice, at a state or federal level will take offence at this statement. Upholding the view that one race should not wield any more instituted legislative power than another is quite literally the opposite of bigotry. It is merely espousing the ideal that each person is equally valuable and should have the same right and opportunity to express their beliefs and be heard equally.

Indeed, among the many public personalities who have been vocal in campaigning against the Voice to Parliament are numerous high profile Indigenous Australians. Surely they are not bigoted and hateful? I know they are not, because of their stance. Of course not; of course they are not. They cannot be racist against their own race; this is just silly. There is no need for such language, and I choose not to use it. For instance, in reference to the federal Labor government's moves towards introducing a national Voice to Parliament, Senator Jacinta Price has stated:

We don't just have 11 representatives in federal parliament who are voices for Aboriginal Australians but an entire parliament full! It is our responsibility, each and every democratically elected member of parliament's responsibility, to represent the voices of all of our constituents, including Aboriginal constituents...The Voice—

in her words—

is just a hand ball for those who want to have a too hard basket so as not to take responsibility.

Senator Price has also declared that:

...our now Labor Prime Minister...suggests without any evidence whatsoever that a Voice to Parliament bestowed upon us through the virtuous act of symbolic gesture by this government is what is going to empower us...and has yet to demonstrate how this proposed Voice will deliver practical outcomes and unite rather than drive a wedge further between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australia.

Some people may say, 'Well, she's from the Liberal Party. That's her view,' and in fact at a state level the Liberal Party is clearly opposing this bill, so they might expect that. If they take that view, I point to a former Labor federal MP and former National President of the Labor Party, Warren Mundine AO.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Former MP?

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: He was, wasn't he? No? I beg your pardon. I may stand corrected. He was certainly a former national president, wasn't he?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Sorry, that is fair. If I am wrong about it, I stand corrected. Forgive me. Anyway, former national president, let's say, Warren Mundine, an Indigenous man obviously, has echoed Senator Price's sentiments, stating:

...an old mindset dominates Aboriginal affairs that prefers words and symbolic gestures over action...

These are his words, not mine:

The principal focus of the [Uluru] statement...seems to be a repackaging of the same old dogma that has defined (and failed) Aboriginal affairs for too many years; namely, that only Aboriginal people are qualified to speak about Aboriginal issues...

Platitudes such as 'Aboriginal people taking care of Aboriginal affairs' sound lovely but essentially amount to separatism...More will be achieved with an 'us' mentality than an 'us-them' mentality that has dominated Aboriginal affairs for far too long.

These are just two prominent Aboriginal Australians, from both sides of the political fence, who have publicly opposed a model along the lines of that in this bill. Clearly, it is nothing short of silly to suggest that these Aboriginal community leaders could somehow be racist against Aboriginal people. Clearly, they are not, and yet their opposition to the kind of model being presented here is crystal clear.

To Mr Mundine's point, I think it is pertinent to consider the views of a body that represents arguably the most persecuted ethnic group of people in history. David Adler, the President of the Australian Jewish Association, has had this to say about a model of the Voice. To be fair, he is talking about a federal model. He says:

Jews will understand from bitter experience that the political creation of ethnic or racial divisions in society is not a good thing. The creation of unique political rights or advantages for one ethnic or racial group will inevitably cause resentment and friction...The AJA executive sees the...Voice proposal and will be voting 'No'...

Again, I stress these comments were regarding the federal situation, of course, but I believe they have parallels here in our state.

I unreservedly agree with these sentiments. In this place, we as members consider myriad points of view through our deliberations and make judgements according to what we consider to be in the best interests of all South Australians. I genuinely fear that by granting a more prominent voice to one particular group—any group, whoever that is—decision-makers will feel somewhat beholden to that constituency, particularly if those in office are held to a more stringent account if they choose not to comply with their requests or demands.

Given this bill singles out a people group, we cannot be naive to think that public figures would not seek to avoid being labelled racist in their actions if it went against their better judgement if they were being pressured to do so by the particular group, in this case the Voice. Indeed, with regard to changing the way our democracy works with the proposed federal Voice referendum, along the lines of what this bill proposes, Peta Credlin aptly wrote:

Fundamentally, what is at stake in this debate is: who really runs Australia? Is it the Parliament elected by all Australian citizens; or is it the Parliament, provided the 800,000 Indigenous people represented by the Voice don't object?

I submit that the same could be said at a state level. If a South Australian Voice is instituted, who will run our state? Our parliament elected by all South Australian citizens of voting age or our parliament provided the 43,000 Indigenous people represented by the State Voice do not object? It is an unprecedented amount of leverage that will be handed to one group. I believe that should it pass, as expected, there will be many unexpected consequences.

In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General informed us that he and the Premier decided they simply could not wait for the possibility of the federal government to enact the Uluru Statement. My question is: why the rush to establish a Voice to the South Australian parliament? Why not wait until we have the results of the referendum on a federal Voice?

I would have thought it to be far more prudent and logical to gauge community sentiment before pushing this legislation through. It would certainly be beneficial for members to have more clarity as to what Australians truly think about the concept in general before this bill comes to a vote.

Or, if they prefer, why doesn't the state government seek to ask South Australians via a state referendum or plebiscite, in order to gauge public opinion?

Surely such a fundamental change to our democratic process must be endorsed by the citizens of South Australia before it and all the consequences intended and unintended are thrust upon them. After all, this bill does seek to amend the constitution of South Australia. Surely the people of South Australia have a right to approve changes to their constitution prior to the government of the day deciding what is best for them.

South Australians, in this case, deserve to be heard right across the state. It is ironic that this bill purports to create a Voice to Parliament and actually changes the South Australian constitution but is being rushed through the Legislative Council in just one week without the authority of a successful referendum to endorse it.

As political commentator Matthew Abraham has observed, this bill will effectively create another tier of government in our state, at least in one way of thinking about it, and one that is far less accountable than our elected local, state and federal governments, as they currently stand. Our parliament should proceed with caution. Indeed, in my view, it should not proceed at all without a statewide plebiscite to give it the moral authority that such a change demands.

I am proud to be a member of the Liberal Party, which has a rich history of acting in the interests of our Indigenous communities. It was the Liberal Party, after all, who dismantled the White Australia Policy and delivered the 1967 referendum to unify Australians, leading to improved rights and welfare of our Indigenous people.

It was the Hon. David Tonkin who was the first Premier to sign a land rights act with the Indigenous people and, of course, the Hon. Dean Brown moved a motion to our parliament to express its deep and sincere regret at the forced separation of some Aboriginal children from their families and homes prior to 1964 and apologised for these past actions, while reaffirming support for reconciliation between all Australians.

As I indicated earlier, I trust that we are able to continue pursuing policies that work together achieving better outcomes in the health, life expectancy, education, employment and housing situation of Indigenous people in South Australia, but I do not accept that this will be accomplished by a Voice to our parliament as it is termed in this bill.

My concern for the disruption to our democracy and my belief that all people are created equal, and should be treated as such, will ultimately dictate my vote on this bill. To conclude, I think one of Australia's greatest sportspeople, the late Lionel Rose, who just happened to be an Aboriginal man, summed it up best when he said:

I think of myself as an Australian. I don't go in for all this black and white thing. To me, we're all Australians.

I wholeheartedly agree and for the reasons outlined and a whole lot of others, I will oppose the bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:48): I rise today to speak on this historic piece of legislation. The Greens acknowledge that this is country that was invaded and sovereignty from First Nations people was never ceded. First Nations people were violently dispossessed, had their children stolen, their families separated, and their lands, waters and skies stolen and destroyed. Successive governments have perpetrated grave injustices since colonisation and we recognise its continuance today.

This is a First Nations Voice Bill for the South Australian parliament. I would also call it a South Australian parliament 'listen bill'; listen for a change and engage in dialogue, not just monologue. What is wrong we must make right. Endemic racism, oppression, misunderstanding, ignorance and the lack of knowledge and education have meant that First Nations people have generationally been subjected to policies and legislation that have impoverished many of their lives.

The Greens want First Nations people to have self-determination over their country, to prosper and to achieve the aspirations that they have for their lives and the lives of their children. We strive for First Nations people to have all they need to live their lives in health, wellbeing and peace on their lands. It is time to recognise that First Nations people's knowledge and law systems provide the foundation for true self-determination.

In 2017, some 250 First Nations delegates and leaders convened at the First Nations National Constitutional Convention, a first of its kind. They were there to address their peoples' institutionalised marginalisation. There they drafted what is called the Uluru Statement from the Heart, a call to all Australians. The Uluru Statement from the Heart reads:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We call for the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the Constitution. Makarrata is the culmination of our agenda: the coming together after a struggle. It captures our aspirations for a fair and truthful relationship with the people of Australia and a better future for our children based on justice and self-determination.

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

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

In 2017, that call went out to all Australians, and Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull called it a 'third chamber', a call he now admits was wrong. Tearfully, last year on television, he called for all Australians to now support the Uluru Statement from the Heart in full for Voice, Treaty and Truth. I am sure he will not be the only Liberal regretting their call in that way. Let's hope that they do so before they leave the position of elected authority in the future, rather than once they are safely ensconced away from the green or red leather benches.

The Uluru Statement offers a new path built on over 200 years of continuing cultures, activism, survival, resistance and countless failed policies and interventions. The Uluru Statement is a self-determining document that sets practical and meaningful groundwork of how to implement, protect and enforce that self-determination through the three key pillars of Voice, Treaty, Truth.

To be specific, the Uluru Statement seeks two changes. First, they hope to secure a First Nations Voice enshrined in the constitution. This constitutional recognition would provide First Nations people with entrenched protection to express their desires and needs in parliament. Second, they seek to establish a Makarrata Commission to oversee agreement making and truth-telling.

Around the country, we are watching unfold the debate for whether we should provide recognition for our First Nations people's voice on a federal level. We have now been given the opportunity here in South Australia to lead by example and ensure First Nations people of South Australia get the recognition and respect from this parliament that they not only deserve but the recognition they called for in that Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Despite what may have been said, there is strong public support for this First Nations Voice. Australians have shown that they are ready to accept the Uluru Statement's invitation to walk with First Nations people in a movement for a better future. From religious groups to peak organisation and cultural bodies, there is a strong united front. I come from a party—the Greens—where 87 per cent at least of our supporters support a Voice to Parliament and the Uluru Statement from the Heart in full. I note that at least 80 per cent of First Nations Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians support a Voice to Parliament.

I note that the no campaign has called for a migrant voice to be included, something quickly countered by the Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia, who in fact support a First Nations Voice to Parliament. Indeed, FECCA states that:

A fair and inclusive society must start with justice for First Nations peoples...Recognising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the structures that govern this country is essential to self-determination within a fair and inclusive society.

There has also been strident support from leaders of at least 10 mainstream religious groups who have demanded immediate action for a First Nations Voice to Parliament. These religious groups include the Anglican Church of Australia, the Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference, the Australian National Imams Council, the Australian Sangha Association, the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, the Hindu Council of Australia, the National Council of Churches in Australia, the National Sikh Council of Australia and the Uniting Church.

In fact, a joint resolution signed by the leaders of these groups declared bipartisan support and that action was 'necessary, right and reasonable'. That resolution reads:

There have been many processes and much work completed...there can be no more delay, our country has wanted and waited too long for justice...Indigenous Australians must now be afforded their rightful place (in the Australian Constitution).

The work of Reconciliation Australia has also shown that there is consistent public support in giving recognition to a First Nations Voice. The Australian Reconciliation Barometer, which is a two-yearly survey on public attitudes to reconciliation, shows in fact that 93 per cent of Australians believe it is important for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to have a say in the matters that affect them. It also showed that 87 per cent of Australians believe it is important to have a First Nations Voice enshrined in legislation, both at a federal and state level.

This statistic, of course, is echoed by the Greens' support, with a Guardian Essential poll showing our support at the moment at 89 per cent of our intended voters. That clear public opinion should be being heard loud and clear right now by the people in this place, but it perhaps shows that we just do not want to listen. I hope that changes.

Our country unequivocally lags behind on the right to self-determination and in particular in the rules of political participation and participation in decision-making in matters affecting First Nations people. On Thursday 21 March 2013, South Australia's constitution was amended to recognise Aboriginal people as the traditional owners and occupiers of South Australian land and waters. This amendment acknowledged past injustices and recognised the continuing importance of Aboriginal heritage and culture.

The next step is giving First Nations people a voice in the policies which impact upon them. Although it will be a decade later, I hope that we will finally see an implementation of that systemic change that is long overdue. This bill will help South Australian First Nations people have a voice, a rightful place at the table. As I have often heard it said by Aboriginal elders, 'If you're not at the table, you're on the menu.' We know that First Nations people are often on the menu in this place and certainly just given the scraps far too often.

This bill will dissolve the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee and give those decisions back to people who will be impacted upon the most. Historically, there have been numerous bodies established by First Peoples, unilaterally by governments or in consultation with First Nations people. However, these bodies have not been properly valued for the potential that they have had to bring about long-lasting change. Here today, we will amend our Constitution Act and recognise this First Nations Voice be heard and make a unique and irreplaceable contribution to our South Australian parliament.

I am glad that South Australia is the state leading the charge. I hope that other states and territories watch this journey of our First Nations and our parliament very closely. South Australia, of course, has led the way in terms of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander reforms and First Nations rights since in fact before Federation. A pioneering piece of legislation that we can all be rightly proud of was passed in this place: the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, the first ever act in Australia to recognise Aboriginal land rights, was assented to in December 1966. That was a first major recognition by any government in this nation in that way.

I am also proud that under a Liberal government the then Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Dean Brown, was the first—and made us in South Australia the first, following the Bringing Them Home report in May 1997—to apologise to the stolen generations. We were the first mainland state, to implement reparations for stolen generations with a reparation scheme. I acknowledge, Mr President, your role in that and, indeed, the very cross-party collegial manner in which those issues were eventually made real. We were the first in the nation to begin treaty negotiations with the then Weatherill government announcing its commitment to establishing up to 40 treaties across South Australia.

Back when South Australia was what we call a colony, but in fact it liked to call itself a province, we were at the very first session of the federal Constitutional Convention back in March 1897 arguing, under the leadership of Dr John Cockburn, that all Aboriginal people deserved the right to vote—1897 in South Australia. Unfortunately, while we convinced the rest of the country with regard to women being given the franchise, we failed in that leadership to convince the rest of the country.

But I point out that we have a proud history here of leading, and it is a history we should be embracing right now instead of somehow having convenient amnesia about it. Even under the previous Marshall Liberal government, South Australia was the first to introduce legislation that would establish a First Nations Voice to a state parliament. Indeed, such was the support for it that the legislation that was brought forward under the Marshall government was reintroduced under the Malinauskas government via the Liberal opposition. Liberal voters must be scratching their heads today, wondering what on earth has happened in the last 24 hours.

From the feedback that the Greens heard there were concerns about the impact this bill might have on existing agreements the state government has with First Nations people and groups. Part 1, clause 7 provides protection for native title groups and other bodies who have these agreements in place, confirming that nothing in the bill will limit or otherwise affect the functions of any other First Nations persons or bodies. This bill also confirms that we as a parliament recognise that not all people identify as either male or female, and when they nominate for a position on a First Nations Local Voice group they will not be limited by their gender identity.

This First Nations Voice is, of course, only a first step in ensuring that First Nations people in this country and in this state reach self-determination. The Greens have always recognised and supported the Uluru Statement from the Heart in full. In fact, we were the first party to do so. That includes not only Voice but also entering into Treaty and ongoing truth-telling through that establishment of a Makarrata Commission. We follow Victoria in this instance, whose Yoorrook Justice Commission is Australia's first formal truth-telling process into the injustices experienced by First Nations people.

This legislation will be our first steps to ensuring institutionalised change continues in the form of a treaty, and truth-telling will continue to recognise the historic and ongoing contemporary wrongs and address ongoing injustices for South Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

I want to thank in particular and provide some reflections from a man called Eddie Synot, a proud Wamba Wamba First Nations lawyer and researcher. He helped the South Australian Greens in our deliberations and understanding of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, and he is a spokesperson for the Uluru Dialogue. I think he put it best when he said:

Voice is the key. It matters for changing the culture and power of decision-making... Despite all of the effort and resource and everything that goes into closing the gap and the various different policies, things on the ground aren't markedly improving for Indigenous peoples... It's only right and fair that [we] have a direct say in those decisions that are made about us.

The Greens have worked with the Voice commissioner, the Malinauskas government and our communities to make sure that this legislation has the best outcomes for First Nations people in this state. Following consultation with our members and with other First Nations representatives, we did have a few concerns relating to matters including voting mechanisms, a review clause, recognition of the Uluru Statement in full, adequate funding and boundary maps.

Our concerns were considered, and I note that we wrote to the Attorney-General about those concerns, and an exchange of correspondence was undertaken and dialogue occurred. I note that, having been considered, some of our concerns are now reflected in the bill itself, and some are coming forward in amendments to specifically address these concerns.

I also note that I am a member of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, which I welcome being disbanded by this piece of legislation. It is an oddity, although a product of its time from a well-meaning former minister, to have a cross-party committee of members of parliament charged with addressing issues of Aboriginal affairs. Surely having people at the table will be more effective than where we sit with that right now.

I also note I am a member of that committee and called for a briefing to that committee from the First Nations Voice commissioner, Mr Dale Agius, and that was delayed and deferred by other members of the opposition on that committee to the point where, having had a Liberal opposition member then resign from the parliament and effectively from the committee, by the time that committee was able and willing to hear from the First Nations Voice commissioner, we were not able to because the bill had been brought forward. I note there were six months when we could have had that briefing and that discussion as a committee with that commissioner.

I do hope that the Liberal opposition did avail themselves, outside of that committee opportunity, to take the same briefings, to have the same discussions, that I know the Greens had, that I know One Nation had, that I know SA-Best had. I do hope that those conversations were, in fact undertaken.

I also want to take a little moment to thank some of the important people who have made this legislation possible. I express my deepest thanks to the original Greens of the South Australian Greens that is part of the Australian Greens First Nations Network, the leadership of Uncle Moogy and, indeed, our South Australian Greens co-convenor Brenz Saunders, supported ably by our other co-convenor Peta-Anne Louth, for their wisdom and guidance and their effort to engage.

To the inaugural Commissioner for First Nations Voice, Mr Dale Agius, your enthusiasm and dedication to your work has not gone unnoticed and we do thank you for leading the extensive community consultations. I thank Greens members in South Australia, and constituents and organisations who I have met with to share their stories, concerns and other feedback. I thank the Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, the Hon. Kyam Maher, as leader in this place for his willingness to maintain an open dialogue, and the multiple briefings that he provided to myself and to the Greens more broadly.

We have known that this debate was coming to this parliament since 2021. In fact, we have had legislation in this parliament for a First Nations Voice to this parliament since 2021. We are here in 2023 hearing concerns that it has all been too rushed. It is quite an extraordinary proposition to claim that.

I wish to conclude by saying this, of course, always was and always will be Aboriginal land, so let's now allow First Nations South Australians to have an effective means of participation within this democracy—it is their democracy—and give them that Voice they so rightly deserve. It is a Voice that will give them the respect they deserve, it is a Voice that they have asked for, it is a Voice that I would hope the parliament will listen to regardless of how we vote on this piece of legislation. In the words of Pat Anderson, Alyawarre woman and co-chair of Uluru Dialogue:

Silence never made history and History is Calling. It is up to all Australians to answer. We call upon the nation to continue walking with us on this [final] stretch to a better future.

In this walk, it struck me that something that has often been reflected upon in this debate is that in 1967, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were, some 70 years after South Australia argued in the federation formation, finally counted, finally seen but still not heard, still silenced. John Howard

dismantled ATSIC almost at the stroke of a pen. John Howard as Prime Minister refused to listen, and with the Bringing Them Home report, refused to apologise.

To me as an MP, that is what the call of the Voice is: to listen and to learn, to reflect and to consider, to be better leaders because we have had more than just our own experience presented to us, to be better than we have been before, and that is that better future that Pat Anderson points to—to walk together on this path that the Uluru Statement from the Heart has shown us. That path is clearly going to be one that we are going to need to carve out and perhaps it will not run as smoothly as we would have hoped, due to having a lack of bipartisan support, and sadly, in this debate, not one walked on by all in this place. But when it is done, I hope all of us as leaders, when we have a Voice, will listen. With that, I commend the bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:13): I rise to speak in support of this historic reform. For far too long, First Nations people have been marginalised and excluded from decision-making in our state and, indeed, in our nation. The impact of colonisation on First Nations people has caused intergenerational harm and trauma. From the forced removal of Aboriginal children from their families to the stealing of land, the destruction of cultural practices, Aboriginal people have suffered and continue to suffer injustice and discrimination.

It is time for First Nations people to have a voice in decision-making in this parliament. For most of Australia's colonised history, policies have been inflicted upon First Nations people, not developed with them, not developed by them. Truth-telling is something the Greens recognise as being vital for our journey towards reconciliation. We know that there has been genocide committed against First Nations people and, as I mentioned, children stolen from their families, land stolen and cultural practices destroyed.

We see today, sadly, ongoing systemic racism against First Nations people. We see First Nations children locked up in disproportionate numbers in our jails. We continue to see poorer health outcomes for First Nations people. None of this is acceptable and all of this is a result of systemic racism and the failure of successive governments to provide what Aboriginal people want and need.

Non-Aboriginal people making policies has led to worse outcomes for First Nations people's lives. We need to hear from First Nations people about the issues they face. Now is an opportunity for us to stop and to listen to their voices and to incorporate their perspectives into our decision-making as a parliament. Now is the time for listening and the time for action.

The Uluru Statement from the Heart, delivered in 2017, calls for the establishment of a First Nations Voice to Parliament. The Uluru Statement calls for us to walk together in a spirit of reconciliation. It has asked us to step up and to build a future that is based on respect and understanding.

This statement, as outlined by my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks, has three vital elements: the first being a First Nations Voice so that we can hear and understand the perspectives of all the nations within our country's borders; the second being truth-telling so that we have a relationship built on trust and respect that does not shy away from those uncomfortable truths; and the third being an agreement, a Treaty, so that we can work side by side to build a better future for our country.

The South Australian Greens are committed to all three elements of this statement: Voice, Truth and Treaty. The Greens support the Voice to Parliament at both a state and federal level. At a state level, this legislation is a crucial step in bringing First Nations voices into our parliament and into our deliberative processes.

When he introduced this bill into this chamber, the Hon. Kyam Maher, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, reflected on the historic nature of this reform, and I echo those statements. As our nation prepares for a referendum on a First Nations Voice later this year, South Australia has an opportunity, which has been presented by the Malinauskas government, to lead. It is only right that we do so as we have a proud history of social reform.

We have a proud history of confronting prejudice and hatred, tackling those issues that divide us: sexism, racism, homophobia. Ours was the first state in the country to legalise trade unions in 1876, the first state in the country to give women the right to vote in 1894, the first place in the world

to give women the right to stand for parliament in 1896, the first state in the country to decriminalise homosexual acts in 1975, the first state in the country to make age-based discrimination unlawful in 1991—the list goes on. History is calling us once again, and once again South Australians will heed the call.

The battle for First Nations' justice, of which the Voice is an important component, is part of a broader fight against racism and inequality in our state. The same ideology of hate that is used to deny Aboriginal South Australians their rightful place in our civic and political life is the same ugly ideology that has been used to deny women their basic rights. It is the same ideology that has been used to deny the rights of LGBTI people. As the late, great Reverend Martin Luther King once observed, 'Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.'

While we have so much work left to do in our state, South Australians have led the way in confronting these injustices, and we will do so yet again. Supporting a Voice to Parliament is a continuation of that great story of progress. Creating a Voice will enable First Nations people to move towards self-determination by finally being heard in making laws, policies and programs.

Too often in our democracy the voices of some drown out the voices of others, but by having a direct link to parliament through direct addresses, reports and hearings, the First Nations Voice to Parliament will be a foundation of our decision making. As a democratically-elected body, the Voice will be built on the principles of equality and fairness. I am hopeful that this model will lead to better outcomes for First Nations people in our state.

We recognise that the challenges in South Australia are immense. Over 50 per cent of our incarcerated youth are First Nations people, and Indigenous people are 15 times more likely to experience homelessness than other Australians. It is clear that we need to take urgent action to address these issues, and the Greens will continue to fight for these issues to be addressed in the parliament.

The Greens will continue to amplify the voices of First Nations people and groups such as Change the Record that have been telling us to address issues such as: raising the age of criminal responsibility to 14; investing in community-led, evidence-based programs to reduce criminal offending; building more culturally appropriate, affordable and public housing; and providing long-term investment in First Nations community-controlled housing sectors and specialist homelessness services.

This is an opportunity for the parliament to take a collective step in the right direction. I am very proud to vote for this bill, just as I will be very proud to vote yes in the referendum that will be held later this year. It is my hope that what we are doing in the parliament this week will move us closer to achieving a future where First Nations people's voices are finally heard, and where we have a parliament that is truly representative of all South Australians, not just the few.

In summing-up, I want to reflect on some of the arguments that have been made against this reform. I do think it is disappointing that there is not a bipartisan approach being taken to this reform, that the Liberal Party has chosen to join One Nation in opposing this legislation—I think that is regrettable for our state. Some of the claims that have been made in this parliament are, quite frankly, false. The suggestion that this is a third chamber is not true. No-one has proposed that a third chamber of parliament be created, and that is certainly not what this is.

Some members have asked: what message does a Voice to Parliament send to children of the future? I submit that the message is very clear: the message is that this parliament and the South Australian community recognises the sovereignty of First Nations people, recognises the unique role they should play in our democracy and wants to give them a voice in this parliament. That is a very powerful and important message to send to our children.

I have heard it suggested that, somehow, by creating a Voice to Parliament we are stoking the fires of division or even racism. I find that a nonsensical argument. Sadly, racism and systemic racism against Aboriginal people has been a persistent force in our state. We cannot overcome that if we do not give Aboriginal people a genuine voice in this parliament. A Voice to Parliament is not about furthering race-based division or furthering inequality; rather, it is about creating the conditions where we can finally overcome it.

I have also heard it said in this place that this is giving unfair treatment to one particular group over another. Rather, what this parliament is doing is recognising the unique role that First Nations people should play in this parliament as the traditional owners of this land, the land on which this parliament sits, and that is one small way of moving us on the path of reconciliation.

In concluding, I want to join with my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks in thanking the members of the South Australian Greens for their leadership internally on this, in particular our First Nations Greens group, the Original Greens. I want to thank my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks for her leadership in the work that she has done with the government on this important reform but also in engaging with First Nations groups over many years. I know that this has been a long-term project.

I want to recognise the leadership of the Attorney-General and thank him for the collegial way in which he has engaged with our party on this important reform. I feel genuinely excited about the potential that lies ahead. It is not often in political life that we have an opportunity to vote for something that can make a genuine difference and has the opportunity to genuinely change things for the better. I see this as being one such opportunity and I urge all members of parliament to get behind it, and let's make the most of what comes next.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:25): I am humbled to be standing here today to speak on the First Nations Voice Bill 2023 on behalf of SA-Best. As we do at the commencement of every parliamentary session, I would like to take this opportunity also to begin by acknowledging the traditional owners of the Kurna land on which we meet and extend my respects to elders past, present and emerging. I also acknowledge that this place, and indeed this parliament, has contributed to the overwhelming and disproportionate disadvantage of our First Nations people.

This is an historic day for First Nations people across the state and hopefully in the months to come across the nation. It takes a bold move, and indeed bold leadership, to put forward a model that we know deals with uncomfortable truths which we have all collectively allowed to go on unheard or unaddressed or both. For many years, this place has failed to truly listen to the views, needs and wants of our First Nations people. Despite any best intentions or endeavours, your voices have not been truly heard in our lawmaking, our policies or our legislation, and you have borne the consequences and outcomes of these processes without voice, without truth-telling and without treaty.

I have not walked in your shoes, which is why I do not intend to stand here today and speak for you. I know when we make speeches in this place we all look for advice, we look for mentorship, we look for guidance, for people who have lived experience. We search for words that inspire us to do a bill or an issue justice. For my advice and guidance and inspiration, I knew exactly who to turn to. When it comes to issues like this at the heart of this bill or our First Nations people and the issues they confront, I often turn to someone who is known to many of us in this place fondly as Aunty Pat.

I acknowledge also the presence here today of another well-respected elder, known to many of us as Uncle Moogy. It is hard to sit with Aunty Pat and not be moved by her words, her knowledge, her lived experience, her voice and indeed her anguish. Like many First Nations people, and our elders in particular, Aunty Pat is much better placed to explain the importance of this legislation than I could ever be. For that reason, I will use this privilege opportunity to read a statement prepared by her, in her own words, about what this means to her and so many First Nations people.

Of course, as we know only too well, Aunty Pat's is not the only voice, but her words undoubtedly resonate with First Nations people across the nation and I hope they resonate with all my colleagues today, especially those opposite, respectfully. In the well-considered, lived and very wise words of Patricia Waria-Read, a proud and universally respected Ngadjuri woman, a volunteer for Nunga Babies Watch and Salt and Pepper, and a respected elder on the Nunga Court Adelaide, I quote:

Before settlement Aboriginal people had a voice, an ancient voice. Our voice has travelled through time, from the beginning.

Our Elders guide us with their wisdom and stories.

Our voice makes a difference!

But today our voice is not heard, we are not listened to, we are silenced.

The Voice in Government can stop on-going trauma, judgemental and racist behaviour towards our Aboriginal families and communities.

Our voice can stop our families and communities from being punished, keep our children from the juvenile justice system, the Department for Child Protection, out of prison and stop our unborn babies from being 'red flagged' and then taken.

Our voice can ensure our children remain with family, community and stay connected to culture. Keeping our children linked to their culture gives us hope for our future. Our children lie at the heart of who we are.

Our voice is our community. Our voice strengthens, heals and builds resilience in support of our health, safety and wellbeing.

The Voice in Government will be the voice of our communities, [our] families and [our] children.

The Voice will ensure the voices of our Aboriginal nations in SA are heard.

Our voice will be heard not silenced.

With respect, the sentiment that Auntie Pat provides in that statement is all the convincing I need in terms of supporting this important piece of legislation. It is my sincere hope I can do her wise, considered and, above all, lived words and experiences justice by voting in favour of this bill.

As the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Attorney-General has said, this legislation will not take away from the work we are doing here in parliament. It will not stymie or hinder or impede our parliamentary processes. I sincerely hope it does much more than that and I know the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Attorney-General does too. I hope it makes us collectively accountable for our decision-making and the outcomes for our First Nations people. I hope it makes us a better vehicle for truly positive change because, Lord only knows, what we have done to date simply has not worked.

This is a defining moment for our First Nations people and their future generations. It is a defining moment for our First Nations elders. It is a defining moment in the history of this state. It is a defining moment for our communities. It is a defining moment for the well-respected inaugural Commissioner for First Nations Voice, Mr Dale Agius, and, of course, it is a defining moment for our Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Attorney-General, Kyam Maher, who together, I believe, have put their hearts and souls into this issue for many years. For that, we thank you.

This is but one step in what will inevitably be a long journey and a difficult one at that. It is my very firm view that we need a treaty and I certainly look forward to reaching that milestone sooner rather than later. I, for one, am very humbled and privileged to be standing here today voting on what will ultimately become a defining part of our state's history and rich cultural tapestry.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:33): I rise to speak in support of the First Nations Voice Bill, although I do so with some trepidation because, as we know too well in this place, no legislation is ever perfect and this one before us today perhaps is not. If there are any problems in its interpretation and the actual rollout and operation of the Voice, it will be up to this parliament to fix it and fix it promptly. This step is something entirely new in our system of government. My colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros and I welcome it, endorse it and acknowledge its significance in the context of the history of this state and this country.

In simplistic terms, the Voice to Parliament is a reasonable recognition of the sovereignty of First Nations people in our state and rightly gives them a say on matters that have a direct or perhaps even indirect bearing on their lives, a recognition that was shamefully and regrettably overlooked by the white colonial authors of Australia's constitution. There has been much debate in public forums, mostly from the far right and redneck elements in our community, that a Voice is racist, that it gives some privilege to Aborigines, representing some 3 per cent of our population, over the other 97 per cent. I do not hold that view; clearly the majority in this place do not hold that view.

This is about acknowledging the sovereignty of ancient and spiritual owners of this country in a much more formal and respectful way to bridge the gap of exclusion and prejudice that was created by the British colonial rulers and continued after the formation of the federation. Before colonisation, historians argue, there were sovereign states that existed, with Indigenous tribes that had their own rules of law. They fought over territory, they traded with each other, they coexisted.

This was their country, and it was taken from them without any formal treaties, unlike what we saw in New Zealand, for instance. Decisions were made that affected them, without them having a voice in that process.

It has taken more than 230 years, but now Australians of all walks have come to accept that meaningful representation that reflects the diversity of First Nations people and empowers them to be an integral part of nationhood must be a priority for us to move forward in harmonious reconciliation. Our short history has been blotted with chapters that would shame us on the treatment of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders and our indifferent attitudes towards them. Some of that continues to this very day in places like Alice Springs.

I was recently reminded of a court case in 2010, involving five white men who, after a night of heavy drinking at the Alice Springs Casino, decided it would be fun to go out in their vehicle and terrorise Aboriginal people camped on the Todd riverbed and fire blanks from a gun. As you could imagine, the campers ran in all directions in fear of their lives. One, Kwementyaye Ryder, threw a bottle at the rampaging vehicle. The four occupants chased down Mr Ryder, who then lost his footing and fell. Defenceless and unable to pose any threat, they repeatedly bashed and kicked him in the head, killing him. The white fellows fled like the cowards they were, without giving assistance to a motionless Mr Ryder, and then for a week lied to the police over the events of that night, until one of them decided to confess.

Of course, this was a reprehensible crime, reminiscent of Ku Klux Klan race hate killings in the southern United States, yet it was the sentencing remarks by Justice Brian Martin KC that disturbed and alarmed a journalist, Michael Brull. It also shocked me. Justice Martin concluded that the crime—remember, a wanton beating of a black man—was toward the lower end of the scale of seriousness for crimes of manslaughter, that not enough violence was inflicted and that the defendants supposedly could not have foreseen a serious risk of death from their violent attack. Poor Mr Ryder. I wonder what might have been had his skin been a different colour. I will quote from Mr Brull's article that was published on 14 May 2010 in *Overland*:

...Justice Martin then considered the possible value of inflicting a heavier sentence for...deterrence [value]. He dismissed this too. His grounds for this are particularly striking: the violence 'arose out of an angry and aggressive reaction to a perceived insult'. Plainly, there could be no value in deterrence with a mere crime of violence perpetrated by intoxicated youths responding to a perceived insult.

What did not feature in the judge's discussion of deterrence was what he acknowledged repeatedly to be the 'atmosphere of antagonism towards Aboriginal persons' manifested by the defendants. Nor was this mentioned as an aggravating feature. Which goes much of the way towards explaining his lenient sentencing.

Mr Brull goes on:

Doody, who did not physically strike Ryder, was sentenced to four years' imprisonment, to be suspended after 12 months. Hird, Kloeden and Spears were sentenced to six years' imprisonment, with a non-parole period of four years. Swain had half a year taken off both measures, on account of his confession.

Yet there is one other factor which played a crucial role in Martin CJ's sentencing, arguably the most appalling part of his decision. Chief Justice Martin went out of his way to provide character references for every single defendant. Doody is 'a person of positive good character'. Hird is a 'solid hard-working young man of good character'. Kloeden has an 'underlying good character'. Spears is a 'person of very good character'. Swain, like Kloeden, was a 'person of underlying good character'. These men of good character repeatedly terrorised Aboriginal people for being Aboriginal, before using a gun to terrorise them further, ending the night by beating a man to death, and then casually driving away without checking if their victim was okay.

Chief Justice Martin's grounds for these conclusions are astonishing. He notes character references in their favour, proving that many of them have friends and employers who think nice things about them...Yet Justice Martin was able to claim that this was 'totally out of character' for all of them, and also that they were 'genuinely sorry'.

Presumably he was able to judge their tremendous remorse from how they casually left behind the motionless man, who soon died...[from] the beating. This too was in their character. Or perhaps their remorse was manifested in the lies they [worked on together to tell the cops]. Or perhaps he judged their remorse from the fact that four out of the five did not cooperate with the police at all. The only one who...did so when it was already apparent that they would be caught.

What was missing from Martin CJ's sentencing remarks, and sentence, was a sense of revulsion at what [happened]. The five young men engaged in recreational activities that would not be out of place in a gathering of Klansmen.

This disgusting crime was not just an attack on...Ryder. It was an attack on Aboriginal people in Australia. It—and Martin CJ's judgement—was an attack on our decency as a people. I am appalled as a human being to live in a country where such a terrible crime can take place, where the media and public intellectuals (with the honourable exception of Chris Graham, editor of the *National Indigenous Times*, who gave me the judgement) [on Friday] have reacted with complete indifference.

I am horrified as a Jewish person to live in a country where a member of a small, vulnerable minority can be victimised in such a shocking manner, and the perpetrators can still be described as basically good people.

And I am ashamed as an Australian that this is the country I live in.

That ends the quotes from the report by Mr Brull. So where was a voice for Mr Ryder in that instance? The law continues to treat Indigenous people more harshly than most whites, as evidenced by the disproportionate number in our jails and before our courts.

Right now, there is an Aboriginal man, Derek Bromley, who has spent almost 40 years behind bars for a murder he maintains he did not commit and will not be released on the parole that was due 14 years ago because he steadfastly refuses to admit to the crime in his Parole Board hearings. You have a DPP—a former judge, Martin Hinton KC—who, in a submission to the High Court set to hear an appeal in the matter, has failed to mention that the Crown relied on a discredited and unqualified key witness to gain Mr Bromley's conviction. This glaring omission has alarmed some prominent criminal barristers.

It is cases of rough justice involving Aboriginals, such as those I have mentioned here, that we must address if, as a nation, we are truly serious and sorry. The ABS June quarter statistics of 2022 show that Aboriginal children are 20 times more likely to be incarcerated in Australia compared to the rest of the population—and it gets worse: 29 per cent of Australia's adult prison population is represented by Indigenous people, who only make up 3 per cent of our population, with 17 of those dying in custody in 2022.

Of some 13,039 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander prisoners, 61 per cent were sentenced. We already know the life expectancy statistics are harrowing for our Indigenous population, with 42 per cent of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people being at the highest risk for cardiovascular disease and other chronic diseases. Further to this, 18 per cent of adults are dealing with diabetes compared to 5 per cent for others.

Australia has long been criticised for its treatment of our First Nations people. Following the visit to Australia in early 2017, the inaugural Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous People, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, reported:

While the government has adopted numerous policies to address the socio-economic disadvantage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, those policies do not duly respect the rights to self-determination and to full and effective participation.

The compounded effect of the policies contributes to the failure to deliver on the targets in the areas of health, education and employment in the '*Closing the Gap*' strategy, and fuels the escalating and critical incarceration and child removal rates of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

Comprehensive revision of the policies needs to be a national priority, and the consequences and prevalence of intergenerational trauma and racism must be acknowledged and addressed.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders require better recognition and active participation in Australian society.

As we all know in this place, none of these statistics are new. Somebody with some authority must speak for them and about them before our lawmakers. However, for all the bad that was perpetrated we must not overlook or disregard the good that has also emerged in creating the modern Australia we all enjoy and which embraces all cultures and celebrates them.

There are many First Nations people who have come from difficult backgrounds and adversity to become leaders in our communities, in the fields of education, science, industry, medicine, politics and sport. I do want to pay special tribute to our own Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, the Hon. Kyam Maher, for his courage, dedication, determination and sacrifices to get this bill before parliament today.

He has taken a lot of personal hits, including the utterly outrageous questioning in some sections of the media of his own Aboriginality and that of his beloved deceased mother. Just to look

at him, to talk to him and hear of his passionate commitment and experiences in furthering the rights of First Nations people is convincing enough evidence for me. Kyam Maher will be highly regarded as one of the most progressive and pioneering legislators we have had in this state's great history.

I also acknowledge the tremendous input by the Commissioner for First Nations Voice, Dale Agius. He is here today in the gallery, along with another respected leader, Uncle Moogy Sumner OAM, who is internationally renowned as one of our Indigenous cultural ambassadors. Contrary to the criticism, there has been an enormous amount of time spent on consulting and engaging with Aboriginal communities around the state, with input from leaders and elders in other jurisdictions to come up with the model that we now have before us.

Sadly, it is something the Attorney's federal leader, Prime Minister Anthony Albanese, has failed to do to date. We still do not know what a national Voice will look like or how it is proposed to work with the federal parliament. I cannot vote yes for something I do not have any detail on in terms of the mechanism or the process. Mr Albanese and federal Labor must immediately rethink their 'All will be right' strategy to avoid an embarrassment at the referendum, which in turn will reflect poorly on Mr Albanese's own standing

But we do have the important details—the model—in this bill, and I thank the Attorney-General for his forthright answers and the assurances he has provided to me about issues I had raised regarding identity and eligibility criteria, and accountability and oversight, including the integrity of candidates nominating and those then elected to the Voice.

I did have concerns the Voice has the potential to be weaponised or manipulated by self-serving groups within the Indigenous community which may have some perverse interest in particular bills or that bills could face legal challenges, throwing a spanner in the works and thereby paralysing the parliamentary process itself. I am satisfied with the assurances the Attorney-General has provided me and my colleague, and he will explain them in the committee stage of proceedings.

I commend this bill to the Legislative Council, and I look forward to a monumental chapter in history being made later this week and am proud to be part of it.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:51): I rise to oppose the First Nations Voice Bill 2023. I have made clear publicly and will reiterate here in this chamber that no amount of detail will make race-based legislation a positive step for Australian society. To segregate us by race is an enormous backward step for Australia.

The Attorney-General and I have nothing in common when it comes to our opinion on this First Nations Voice Bill, but in fact on the topic of lifting up those most disadvantaged we have much in common, and I find the suggestion that opposing this bill and the no campaign is akin to bigotry and hatefulness, as stated in the Attorney's second reading explanation, deeply offensive.

I have made clear publicly and will reiterate in this chamber that for me and the constituents I represent the way forward to assist those of us who are most vulnerable and disadvantaged, which is a fundamental passion of mine, is to focus on need regardless of race. This approach would obviously include support and lift up the unacceptable fact that a disproportionate number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people live in despairing conditions, whilst not ignoring the fact that almost three-quarters of those living in poverty, and who are either homeless or at imminent risk of being homeless, are in fact not Indigenous.

This proposition of a First Nations Voice Bill in no way acknowledges the fact that many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are doing as well as non-Indigenous Australians. They get educated, work and contribute positively. I believe in respecting people's culture and people's right to maintain a culture, where it is cohesive and not in conflict with the values of Australian society. That is different to supporting race-based legislation that divides us.

I reiterate how insulting I find the suggestion that concerns or opposition to this government's approach to enhancing the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people is in conflict with wanting to enhance the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. This could not be further from the truth, and I stand with those in the community who want to see funds spent on real, tangible benefits for the Aboriginal community, not bureaucracy, and those who feel strongly that we should all be seen as fundamentally equal under the law.

I know that many faith groups and people living in both rural and city communities oppose this piece of legislation. South Australians deserve from their elected South Australian Labor government a balanced and rational approach, and I must express my disappointment that the Attorney failed to mention the many myriad strategies taken to try to enhance the lives of Aboriginal people by progressive governments in his recent address to parliament.

The Attorney did not mention the over \$30 billion a year on trying to bridge the gap or that, at a minimum, twice as much money is spent by the government on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people as non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, or in fact the many thousands of Aboriginal groups that have been established and supported by the government. But with many measures actually getting worse, such as suicide rates, adult incarceration rates, number of children school-ready, and number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children living in out-of-home care, many ask: where is all the money going and why is it not working?

Speaking to people in the Aboriginal community recently, they assure me they do not see it and I believe them. An investigation into all this spending with no outcome and increased transparency is urgently needed—not another web of complicated bureaucracy as proposed here by the South Australian Labor government masked by the name the Voice.

The Attorney's second reading speech seemed only designed to shame and guilt non-Indigenous Australians. I might add that one in four Australians are immigrants or refugees who have since established themselves in this fabulous country after colonisation—contributing, thriving—many of whom came from their own impoverished conditions in their home country with their own stories of disadvantage and hardship. We in this chamber must remember what a fabulous country Australia is, and that many are given the opportunity to thrive and succeed despite an unfair start. Let me make clear, however, that more can and should be done for those who are impoverished in this state but on a needs, not a race, basis.

As I stated, I am against the concept of the bill but I will point out some specific concerns. Part 1, clause 4(1)—Meaning of First Nations person, states that:

...a person will be taken to be a First Nations person if the person—

- (a) is of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent; and
- (b) regards themselves as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander...; and
- (c) is accepted as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person by the relevant Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander community.

How will it be determined, as stated in clause 4(1)(a) that an individual is Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander? Clause 4(2) states:

- (2) For the purposes of this Act, a person will be taken to be of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent if the person is biologically descended from the persons who inhabited Australia or the Torres Strait Islands...before European settlement.

How will this be determined and is all this scrutiny on someone's race a positive thing? For me, it is such a backward step, and a focus on need rather than race would avoid such inappropriate speculation. It is explicitly stated in the Commissioner for First Nations Voice South Australian parliament Second Engagement Report that under the current model there is no requirement for voters to submit proof of Aboriginality documentation as part of their declaration.

The government is aware of the potential pitfall of proving Aboriginality, suggesting within the Second Engagement Report that an Aboriginal commissioner may indeed be established in future to verify connection to country. How much is this all going to cost going forward? Is this a positive step? I would say no, along with many in our community. As stated earlier, for me and the constituents I represent, the way forward is needs-based not race-based support, and it is felt that we must not question how much the Voice will cost, and we must not oppose a bill that is based on race or we will face being called bigoted and hateful.

Ironically many Aboriginals are questioning the Voice bill and whether it will actually result in change for them, whether they will in fact have their voices bypassed as a result of the establishment of the Voice, and ask why money, time and energy being directed toward the debate and enactment of the Voice cannot just be directly applied to tangible outcomes on the myriad issues already

expressed and ignored by the government. More concerning is the lack of detail in some fairly significant areas such as the actual number of regions, the number of elected members in the Local First Nations Voice and the number of members comprising the State First Nations Voice. Despite numbers being publicly stated, no actual numbers are stipulated in the bill.

Most concerning is clause 34—Other advisory committees. The State First Nations Voice may essentially establish any number of 'such other committees' with the Attorney-General's approval, and members of those committees will be legislatively entitled to such remuneration, allowances, and expenses as determined by the minister. This reads as a potential blank cheque paid for by every South Australian taxpayer.

I wonder: where is the Child and Young Person Visitor's guaranteed resourcing? I submitted legislation last year that would have secured adequate resourcing to the team that looks after the wellbeing of children and young people living in state residential care. We know there is an over-representation of Aboriginal children in our child protection system, but you, the government, voted no. This is another example of the Malinauskas government funding bureaucracy and not real, tangible solutions.

I would like to speak to the amendment of the First Nations Voice Bill I intend to move regarding clause 34—Other advisory committees. This amendment is designed to ensure that the establishment of further committees is only undertaken where it can be shown that expertise cannot be sourced by the already First Nations Voice. I make clear that I oppose the bill entirely, but considering it is clear there are the numbers for it to pass, I want to ensure I give parliament the opportunity to ensure appropriate restraint on the establishment of further committees.

Clause 41 of the First Nations Voice Bill notes clearly that the State First Nations Voice may provide a report to parliament, but legislatively they do not have to provide a report or attend. Where is the accountability? Clause 42 repeats this: it may be requested to present to parliament, but they have a get-out clause in clause 42(3); however, nothing in this clause requires the State First Nations Voice or a member of the State First Nations Voice to provide a report or attend parliament.

Parliamentary committees must report as due diligence and best practice to show accountability to the South Australian taxpayer. Race-based legislation has no place in our society and does nothing to promote cohesion and unity. Assistance in addressing those who are living in disparaging circumstances should be delivered on need, not any divisive mechanism like this legislation sets out to enshrine in our laws. I will be voting no and I will be representing many South Australians whom the Malinauskas government has chosen to ignore in the pursuit of rushing this legislation through, frankly, to stroke their own ego ahead of a federal referendum.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (17:01): I rise today to speak in proud support of the First Nations Voice Bill. This bill is the first of its kind, and marks a significant moment in the history of our state, and a momentous start to the year ahead. Through this bill, this parliament can commit to serious engagement with Aboriginal people of South Australia about the issues, policies and laws that affect them.

The call for a Voice to Parliament comes from the Uluru Statement from the Heart, an invitation from First Nations people to Australians to walk together towards a better future. The Uluru Statement calls for three changes in particular: the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the constitution, a Treaty process, and truth-telling about our shared history.

Since colonisation, the indignities visited upon the First Nations people of this land have been countless. They have been carried out at the hands of and with the blessings of previous governments, both Labor and Liberal, state and federal, Australian and British. I will not revisit those indignities, as I would hope that everyone in this place is aware of them. I will only say that despite attempts at genocide, one of the oldest living cultures on the planet is proudly still here. There is a direct and uninterrupted link between the inhumane cruelties of settlement and disadvantages faced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people today.

Across the country, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people still face lower life expectancies by up to eight years, on average. The infant mortality rate is twice the rate of non-First Nations children. Aboriginal women are 32 times as likely to be hospitalised as a result of family

violence as non-Aboriginal women, and they are over-represented in every single domestic and family violence statistic. Aboriginal children are still over-represented in youth detention and incarceration statistics. To cap it off, the rate of over-representation of Aboriginal adults in incarceration in South Australia actually increased in 2021.

Nationally, we are on track to meet very few targets set forth in the Closing the Gap initiative for 2031. That is shameful. It is clear that whatever existing frameworks or policies being used to address the disadvantages faced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities are not working. In this place we are sometimes very far from the people and communities that we legislate on behalf of. That distance can be physical or it can be cultural.

The Voice creates the opportunity for First Nations people to have a hand in the creation of policies that are meant to help support them. The Voice does not only create an opportunity for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to have a greater say in decisions that implicate them, it also creates the obligation to listen to what they have to say. We have to be receptive and open-minded and respect the wisdom that comes from the lived experiences of those with different lives from us, who come from cultures that are different from ours. We must recognise that they know things that we do not, can help us see what we may be blind to, and are the best authority on their own communities.

In elevating the voices of communities facing disadvantage, we have the opportunity not only to meaningfully improve their lives but also to improve the lives of all. In lifting others up, we lift ourselves up. While we remain ignorant and perpetuate cycles of disadvantage, pain and suffering, we are all worse for it. No-one is free until we are all free. This is the essence of solidarity.

The Voice is a first step, and I look forward to standing in solidarity with First Nations communities as we continue down the path they have generously invited us to walk. I would just like to make one comment. I will not give further oxygen to the arguments opposed to the bill from the opposite side, but what I will say is: shame! Shame on you!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:06): I thank all honourable members who have contributed to the second reading stage of this bill and a lot to the development of this bill. As outlined in letters I have sent earlier this month, it is our intention to conclude the second reading stage today, and given where we have got to, I intend to go into clause 1 in committee, and that will give members an opportunity to put questions on the record. We can come back on Thursday to answer some of those general questions members put on the record at clause 1, which is something we have done in practice not infrequently.

Obviously there will be a chance during the committee stage to ask more precise questions about individual clauses, but I think I can answer many of the questions that have been raised and anticipate some of the questions people will have in committee, particularly from the extensive briefings that have occurred with members of various parties in this chamber.

I will first go through some of the comments made during the second reading stage. The Hon. Michelle Lensink, on behalf of the opposition, had a concern about the consultation that was engaged in the development of this bill. The Commissioner for First Nations Voice commenced engagement with First Nations people, leaders and communities in August 2022. Seven sessions were held in Adelaide and the outer metropolitan region, and 17 were held in regional and remote areas, including the South-East, Mid-North, Yorke Peninsula, Riverland, Eyre Peninsula, APY and Far West Coast.

The sessions went for a six-week period and concluded on 11 October 2022. A second round of community engagements occurred on 17 November 2022. This was undertaken in two parts: face-to-face engagements until 22 December 2022, and community-wide online engagement facilitated through the YourSAy website, which closed on 6 January 2023.

I am informed that more than 200 people attended the face-to-face engagement sessions, 26 surveys were completed, and 42 written submissions were received, with 11 from organisations and the remainder from individuals. We have engaged constructively with all parties, particularly with the Liberal opposition on this issue. On 8 September last year I first met with the shadow minister for

Aboriginal affairs, the member for Heysen, on the subject of a Voice to Parliament once consultation had started.

On 9 November, when we first released the draft bill, I ensured my office provided a copy of that draft bill to the shadow minister's office. On 24 January this year, I met again with the shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs, the member for Heysen, to further discuss the Voice and developments that occurred during the second round of consultation.

On 7 February, when we released this final bill, we provided the shadow minister's office with copies of the final bill itself, Commissioner Dale Agius' second engagement note, the government's response to that engagement note, the government's response to how our bill answers the 15 questions that the leader of the federal opposition, Peter Dutton, had set out on the Voice, and copies of every single written submission that we received. In fact, we provided that to all parties in this chamber.

I do not remember once in my time in opposition receiving copies of every single submission that was received on a particular piece of legislation that was going through the chamber. I think it is fair to say that the engagement that has occurred with Aboriginal South Australia on this bill has been the most comprehensive engagement any government has ever undertaken with Aboriginal South Australia on any proposed legislation or policy. I think there has been an outstanding level of engagement.

I thank Commissioner Dale Agius for the work that he and his team, ably assisted, have done on this bill and the level of engagement that has occurred. As I have said, there has been very significant engagement. I gave as the example the Liberal opposition, because that was a concern raised by the Liberal opposition, but we have engaged constructively, and I thank all other members of other parties for their engagement in this process as well.

The Hon. Michelle Lensink raised an issue of links to native title groups. It is our very strong view that the proposed Voice to Parliament can coexist, and will coexist, with existing bodies and organisations. The Voice represents an opportunity for all First Nations people, including but not limited to those represented by First Nations prescribed body corporates, to be able to use their Voice for the benefit of communities and First Nations people in South Australia.

In particular, those Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who have not originally called South Australia home and are not members of the South Australian prescribed body corporate or members of the stolen generations, who through the deliberate acts of past governments have not found their way home yet, can be represented and their voices heard in this bill.

The bill has been amended to make it clear that the Local Voice and the State Voice will operate in conjunction with, and not usurp the functions of, any other First Nations persons or bodies or any agreement or arrangements that have been entered into. It is something that in particular the Hon. Tammy Franks talked to us about in consultations. We have included a specific provision in the final bill.

Further to that, in recognition of First Nations prescribed body corporates and their important role, the bill has also been amended to require the establishment of a native title bodies advisory committee. The membership of the body will comprise a person nominated by each of the bodies prescribed in regulations that will represent each of the native title groups in South Australia.

As the Hon. Michelle Lensink noted in her contribution today, the criticisms that they, that is groups like native title services, have of this model would potentially also apply to the Liberal model of legislation, and that is entirely true. The Aboriginal Representative Body Bill, which is still live and in the other chamber as the Liberal Party's preferred model, would suffer from exactly the same criticism that is sought to be levelled.

I thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Leader of the Opposition in this place, for her contribution. The honourable member was concerned that the other elements of the Uluru Statement, Truth and Treaty, are not defined. This bill does not seek to determine what will constitute Truth or Treaty for the purposes of the implementation of the remaining parts of the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

What clause 8 of this bill does is seek to make it clear that the First Nations Voice Act will be read in conjunction with any future legislation that implements the other two measures of Truth or Treaty. It does not require it but it certainly recognises that it is our intention, and it is our stated intention, to implement in full all the elements of the Uluru Statement—that this is read in conjunction.

We are committed as a government, as we made clear way back in NAIDOC Week in 2019, to implement in full a state-based version of the Uluru Statement. The Hon. Nicola Centofanti raised concerns that this is—I think this was the term used—'a fourth arm of government or a third chamber of parliament'.

As the Hon. Tammy Franks has pointed out, even those who were opposed to the original Uluru Statement many years ago and coined the concern of the third chamber have now come out in regret at doing so. This bill establishes the First Nations Voice as an advisory body—an advisory body. It is very, very clear. We have had the benefit of very, very senior legal advice, the best legal advice that governments can have available, and this is an advisory body. It is not a fourth arm of government; it is not a third chamber.

In the Hon. Laura Henderson's contribution she raised concerns that South Australians were likely unaware that this was an election commitment. I think it might have even been the very first election commitment that the then Labor opposition made from opposition. It was made on 4 July 2019, a long time before the 2022 election.

It subsequently became the core of our Aboriginal affairs policy that we took to the election. It was raised time and time and time again by the then Leader of the Opposition. At the main debate between the Labor and Liberal leaders prior to the election, it was the very first thing that the then Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, said.

In fact, having been at quite a few of the events in the lead-up to the election, it was pretty much the first thing that the then Leader of the Opposition said every time he spoke at events. I sat through many times when the then Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, would acknowledge that we were on Kurna land in whatever event we were at and we pay respect to elders past and present, but it is not in our words, it is in our deeds and then he went on to talk about our commitment to implementing a Voice to Parliament. It was front and centre of nearly everything that the Leader of the Opposition did in the lead-up to the election.

It was not just in the lead-up to the election. All of us who are political tragics will remember on election night on the ABC Antony Green calling the election and crossing about half an hour later to the new premier-elect, Peter Malinauskas, and again it was the first thing he said on that night. I completely repudiate the idea that this was something that we were hiding and that people could not have been aware of this.

Another point that the Hon. Laura Henderson raised was that this legislation has not provided an outline of the resources to be provided. The bill provides that Local Voice members and State Voice members will receive appropriate remuneration allowances and expenses in undertaking their functions. It also clearly states that the Voices will be supported by a secretariat that will be provided with resourcing to carry out their functions.

The detail of those resources is an administrative matter and not something that is generally set out in legislation establishing statutory authorities, but in a little while I will have more to say about that because, of course, in coming up with the figure of approximately \$10 million over the forward estimates we have had to consider what they might be and I am happy to talk about some of the workings that have informed those figures to the chamber. I will do that in a little bit.

There was a concern raised that there is no cap on committees or their remuneration. The State Voice can establish advisory committees and remuneration could be paid, but there is a very significant safeguard in relation to this. The idea that it will completely grow out of control and that the State Voice will appoint a plethora of committees, pay a huge amount of money and drain the resources of the state is not founded.

Committees under the bill are entitled to such remuneration, if any, as may be determined by the minister after consultation with the State Voice. This is something within the providence of the government of the day to determine what remuneration will be paid. The idea that this will become a

huge black hole and suck the state's resources does not bear any resemblance to what is actually in the legislation. It will be up to the minister and the government of the day to determine that.

There was concern raised about the provision for filling vacancies. The ability to appoint the person who received the next highest number of votes to the vacant office is very similar, in fact, to the position that is adopted in the opposition's Aboriginal Representative Body Bill, which is alive in the other chamber as their stated policy. It is very similar to those provisions. It is strange indeed to criticise a provision that is your own stated policy in your bill that is alive in another chamber that does a very similar thing.

There was a criticism in the contribution that the bill changes the very way in which parliament will function. It will not; everything is contained in the bill about how the bill will operate in relation to parliament. To avoid any doubt, any doubt whatsoever, there are provisions in the bill that make it abundantly clear that nothing in this bill about the Voice will prevent, in any way, the parliament from conducting its business, including, to avoid doubt, the consideration or the passing of bills. It is plain on the face of the legislation.

I thank the Hon. Heidi Girolamo for her contribution. The honourable member had concerns about a lack of detail about costs, operations and changes to the constitution. The bill contains a significant amount of detail about how the model will operate. In fact, it has been a criticism by the opposition over the past few weeks that it is too detailed and too comprehensive, and now the criticism is the opposite way—that it does not provide the details. Once again, it is difficult to accept some of these criticisms, which although well-meaning are contradictory in nature, from different members of the opposition on this bill.

The changes to the Constitution Act are complementary to the establishment of the First Nations Voice under this bill. However, I want to make it clear that the Constitution Act does not need to be amended to establish the Voice, but we think it is worthy of the document and the legislation, which is almost a birth certificate of a state or a nation, that this is reflected in it. We think it is of significant-enough gravity that it ought to be mentioned in some way in our Constitution Act.

There was a question raised by the honourable member about sufficient time to consider bills, when the State Voice meets only four to six times a year. Of course, the minister may approve additional meetings; however, like many advisory boards of committees, work can also be conducted out of session. For example, the State Voice may meet to determine what priorities it would like to focus on in the coming year and to allocate particular members to consider particular bills, or decide on particular areas or pieces of legislation that they would like to focus on. There will be, as I will go through in a moment, an intention for an annual stipend in addition to sitting fees to ensure that members are remunerated for work outside regular meetings, which is not an uncommon thing for such committees.

The honourable member asked how meetings will align with sitting calendars. The timing of meetings will be a matter for the State Voice to determine. We are not going to determine and tell the State Voice when they are going to meet—I think that is how that would be answered. There was a question about whether bills would be delayed by the Voice. The answer is no. Clause 39(2) and clause 40(7) make that abundantly clear.

There was a question about what the personal liability is for the Voices. The bill does not anticipate and does not provide for Voices to administer funds. That is a matter for the secretariat, which will be made up of people who come under the public sector regime.

I thank the Hon. Dennis Hood for his contribution and some of the views he brought forward. I know the Hon. Dennis Hood and I, over the 10 years we have served in this chamber together, on some matters have not seen eye to eye at all, but I have always appreciated the exceptionally respectful way he has put forward his views and the dignity with which he does it. On this occasion we are diametrically opposed, as we are on some other things, on the fundamental view about how we go about implementing the changes we both think are needed to benefit Aboriginal people.

The Hon. Dennis Hood raised concerns about amendments to the Constitution Act without referendum. It is the case that the vast majority of provisions in the constitution can be amended by an act of the South Australian parliament without referendum. For example, a recent reform to the

constitution, passed by the parliament without a referendum, clarified, upon the death of Queen Elizabeth II, the functions of power transferred to her successor. That did not require a referendum, and I do not think it should have required a referendum. Having gone to the election with such an open policy to implement this, I think it is reasonable that the government of the day implements this and can make the changes that we think are needed, also without a referendum.

I wish to turn my attention to the two government amendments that have been filed in this place. The amendments are in response to feedback from some members, particularly the Hon. Tammy Franks. I thank her for bringing these forward to us in relation to the electoral system that is used to elect members to the Local First Nations Voices.

As I said, we received a significant amount of feedback, including from the Hon. Tammy Franks, that the method of electing people to First Nations Voices that is used in APY elections is a first-past-the-post system or a proportional representation system, and that is what we have done in relation to the two amendments that are filed. The amendments create a voting method of a single transferable vote, which all of us would be familiar with because that is what is used to elect us to this place when we face elections. In particular, they require the Electoral Commissioner to make rules that apply, as far as is reasonably practical, to the Electoral Act provisions for the counting of votes in the Legislative Council.

In practice, it will mean marking numbers of preferences on a ballot paper and not just filling out a '1', which you would do in a first-past-the-post system. The Electoral Commissioner has advised that this is likely to require voters filling out at least as many preferences as numbers of positions to be elected. For example, a seven-member Voice would require voters to indicate at least seven preferences. The Electoral Commissioner noted that this may lead to an increase in the rate of informal voting. To avoid this, we have included a savings provision to provide that the failure to mark the certain number of boxes will not in itself render the vote informal.

I thank all those who have made contributions on these matters. Over the past weeks and months, officials from my department, the commissioner and his team and I have taken part in many briefings with members about this bill and a number of questions have been raised during those briefings. To expediate the committee stage, I think it is worth going through in some detail the questions that were raised and provide as much detail as I possibly can about how this will operate and how we will intend it to operate even if some of the administrative details are not finally settled. I think it is worth giving an idea of how we see it going forward.

The member for Heysen, on behalf of the opposition, had questions about what form of remuneration Voice members will receive, what the secretariat of the Voice will be and how the budget allocation for the Voice will be broken down. The implementation and operation of the First Nations Voice over the next four years has been given a budget of \$10.3 million and this cost is split into two components: the cost to undertake local elections for the Local Voices and the operational administrative costs of both the Local and the State First Nations Voice.

After discussions with the Electoral Commissioner, election costs are being budgeted against two elections over the next four years. An initial election—hopefully, parliament willing, sometime later this year—with a hybrid of postal and partial remote polling and with election stations set up throughout South Australia is looking to be held at a cost of approximately \$2.94 million. The cost of a second election in the forward estimates, which is to be conducted in line with the state election, is budgeted at \$1.25 million. This cost considers the efficiencies of holding the Local First Nations Voice elections at the same time as the state election. The bill proposes, after the first initial standalone election, that it will be running in conjunction with state elections.

Operational and administrative costs for the Local First Nations Voice have been costed to ensure the Voice is able to operate effectively and function as intended by the act. The operational and administrative functions have been approximated at about \$1.5 million per year. That is broken down into payments for members of First Nations Voices, as well as the administrative cost to the secretariat that will support the First Nations Voice.

These are indicative costs. Of course, it will be subject to it passing parliament and final consideration, but a working model has been that elected members of First Nations Voices would be entitled to not a significant but a small annual fee in recognition that people will be doing work outside

meetings. If an Aboriginal person who comes from Coober Pedy or Ceduna is elected to the Voice, there is absolutely no doubt that when they are walking down the street doing their shopping people will feel free, as I am sure we all experience, to give views about what should be happening. So, there is a recognition of an annual fee, as well as sitting fees that are in line with other such committees.

A working model is of an annual stipend, depending on the respective positions on Local First Nations Voice. What is currently being proposed is that each local member would be remunerated with an annual stipend of \$3,000 a year, with state members, that is the two presiding members of each Local Voice who go on to form the State Voice, being provided \$7,500 a year. The elected joint presiding members of the State Voice, the two positions, will be remunerated at \$15,000 a year.

Just for clarity, if these are what are finally adopted as the figures, they will be cumulative for members on the State Voice. That is, a local member would receive \$3,000, the presiding members of that Local Voice who then go on to the State Voice would receive \$3,000 plus \$7,500 for a total of \$10,500. The presiding officers of the State Voice would receive the \$3,000 plus \$15,000 for a total of \$18,000.

To avoid doubt, the most any member can be paid—and they are the two members who are the presiding members of the State Voice—is an annual stipend of \$18,000 a year. It is not a huge sum, but it is a recognition that people will be spending time outside meetings doing this. I am very confident there will be a lot of people who will be putting their hands up for this even though it is not a massive amount of money.

Sitting fees are proposed to be the same for local and state members and are currently budgeted at \$206 per meeting or \$258 per the chair of the meeting. These amounts are commensurate with fees paid to members on other government advisory bodies such as the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Committee that currently exists, but as this bill passes it is proposed not to exist. To be clear, it is proposed that members will receive a small annual stipend in recognition of the work that they will do all through the year and not just at meetings of the Voice, plus a sitting fee. Members will recall that for each of the Local and the State Voices it is, unless authorised by the minister, four to six meetings a year where the sitting fee of \$206 or \$258 will apply.

We have also anticipated costs, if necessary—and it will be necessary in some instances but not all instances—being able to have expenses for travel, accommodation and meals, as is provided for members of the committee and, indeed, members of the Public Service when they are needed to travel for the work that they do. In addition, the budget anticipates a provision of \$1,000 per member for the lease of a laptop to assist them in their duties.

For the sake of completeness in terms of budgeting, there is a provision also for the cost of hiring facilities when meetings occur—those four to six meetings a year. For each of the Local and State Voices there is a tentative budget provision of \$750 per meeting to hire the facilities to have the meeting. That equates to almost half of the provision of the resourcing of the secretariat that I talked about, being \$1.5 million.

Also included in that \$1.5 million is \$700,000 that is budgeted and allocated against resourcing the secretariat. It is anticipated that the secretariat will have five to six FTEs. They will be public sector employees likely within an agency in government who will provide secretarial support for the Local and the State Voice. I should also point out that the bill provides for the possibility of other public sector employees also providing administrative support to the Voice. I am sure if there are questions about specific policy areas in government, those different departments will be happy to do that.

These are not legislated anywhere. It is unusual that we would provide details of what our thinking is in relation to this but reasonable questions have been asked about levels of remuneration, so I thought it was worth placing on the record what our initial thoughts are and what makes up the budgeting component of that just over \$10 million over four years. It is not, I think, in anyone's estimation an excessive sum for the work that people do but a proper recognition that these will be roles that people will no doubt spend a lot of their time and effort on.

There was a question also asked in that briefing about the tripartite test: is it legislated elsewhere? The three-part test adopted in the bill is widely referred to both administratively and judicially and has been adopted federally for the purpose of determining eligibility for some services and benefits.

In South Australia the definition can vary; however, the tripartite test is used in both the Sentencing Act 2017 and the Correctional Services Act 1982. Pursuant to part 4 of the Correctional Services Act, an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander person for the purposes of the act means a person who is descended from an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and regards themselves as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and is accepted as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander by an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander community. For the purposes of section 22 of the Sentencing Act, it is a very similar definition. As I have said, this tripartite test is used extensively, both federally and in the state.

There were a number of questions over the briefings from SA-Best representatives, the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. Connie Bonaros, both of whom I thank for their extraordinarily heartfelt contributions today. One of the questions raised was: in the committee structure that is set up—the four required committees—is there a definition of 'youth' and could it include children? I place on the record that the bill very intentionally does not define youth for the purposes of a First Nations advisory committee. This was a deliberate decision.

The committees, both a youth committee and an elders committee, are required under the act and each of the Local First Nations Voices will appoint two persons of different genders for a youth committee and an elders committee. It was decided that it would be up to each First Nations Voice to use their own definition and understanding as it applies to them. There is not a universal definition of what an Aboriginal elder is, and we think it most appropriate that each body decides for themselves what constitutes the elders they appoint and similarly with the youth or young people they appoint.

So, yes, it could include anyone of any age; it is deliberately not defined. Certainly, that is something that Commissioner Agius reiterated had come through again and again during the consultations—that the voices of elders and youth need to be a central component of a Voice, which the changes in the final bill establishing those specific committees do.

There were also questions during the SA-Best briefings about what governance and integrity measures are in place for the Voice. I am pleased to be able to say there are a wide range of mechanisms in place to ensure that the voices are responsible and accountable. At its highest level, as an elected body, members of the Voice will be responsible and will be held accountable by the people who elect them. If they are not undertaking their functions appropriately, then it is unlikely they are going to be returned at the next election, just like we all face in terms of how we conduct ourselves.

The bill provides a large number of governance provisions. These include the ability to remove a member for misconduct or noncompliance with a condition of office, or for failure to comply with the duty to act honestly, or noncompliance with a code of conduct; a requirement that all Local Voices and State Voices keep proper accounting records and prepare annual statements of account; a requirement that all Local Voices and State Voices keep accurate minutes of their meetings; a statutory duty to act honestly in the performance of their functions; a statutory code of conduct; annual reporting obligations; and confidentiality requirements.

The code of conduct that will be drafted will ensure that members act for proper purposes connected with their work as members of the Local Voice or State Voice. It will be able to deal with a wide range of matters, which are likely to include conflicts of interest, bullying, sexual harassment, requirements to exercise due diligence and act in good faith, how information should be handled and the values that are to be followed by members.

I also note, as I have outlined, that the entire secretariat will consist of Public Service staff, who will be subject to the usual Public Sector Code of Ethics and accountability measures in the usual ways. The Voices will be subject to the Freedom of Information Act and will be subject, in performing public administration, to all of the oversight that integrity bodies have when others are performing acts of public administration.

There was a question raised by SA-Best in briefings about donation disclosure requirements and other Electoral Act obligations. Pursuant to clause 21 of the bill, an election of members of a Local Voice must be conducted by the Electoral Commissioner in accordance with the rules set out in schedule 1.

Schedule 1 of the bill sets out the basic requirements for the conducting of the election; however, clause 21(2)(b)(ii) acknowledges that there will be a number of matters that are not dealt with in schedule 1 and allows the Electoral Commissioner, after consultation with the State Voice and the minister, to make further rules to ensure the proper conduct of these elections. These additional rules will be modelled on existing obligations and provisions within the Electoral Act where appropriate. Exactly how specific rules will be made in relation to private donation disclosures for the purposes of the election to Local Voice will be considered in the lead-up to the first election by the commissioner.

Importantly, and this is something that I suspect we would have found in this bill by way of amendment by the Greens or SA-Best if we did not put it in there, clause 50 in the final bill requires a review of the act, and that review of the act will consider additional requirements that could be needed around electoral rules if that was one of the items that came up in the rules. Additionally, the government anticipates the Electoral Commission will conduct a review of the First Nations Voice election as he does for general elections and by-elections, as well as periodic local government elections.

There was a question raised in the SA-Best briefing about why remuneration for members of the Voice is determined by the Governor and not by the Remuneration Tribunal. The draft bill that was released for public comment provided that remuneration allowance and expenses for Local and State Voice members would be as determined by the Governor. This is consistent with a number of other statutory bodies where remuneration is also determined by the Governor. The guiding principle is that this is an advisory body and not a decision-making body. It is the case where there are significant decision-making bodies or decision-making individuals that remuneration is set down by a remuneration tribunal, rather than by the Governor.

As I said, the tribunal generally sets remuneration for bodies with significant decision-making powers, such as members of parliament, members of the judiciary, members of the Parole Board, the Governor of South Australia, elected members of local government councils and CEOs of local councils. The government is of the view that the ability of the Governor to make the determination, coupled with provisions in part 6 around administration and resourcing, ensures that members of the Local Voice will receive adequate remuneration, recognising—and I think this is an important point because I think it occasionally gets mischaracterised, particularly in the federal debate—that this is not a decision-making body. This is an advisory body and certainly how the remuneration is determined is in line with other advisory bodies.

Finally, there were a number of questions that were put forward by the Greens in briefings that were held, and I am sure there will be further points or questions raised from all members during the committee stage. However, I would like to particularly thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for her engagement in the very early stages. A number of the changes that have been made in the bill reflect ideas put forward, including how the provisions for gender balance on the First Nations Voice work, the inclusion of a provision for the review after three years of the bill being in operation and, of course, the new way that the election is to be counted. These are sensible provisions that I think will make this bill better.

I am sure we will have further questions during the committee stage, but I am hopeful that, by being as open as we can and by providing detailed answers as best we can now in the second reading speech, we will have answered many of the questions that we might have at the committee stage.

I will foreshadow that the intention at the conclusion of this and the vote on the second reading, should that be successful, will be to move into clause 1, primarily for the purpose of allowing members to get as many questions as possible on the record at clause 1 so we can give them as comprehensive answers as possible before we come back on Thursday to conclude the committee stage of the debate.

Before I conclude, I would like to take this opportunity, which I did not do in my initial first reading speech, to thank so many people who have contributed so much to this bill. First and foremost, there are the hundreds and hundreds of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in South Australia who have given up so much time, and not just in our recent efforts but as we went through the contributions of the Aboriginal representative body of the former government, particularly those of Dr Roger Thomas on whose shoulders we stand when we put this bill forward.

In particular, I would like to thank some of those who have given up hundreds and hundreds of hours of their time over and above the normal call of duty to get to where we are with this bill: government officials, Roland, Patrick, Nerida, Kelly and Mark, and a number of significant Aboriginal people from around Australia who have thought long and hard about this and who have been a source of great advice and great help in developing this bill.

In particular, I want to single out Tom Calma, Amy Rust, Megan Davis, Pat Anderson and Peter Buckskin. But, as I said, most of all, thank you to so many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who have helped us to get where we are today over many years. I commend the bill to the chamber and look forward to the committee stage.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes11
 Noes.....6
 Majority5

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Franks, T.A.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Maier, K.J. (teller)
Ngo, T.T.	Pangallo, F.	Scriven, C.M.
Simms, R.A.	Wortley, R.P.	

NOES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Game, S.L.	Girolamo, H.M.
Henderson, L.A.	Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.

PAIRS

Pnevmatikos, I.	Wade, S.G.	Martin, R.B.
Lensink, J.M.A.		

Second reading thus carried; bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: My first question is: what are the rights for common law holders in relation to this bill?

The CHAIR: Attorney, is it your intention to answer these questions now, or are you looking for everyone to put their questions on the record?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy for people to put them and I can go through if we have time to answer them all, but maybe get everyone's questions on the record.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I am happy to put my questions on the record for a response in the way that the Attorney has foreshadowed. What are the rights for common law holders in relation to this bill? Can Voice members talk about what they raise with cabinet during what is clause 43 or cabinet meeting? My final question for the moment is: when Dr Roger Thomas addressed this

parliament on the floor of the House of Assembly, in the same way that the previous Treasurer, Rob Lucas, was able to address the House of Assembly from the floor of that assembly, what provisions were made to ensure that parliament was protected from our particular sovereignty?

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: I thank the Attorney for giving further detail in his second reading summing-up. Obviously, those of us on this side have concerns about the bill, hence our voting, but it is reassuring to have some of that information up-front. He has answered a number of my questions, he will be pleased to know, so the committee stage might be slightly shorter on Thursday. I think most of my questions are better asked at the various clauses when we get there, but I have a few I can put on the record now to give him time to consider.

The first deals with clause 23, on the issue of the bodies being sued. I am interested in defamation. Would they be subject to defamation proceedings potentially? It says they can be sued as a body corporate, so would that apply to defamation as well and, if not, under what circumstances could they be sued? Also, what are the public liability implications under that heading as well? That is the first one.

The next one would be more relevant under clause 40. Will there be time limits for speaking, for example, when the representatives speak on the floor, or is it envisaged that, if they were speaking in the House of Assembly, they would be subject to the normal provisions of the House of Assembly? Here we do not normally have time limits: how would that differ between the houses, if there is any difference at all?

Some practical issues about where they would be positioned, etc.—this is not a big place. What does the government have in mind as to how that would work? We will deal with that in more detail when we get to clause 40, but they are a couple of things that the Attorney might want to consider.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: I flag that I will have questions more suited to committee stage but some that you may need to go away and take advice on. The first is that the minister has made commentary about this being an advisory body and these decisions not being binding. Will the minister confirm that there is no reasonable expectation for administrative decision-makers to take the view of the Voice into account? That is the first question.

Secondly, can the minister advise whether he has sought legal advice on whether there is case law that would be persuasive in instances of judicial activism in establishing a reasonable expectation that recommendations by the Voice could be made binding? Thirdly, is there a risk that decisions could be challenged by the First Nations Voice, given that it can sue in its own name?

I have further queries that I will address in committee. As the Hon. Dennis Hood has highlighted as well, I think quite rightly it will impact the way in which we all function. I do have some queries as to whether the minister anticipates that the First Nations Voice will address the parliament during government time or private members' time or whether there will be additional allocation on a different day, and what that might practically look like.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: I have a series of questions in regard to the consultation that occurred, and ask whether we can get some further details about the YourSAy survey, the responses received and how it was incorporated within the development of the bill. Also, how confident are you that this model will be effective, and what are the potential impacts on outcomes for First Nations people? I guess that is probably the starting point.

I have a series of questions around the boundaries as well. What will happen if a representative for a particular region cannot be found? How have regions been determined? What will happen when a population changes or moves, and how will this impact on the regions and boundaries? What happens if a First Nations person moves, perhaps from interstate, into a particular region? Are they entitled to run for a role within the Voice?

Similar to the Hon. Mr Hood, I also have questions about financial risk. You have covered some of it, but it would be good to get some further information on the structure. Why was a body corporate structure selected? Are there other entities where that structure has been in place? It is a relatively new structure, from my understanding, so why was that selected over a statutory authority or something like that?

I also have questions about individual risk. Some of that has been explained, but I would like to explore that further, as well as vacancies. How will any breaches or legal issues be disclosed and communicated? How will the region or location of members be taken into consideration for vacancies? I believe that in the legislation it states it will be determined by the Governor, so what support will be provided there?

Then there is the conduct of the actual election process. Will the Electoral Commissioner receive additional funds or support in order to run these elections? What would happen in the event of a by-election, including the costs associated with that?

Similar to that—I think it has been touched on already—is the logistics of how it will work in the house as well. Probably, clause 40 is the relevant one. I have a series of questions there, and it would be good to be able to flesh that out further on Thursday. In the event that there are emergency bills or significant pieces of legislation, how is that going to be communicated? If there were amendments to bills, would the First Nations Voice be invited back to speak or would it be one time and that is it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: So one time? Thank you; that is now already answered. I appreciate that we touched on resources and the payment of fees, so I have taken those questions out. However, from a staffing perspective, how many staff will be allocated across the board, including research officers, public servants and assistants as well?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I would like to thank the Attorney and his staff for making themselves so amenable to all of us, and for the lengths they have gone to to answer the many questions we have put to them.

I chewed off the Attorney's ear about children in this bill, and the importance they have. I just want the Attorney to confirm again that, notwithstanding that the youth committee will be broad enough to have whatever definition of 'youth' it is that ultimately is decided upon, there will still be the ability to establish other committees that are issue specific, issues that we have canvassed in those meetings. They may very well include issues that relate to youth and/or children and other specific issues.

In terms of the address to parliament, one of the things that we have canvassed at length is the ability for us to effectively take into account the reports that are provided or the addresses that are provided when we are working through those debates and the consideration given to that.

In terms of the funding, I appreciate the response in relation to why we have not gone down the path of a remuneration tribunal, though one of the issues that we did talk about was that that is a protection mechanism in ensuring that future successive governments do not axe funding to those important allocations. What sort of considerations could be given to ensuring that within the department there is some sort of quarantining of funds to make sure that, in successive governments or in future years or when our budget is not looking that great, this is not where we look to cut funding?

I have questions along those lines when we get to the relevant clauses as well but nothing that I think the minister needs to take on notice now that he will not be able to answer at that point.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank honourable members for their contributions at clause 1 and effectively putting questions on notice. I think this will lead to a very conducive committee stage on Thursday. It has given an opportunity to go away and come back with answers. If there are any further questions that people have or think of tonight, please do not hesitate to send them through to me during the course of tomorrow because, once we get to Thursday, if we do not have it immediately we will have to take it on notice and reply back to you, if it passes on Thursday, between the houses.

I would much prefer to be able to come back and give answers as we are considering it tomorrow. So please do not hesitate, if you have a couple more questions, to get in contact. I would ask, for the sake of the sanity of the people who are answering all these questions, that maybe it be by the middle of the day tomorrow if you have further questions so that they can reasonably be answered.

My second reading sum-up looked at the total costs. I think it was approximately \$700,000 with approximately six FTEs as the secretariat. The provision for the cost of the election, the first standalone election should this bill pass later this year, has been budgeted at \$2.94 million and then elections that occur simultaneous to state elections at approximately \$1.25 million. I think the Hon. Ms Girolamo had those specific questions, but I will make sure I get full answers to the questions that people have put on notice.

I look forward to the committee stage. As I have indicated a number of times, it is the government's intention to conclude before we leave this place on Thursday.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

FAIR WORK (FAMILY AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LEAVE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 18:05 the council adjourned until 22 February 2023 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***FORESTRY PLANTATIONS**

185 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16 November 2022). Can the minister advise—

1. What is the total funding allocated in the 2022-23 state budget to the establishment of new forestry plantations?
2. What is the total funding allocated over the forward estimates to the establishment of new forestry plantations?
3. What is the total funding allocated in the 2022-23 state budget for the federal government Support Plantation Program?
4. What is the total funding allocated over the forward estimates for the federal government Support Plantation Program?
5. Has an agreement with the federal government regarding the Support Plantation Program been signed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

No agreement has been signed with the federal government regarding the Support Plantation Program.

The South Australian government is pursuing a suite of significant election commitments to support growth in the state's forest industries including \$15 million for a Forestry Centre for Excellence, \$2 million for a Forest Products Domestic Manufacturing and Infrastructure Masterplan and \$2 million to replace fire towers with new technologies and will investigate opportunities as necessary.

VETLAB

186 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17 November 2022). Can the minister advise:

1. What is the total cost of the project to boost capacity and capability of the VetLab facility?
2. Is the project being funded by the government or the private sector?
3. When did this project start?
4. When is this project expected to be completed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I have been advised:

1. Total cost of the three current VetLab activities is estimated at \$425,700 ex GST
2. The VetLab upgrade, FMD PCR set-up and serology equipment are government funded.
3. Funding for the upgrade of the molecular suite was made in the 2022-23 financial year.
4. The molecular diagnostics suite upgrade is expected to be completed by mid-2023.

BIOSECURITY

191 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (30 November 2022). Can the minister advise:

1. Are any departmental resources committed to assisting farmers in developing and updating their biosecurity plans?
2. Have farmers received any direct communications from the government or department to assist them in developing and updating their biosecurity plan?
3. When was this communication provided?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I have been advised:

1. PIRSA provides the One Biosecurity online application which has been developed to allow sheep and cattle producers to create and update their biosecurity plans in a self-guided online format. Should producers require additional advice they can contact both their industry biosecurity officer or PIRSA biosecurity staff.

Under the Emergency Animal Disease Response Agreement (EADRA) industry is responsible through normal commitments for farm level biosecurity implementation to reduce the risk of an emergency animal disease

(EAD) outbreak. Farm biosecurity planning resources are available to assist industry sectors which can be found on the national farm biosecurity website.

Through the red meat and wool program, PIRSA funded upgrades to the One Biosecurity online application as well as providing a grant for a biosecurity extension officer working within Livestock SA to improve farm level biosecurity. Livestock SA has continued to fund officers who will continue to provide support to producers regarding farm level biosecurity to producers.

PIRSA also jointly funds a pig industry biosecurity officer with Pork SA to strengthen biosecurity preparedness across the pig supply chain, which includes a component of improving farm level biosecurity with producers.

2. As part of a wider communication campaign regarding the outbreak of lumpy skin disease and foot-and-mouth disease in Indonesia the department emailed all South Australian producers holding a property identification code urging them to be alert to the signs of FMD and LSD, to update their biosecurity plans and providing links to sites with biosecurity information.

One Biosecurity members have also received a newsletter highlighting the improvements of the online biosecurity application and urging them to review their plans. Members will receive regular biosecurity news and tips to help keep farm biosecurity in front of mind.

3. The communication was timed to complement the wider national and state level government and industry communication campaigns. The biosecurity notice was emailed to all livestock producers and also posted on the PIRSA website on 3 August 2022. The One Biosecurity member news was posted on the One Biosecurity web page on 24 November 2022 and members notified of the new article via email on 2 December 2022.

WINE EXPANSION AND RECOVERY PROGRAM

192 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (30 November 2022). Can the minister advise:

1. What is the total funding allocated to the Wine Expansion and Recovery Program in 2022-23?
2. What is the total funding allocated to the Wine Expansion and Recovery Program in 2023-24?
3. What is the total funding allocated to the Wine Expansion and Recovery Program in 2024-25?
4. What is the total funding allocated to the Wine Expansion and Recovery Program in 2025-26?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Trade and Investment has advised:

1.	\$1,100,000
2.	\$750,000
3.	\$375,000
4.	There is no funding allocated in 2025-26.

To assist the local industry to deal with the ongoing challenging conditions, the government of South Australia is providing a \$100,000 grant to Riverland Wine for the development of a 10-year industry blueprint, with Riverland Wine contributing a further \$50,000.

The blueprint will identify strategic priorities for the entire region's wine industry to help it recover from some of the most challenging years in decades and improve productivity.

EXPORT FUNDAMENTALS PROGRAM

197 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (1 December 2022). Can the Minister for Trade and Investment advise—

1. Did the Export Fundamentals Program support any wineries in its lifetime?
2. Which businesses or organisations did the Export Fundamentals Program support since 2020 including the amount provided to the business or organisation?
3. When did the last round of the Export Fundamentals Program open and end?
4. When did the Export Fundamentals Program cease to be offered?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Trade and Investment has advised:

1. The Export Fundamentals Program was a general program that operated across many sectors and was not designed to be a wine industry support program.

Over its lifetime, less than 29 per cent of the organisations who accessed the program were wine industry applicants.

2. Due to the generalist nature of the Export Fundamentals Program, export capability development services were provided to assist South Australian business to improve their ability to export.

Workshops were held to provide businesses with a step-by-step guide to exporting. Information sessions were also held on export-related topics including free trade agreements and cross-border eCommerce.

The Export Fundamentals Program did not provide grants to businesses.

Businesses that participated in Export Fundamentals workshops and information sessions are listed alphabetically below.

Businesses Participating in Export Fundamentals Information Sessions and Workshops
G Patritti & Co Pty Ltd
1847 Awesome Holiday
5Nines Distilling
AB Original Consultants
Adelaide Expo Hire Pty Ltd
Adelaide Small Business Connections
AEM CORES PTY LTD
Alexander Daniels Wines
Alliance Wine Australia PTY Ltd.
Alpha Box & Dice
AM
Angel Oysters Australia
Apeiron Wines
ARO Educational Services
ART Lab Solutions
AusHealth Corporate
AUSSIE PETS & STOCK FEED SOLUTIONS PTY LTD
AussiEqy Pty Ltd
AussieSource
Austasia Global Impex
Austral Farms Pty Ltd
Australia Origin Direct
Australian Business Initiatives Pty Ltd.
Australian Distilling Co.
Australian Nut Processors
Australis Fresh
AUSVEG SA
AUVSHOPIN PTY LTD
Bamboo Bubby Pty Ltd trading as The Caring Kind & Yummy Mummy Food Company
Barbell Mate Pty Ltd
Barossa Grape & Wine Association
Beegin
Beerenberg Pty Ltd
Belehris Estates
Belvidere Wines
Beston Global Food Company
Bickford's Group of Companies
Biological Services
BLASKO

Businesses Participating in Export Fundamentals Information Sessions and Workshops
Bleasdale Vineyards
BlueLargs Pty Ltd
BMD Wines Pty Ltd
Bobbies Petcare Pty Ltd
Boss
Boston Bean Coffee Company
Buzz Honey
Centralian Controls
CHATEAU TANUNDA
Chemsupply Australia Pty Ltd
Claymore Wines
Clever Culture Systems
CMA
CMA Mental Arithmetic Adelaide
Cocco Corporation
Colour Island Australia
Contrak Container Company
Cotton Apothecary
Creative Chic
Customs Agency Services
D&S Resources Pty Ltd
Dandelion Vineyards Pty Ltd
Daycone Pty Ltd ATFT Daycone Trust t/as Tucker's Natural
Derby Rubber Products
OHL
Dominant
Donoso & Sons Pty Ltd
DOWIE DOOLE
Durand Distillery
East African Traders
Ecco Consulting Pty Ltd
Eclipse CS Pty Ltd
EiQht at the Gate Wines
Electricity Technology
EMDG Consulting
Emu Tracks
Enviroclad Australia Pty Ltd
Eskadale Vineyards
Eurostyle Group Pty Ltd
Evolution Concrete Australia
Export Finance Australia
Ezy-Fit Engineering Group
Fallon Consulting
FedEx
Feedsy
FEENEY
Finniss River Vineyard
Fleurieu App

Businesses Participating in Export Fundamentals Information Sessions and Workshops
Fodden Trading Pty Ltd
Foil Drive
Foil Me
Food Manufacturing and Services Pty Ltd
FortNynia
Freelance
FreshMekong
From Oz with love Pty Ltd
Fusion Business College
Gem Solution
Genealogy SA
Geoff Merrill Wines
Global Hawk Pty Ltd
Golden Fortune Investment (Australia) Pty Ltd
Gradermate
Grassland Nutrition
Hahndorf Academy
Harness Business Consulting
Hart of the Barossa
Hayes Family Wines
Hither & Yon
Horizon2Technologies
Hydro-dis Australia Pty Ltd
Ikaika Pty Ltd
Indie Co-Lab
Individual
Info Pacific International Pty Ltd
Innotech International Pty Ltd
Intercast and Forge
Iris and Wool
Ironside Roofing
Jabin Hopkins Institute of Technology
jericho wines
JT JOHNSON AND SONS PTY LTD
Kimchi Club
Kirrihill Wines
Langmeil Winery
Lansdowne Wine
Laucke Flour Mills
Leconfield Wines
Levrier by Jo Irvine
Lifestyle Bakery
Limestone Coast Wines
Liquid Integrity Systems
Lochert Bros. Pty Ltd
Lu Lu Luisa
Magnetic Alliance
MECHVAC Engineering

Businesses Participating in Export Fundamentals Information Sessions and Workshops
MERITE wines
Microbic Pty Ltd
Mighty Craft
Millow Group
Mini Mammoth Games
Movers&Shakers
Mudgeten PTY LTD
Muster wine Company
Nature Australia Fruit Honey
Naval Group Australia
NCI Trade Credit Solutions
Neomorph Mouthguards
No Regrets Company Pty Ltd
Norseld Pty Ltd
Northline
NPA
Oceania Impex Australia Pty Ltd.
O'Connors
Omnitech
Omni-Tel Pty Ltd
Op2ma
Organic Hill
Origin Energy Limited
Oziflow International Pty Ltd
Paliico Bee Cosmetics
Paper Cactus Games
Paulett Wines
Pfitzner Performance Gearbox
Pioneer Wine Group
Pure Wine Co.
Puretec
Queenies Australia
QUOVO
REDARC Electronics
Redarc Electronics Pty Ltd
Regional Development Australia Yorke & Mid North
Roar Sugar Group Pty Ltd
Robern Menz (MFG) Pty Ltd
ROH Wheels Australia
Roseneath Organics Pty Ltd
RPG Pipe Systems
Rustic Soapery
SA2050
SAAB Group
SAGE Automation Pty Ltd
Sally Tuthill
Schwarz Wine Co
Seeley International

Businesses Participating in Export Fundamentals Information Sessions and Workshops
Sentek Pty Ltd
Sevenhill Cellars
Sheetmetal Australia
Shinka Management
Silver Fleece
Simply Olive & Bee
Soil Management Systems
Soniclean Pty Ltd
Sorby Adams Wines
Southern Design Group
Southern Kuya
Southmore Partners
Southtome Pty Ltd
Standard and Partners
State Sales & Marketing
Strategia Toldi
Swan and Sane
TAYLORS WINES PTY. LTD.
Techno Plas Pty Ltd
Tekelek Australia Pty Ltd
The Gourmet Entertainer T/A Mudgeten PTY LTD
The Great Australian Wine Company
The Hygiene Co.
The Trustee for THE BARTON FAMILY TRUST
Thermaguard Pty Ltd
Thorn-Clarke Wines
Tornielli Family Wines
Transformation Consultancy
Trical Australia
Tucker Creative
Turon Wines
University of South Australia
Verseng Group
Vimeo Capital & Consulting Pty Ltd
Watkins Family Wines
Whistler Wines
Wilco Technologies Pty. Ltd.
Wild Game Wine
Wines from Aus
Wish You Were Here Box
Wood Consulting
Writing Projects Now
Yehi Australia
Ziptrak
Zonte's Footstep Pty Ltd

3. The Export Fundamentals Program did not have rounds. Australian Industry Group was contracted between 3 February 2020 and 2 August 2022 to deliver workshops and information sessions.

4. The Export Fundamentals Program ceased to be offered when the Australian Industry Group's agreement expired on 2 August 2022.

NATIONAL TRADE PROGRAM

198 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (1 December 2022). Can the Minister for Trade and Investment advise—

1. Did the National Trade Program support any wineries in its lifetime?
2. Which businesses or organisations did the National Trade Program support since 2020 including the amount provided to the business or organisation?
3. When did the last round of the National Trade Program open and end?
4. When did the National Trade Program cease to be offered?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Trade and Investment has advised:

1. The National Trade Program was a general program that operated across many sectors and was not specifically a wine industry support program.

Over its lifetime, less than 7.4 per cent of participants represented the wine industry.

2. The National Trade Program was an export capability development program held with the Export Council of Australia and Food South Australia. The Export Council of Australia and Food South Australia provided advice and workshops to help businesses to identify expansion gaps and connected them with potential interstate buyers to build their ability to scale for exporting.

The National Trade Program did not provide grants to businesses.

Businesses that participated in the National Trade Program are listed alphabetically below.

Businesses Participating in the National Trade Program
Australian Native Food Co
Beach Road Wines
Cleland Fine Foods (Meat at the Mount)
Cloud Theory Marshmallows
Edible Reconciliation
Finndian (Beyond India Home Dining)
Fodden
Island Beehive
Kangaroo Island Oats
Kimchi Club
Low & Slow American BBQ
Lowan Park Produce
Mumamoo Group
Naked Blendz
OrganicQ Kangaroo Island
Palilco
Pinaroo Farms
Rosevale Lentils
Simon Tolley Wines
Sinclair Distillery
Southern Kuya
SPQR Holdings—Cucina Classica
Taronga Almonds
Toolunka Estate
Warndu
Woolmore's Fine Foods
Yours Truly Chocolates

3. The National Trade Program held two pilot programs with the Export Council of Australia and Food South Australia. The Export Council of Australia was contracted to deliver the National Trade Program between 6 June 2021 and 1 May 2022. Food South Australia was contracted to deliver the National Trade Program between 25 November 2021 and 30 June 2022.

4. The National Trade Program ceased to be offered when Food South Australia's agreement expired on 30 June 2022.

EXPORT ACCELERATOR PROGRAM

199 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (1 December 2022). Can the Minister for Trade and Investment advise—

1. Did the South Australia Export Accelerator Program support any wineries in its lifetime?
2. Which businesses or organisations did the South Australia Export Accelerator Program support since 2020 including the amount provided to the business or organisation?
3. When did the last round of the South Australia Export Accelerator Program open and end?
4. When did the South Australia Export Accelerator Program cease to be offered?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Trade and Investment has advised:

1. The South Australia Export Accelerator Program was a general program that operated across many sectors and was not specifically a wine industry support program.

The majority of participants in this program were from sectors outside of the wine industry.

2. Since 1 January 2020, the South Australia Export Accelerator Program supported 133 businesses. The businesses that were supported and the funding received is listed alphabetically below.

Business Name	Grant Amount
AG Schilling Co	\$30,000
Acacia Systems Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Adelaide Fringe Inc	\$16,220
All Natural Gourmet Pet Treats Pty Ltd (*)	\$35,000
Alliance Wine Australia PTY Ltd.	\$19,969
Angel Oysters Australia Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Apiwraps	\$30,000
Apxium	\$30,000
Artisans of Barossa Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Australia Swan Vintage Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Australian Fresh Dairy Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Avinet Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Barossa Food Co/Quincy Fine Food Distribution	\$10,000
Barossa Valley Brewing Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Barristers Block	\$30,000
Bec Hardy Wines (Pertaringa Wines) (*)	\$49,400
Belehris Estate Pty Ltd	\$30,000
BetterTaste Organics	\$5,000
Biosensis Pty Ltd	\$17,440
Bleasdale Vineyards Pty Ltd	\$15,000
Brayfield Park Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Bremerton Vintners Pty Ltd	\$15,250
Brockenchack Wines	\$29,340
Bull & Bull	\$5,000
Byrne Vineyards	\$13,330
Charleston Cellars Pty Ltd	\$14,325

Business Name	Grant Amount
Claymore Wines Pty Ltd	\$23,800
Cocco Corporation Pty Ltd	\$15,750
Connexion Systems Pty Ltd	\$12,000
D&S Resources Pty Ltd	\$16,000
Dowie Doole	\$30,000
Dressler & Company Australia Pty Ltd*	\$31,286
Dunqud Pty Ltd	\$26,284
Earth Adventure	\$12,900
Edible Blooms Pty Ltd	\$15,350
Eight at the Gate Wines	\$30,000
Elderton Wines Pty Ltd*	\$46,731
Fabal Wines Pty Ltd	\$27,825
FCT - Combustion Pty Ltd	\$30,000
FCT ACTech Pty Ltd	\$17,250
Feedsy Pty Ltd	\$14,500
Fivecast Pty Ltd (*)	\$50,000
Food Service Solutions	\$30,000
Gemtree Wines	\$30,000
Gibson Wines	\$20,450
Hallprint Pty Ltd (*)	\$30,000
Haselgrove Wines Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Hastwell & Lightfoot Vineyards	\$19,500
Healthy Garden Australia Pty Ltd	\$8,500
Hither & Yon	\$30,000
Hugh Hamilton Wines Pty Ltd	\$20,700
Imperial Education Group Pty Ltd	\$28,000
Jabin Hopkins Institute of Technology	\$28,000
Jamilah Pty Ltd / Trading As 919 Wines	\$4,000
Jujubes SA Pty Ltd	\$5,000
Kangarilla Road Vineyard and Winery	\$9,600
Kangaroo Island Distillery Pty Ltd	\$16,310
Krix Loudspeakers Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Lenswood Coop	\$30,000
Limestone Coast Wines (LCW Corp)	\$30,000
Link4	\$30,000
Lou Miranda Estate	\$27,000
Macro Leather Pty Ltd	\$5,000
Mallee Estate Wines	\$14,000
Manser Family Wines	\$5,000
Massena Vineyards Pty Ltd	\$15,000
Mexex	\$30,000
Micro-X Ltd	\$24,250
Mighty Kingdom Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Ministry of Clouds	\$26,200
Momentum Food and Wine Pty Ltd	\$17,450
Mooka Oysters	\$15,810
Moorooroo Estate Wines Pty Ltd	\$29,028
Mr Riggs Wine Company	\$30,000

Business Name	Grant Amount
Never Never Distilling Co.	\$27,000
Norseld Pty Ltd	\$11,350
Nova Vita Wines	\$30,000
ODD Games Pty Ltd	\$2,500
Oliver's Taranqa Vineyards	\$26,178
Pangkarra Pty Ltd	\$12,500
Patritti Wines	\$20,000
Paulett Wines	\$30,000
Paxton Wines Pty Ltd	\$22,500
Penley Estate Pty Ltd (*)	\$60,000
Personify Care Pty Ltd	\$29,393
Pfitzner Performance Gearbox	\$10,875
Ping Services	\$30,000
Ponting Wines	\$30,000
Portia Valley Wines Pty Ltd (*)	\$30,000
Pouch Australia	\$16,225
Praxis Labs Pty Ltd	\$4,875
Prohibition Liquor Co Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Pure Vision Wines	\$17,738
Purple Hands Wines Pty Ltd	\$5,174
Quality College of Australia	\$30,000
Raidis Estate	\$30,000
Rainbow Fresh Pty Ltd	\$13,275
Red Herron Pty Ltd	\$11,500
Ricca Terra Vintners Pty Ltd	\$14,625
SA Speciality Bottling	\$16,500
Salena Estate Wines Pty Ltd	\$28,370
Schubert Estate	\$23,750
Schwarz Wine Trust	\$12,144
SEAPA Pty Ltd	\$27,850
Selentium Defence Trading	\$25,000
Seppeltsfield Road Distillers	\$5,000
Shaw and Smith	\$30,000
Sidewood Estate	\$30,000
Snapwireless Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Sorby Adams Wines Pty Ltd	\$16,000
Soul Growers	\$30,000
South Australian Seed Marketers Pty Ltd*	\$15,302
Spacetalk Holdings Pty Ltd	\$18,000
St Johns Grammar School Inc	\$30,000
Starrs Reach Vineyard	\$16,150
TCPinpoint Pty Ltd	\$5,000
The Hills Distillery Pty Ltd	\$30,000
The Trustee for Nicholas Kasmeridis Family Trust	\$28,000
The Trustee for Spatial Scientific Technologies Trust	\$7,475
The Trustee for The Mt Barker Bakery Trust	\$15,000
The Usual Suspects Collective Pty Ltd	\$15,000
Tomich Wines	\$30,000

Business Name	Grant Amount
Trakgene Pty Ltd (*)	\$45,000
Turkey Flat Vineyards Pty Ltd	\$29,849
UPull It Pty Ltd	\$30,000
Verseng Group Pty Ltd	\$6,250
Virginia Farm Produce	\$29,990
Wilco Technologies	\$30,000
Woodside Cheese Wrights (*)	\$41,500
Woodstock Estate	\$30,000
Xapiapps	\$30,000
Yelland and Papps	\$15,000
Zonte's Footstep Pty Ltd	\$22,500

(*) Denotes received more than one SA Export Accelerator Grant

3. The last round of the South Australia Export Accelerator Program opened on 2 October 2021 and closed on 18 February 2022.

4. The South Australia Export Accelerator Program ceased to be offered from 26 July 2022.

VIRTUAL BUSINESS MATCHING

200 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (1 December 2022). Can the Minister for Trade and Investment advise—

1. Did the Virtual Business Matching Program support any wineries in its lifetime?

2. Which businesses or organisations did the Virtual Business Matching Program support since 2020 including the amount provided to the business or organisation?

3. When did the last round of the Virtual Business Matching Program open and end?

4. When did the Virtual Business Matching Program cease to be offered?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Trade and Investment has advised:

1. The Virtual Business Matching Program was a general program that operated across many sectors and was not specifically a wine industry support program.

The majority of participants in this program were from sectors outside of the wine industry.

2. Due to the generalist nature of the Virtual Business Matching Program, funding was allocated to the program to manage the activities, such as the software platform, fees associated with venue and technical support, or conference participation costs, if applicable.

Financial support was not given to individual businesses.

Businesses that participated in Virtual Business Matching activities are listed alphabetically below.

Businesses that participated in virtual business matching activities
23rd Street Distillery
Agilex Biolabs
All the things Australia
Ambra Spirits
Aus Continent Wine Group Pty Ltd
Australia Swan Vintage Pty Ltd
Australia Yinmore Wins Pty Ltd (TA Knappstein Wines)
Australian Distilling Co
Australian Native Food Co
Australian Vintage Ltd
Ausus Pure
Avance Clinical

Businesses that participated in virtual business matching activities
Barossa Valley Brewing
Barossa Valley Wine Company
Barristers Block
Bec Hardy Wines
Beerenberg Honey
Bellberry Ltd
Bentleys R&D Tax Incentives
Besa Juice
Beston Global Food
Betheone Australia
Bickford's (Australia) Pty Ltd
Bioe Bank
Black Bottle Candy
Black Squid Distillery
Blue Lake Milling
Bandar Wines
Brand & Sons
Bremerton Vintners Pty Ltd
Brothers in Arms
Buzz Honey
Byrne Vineyards
Cape Barren
Cape Jaffa Wines
Casarosa Farms/The Almond Farmer
Chalk Hill
Chapel Hill
Chateau Tanunda
Chateau Yaldara
Cimicky Wines
Cirillo Estate Wines
Clare Valley Food Pty Ltd
Cleanseas
Clever Planning with Geology
CMAX Clinical Research
Consilium Technology
Coopers
Dandelion Vineyards
David Franz
Deno Australia
Dewey Station
DINKO TUNA
Dowie Doole
Earthworks
Eight at the Gate
Eyre Peninsula Seafood
Famous Soda Co
Ferguson's
First Drop Wines

Businesses that participated in virtual business matching activities
Food 366
Foxie Games
Gatt Wines
Gelista
Gemtree
Glaetzer
Head Wines
Healthy Garden Australia
Healthy Heart Produce
Heathvale Wines
Heirloom Vineyards
Hemera Estate
Hentley Farms
Hill Smith
Hither & Yon
Hugh Hamilton Wines
Irvine Wines
Jarressa Estate Wines
JIA YUAN HUA AUSTRALIA Pty Ltd/Monteperle Winery
Kalleske Wines
Kangaroo Island Olives
Kangaroo Island Spirits
Kingston Estate
Kinkawooka Shellfish
Kirrihill Wines Pty Ltd
Knappstein Wines
Koqnat
K-Tig
Lambert Estate
Langmeil Winery
Lannister Group
Leconfield Wines
Levrier
Limestone Coast Fishermen's Cooperative (LCFC)
Longview
Lucias Fine Foods
Lucy's Foods
Macro Meats Pet Snacks
Maggie Beer
Maison Blue
Massena Vineyards
Maxwell Wines
Mayne Pharma
McLaren Vale Distillery
Merite Wines
Mexex
Mighty Kingdom
Mitchell Clare Pty Ltd

Businesses that participated in virtual business matching activities
Mojo Kombucha
MORI SEAFOOD
Morris Fine Food
Mountadam
Mountain Fresh
Nature Australia
Needle & Pin Spirits
Nick Haselgrove Wines
Nova Farms
Nova Vita Wines
Novafarms
Oleapak Olive Oil
Oliver's Taranq Vineyards
Olsson's Salt
P'petual Holdings
Panqarra Foods
Paracombe Wines
Patrick of Coonawarra
Patritti
Paulett Wines
Peel and Tonic
Pendleton Olive Estates
Penfolds
Peter Lehmann Wines
Pewsey Vale
Pike Wines
Pirate Life Brewing
Pirramimma
Polka Drops
Portia Valley Wines
Prism Defence
Prohibition Liquor Co
Rainbow Fresh
Red Hen Gin
Remarkable State
Rockford Wines
Rymill Coonawarra
Salena Estate Wines Pty Ltd
San Remo
Schild Estate Wines
Schwarz Wine Company
Seeley International
Seppeltsfield Road Distillers
Seppeltsfield Barossa
Serafino Wines
Shingleback Wine Pty Ltd
Shottesbrooke
Sisters Run

Businesses that participated in virtual business matching activities
Sky Migration
Smallfry
Smash Seltzer
South Australian Lobster Company (SALCO)
Southern Bluefin Tuna
Southern Kuva
Southern Oncology Clinical Research Unit
Spring Gully
Spring Gully Foods Pty Ltd
St Hallett
Stehr Group
Stephen Pannell Wines Pty Ltd
Syneos Group
Teusner Wines
The Carob Kitchen
The Islander Estate Vineyards
The Pawn Wine Co
The Yummy Kitchen Co
Thistle Be Good Pty Ltd
Thomas Foods International
Thorn Clarke
Thornby Premium Lamb
Three Dark Horses
Tim Adams Wines
Tim Smith Wines
Tomich Wines
Torbreck Wines
Tucker's
Turon Wines
Tutto Pasta
Ubertas wines
Utonic Beverages
Verida Australia
Veroquard Australia
Virgara Wines
Voxon
Wakefield Taylors Family Wines
Warndu
We Made A Thing
Whistler Wines
Williams Seafood
Wine Wave
Wines by Geoff Hardy
Xurong Abalone
Yalumba Wines
Yelland & Papps
Yours Truly Chocolates
Yumbah Aquaculture Ltd

3. May 2021 to December 2021.
4. December 2021, although the Department for Trade and Investment will continue to offer hybrid or digital programs as part of its overall engagement with overseas markets.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (2 November 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

A working group was established to consider the emergency services options for this community.

The working group recommended an after-hours nurse-led clinic based at Gumeracha District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital, with virtual support from a medical practitioner. Under the proposal, the after-hours clinic would operate Monday to Friday 4pm to 8pm, and Saturdays and Sundays 10am to 4pm. A community forum was held on 12 January 2023 to inform the broader community on the details of the proposed model, which was supported. The community now have the opportunity to provide feedback until 27 January 2023, and staff consultation has commenced.

A similar process is now underway for Strathalbyn with a working group having met twice before Christmas to consider options.

Extensive work is underway to ensure we are attracting medical practitioners to all regional and rural areas of South Australia, recognising their importance to the health and the fabric of rural communities. South Australia's Rural Medical Workforce Plan 2019-24 lays out these strategies, the most critical of which has been the successful introduction of South Australia's Rural Generalist training program. The SA Rural Generalist Program is increasing the number of doctors who specifically train in rural medicine in a regional and rural community, based on evidence that the longer doctors spend training in a rural area, the more likely they are to practise long-term in that community. The Rural Generalist Program SA has overseen a significant expansion in rural medical training, with 2023 projected to see further increases. For example, rural intern positions have more than tripled to 18 in 2022 and intern rotations from metropolitan to rural areas increased from 20 in 2019 to 47 in 2022.

The South Australian government also supports the recruitment and retention of rural doctors by funding the Rural Doctors Workforce Agency to undertake targeted recruitment campaigns and to provide supports including upskilling, spouse and childcare supports and business supports to attract rural doctors to South Australia.

In addition, the government has committed to a staged rollout of 10 specialist doctors in regional South Australia, establishing more local medical services for local communities.