

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 28 September 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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (OMBUDSMAN AND AUDITOR-GENERAL) (TERMS OF OFFICE) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 September 2023.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (11:02): I rise to make some remarks in relation to this bill, which we are largely supportive of but have some amendments to, and I note that other honourable members have as well. This is not a complex bill, but I guess some of the time frames—there are different views.

I would, at the outset, like to thank both Mr Wayne Lines and Mr Andrew Richardson for their distinguished service in the roles of Ombudsman and Auditor-General respectively. They have served with distinction in carrying out their duties. We also thank the people who work with them in such incredibly important roles. We know that the roles of Ombudsman and Auditor-General are very important to this state, as they are indeed in all jurisdictions, in ensuring there is a level of transparency and independence and oversight of government accounts and government processes.

In particular, the Auditor-General, in the lead-up to the end of the 2018 parliamentary term, had done some reports in an area which was and continues to be of great interest to me—that is, the South Australian Housing Trust or South Australian Housing Authority in terms of maintenance and the oversight that was not taking place. It was that office which had uncovered the fact that there had been no asset inspection report done of Housing Trust properties since 2003 and as a result their desktop survey showed that there was some \$700 million worth of public housing maintenance backlog that needed to be addressed.

We have also seen tabled recently that the Auditor-General has sought to have access to cabinet documents, which this government—now that Labor has been re-elected—continues to deny. When we were in government, as a member of the Marshall cabinet, we certainly considered those requests and determined that they were in the best interests of the state to provide those, so that the financial accounting within those submissions was able to be properly scrutinised.

There are clearly the annual reports that are tabled by both of those statutory officers, as well as from time to time a number of other examinations. Most recently, we have had management

of SA Health's personal protective equipment (PPE) and cloud computing in SA government. The Ombudsman clearly has a very important role in FOI determinations and a range of other areas.

I think in terms of vulnerable persons there are directions there that have been very useful for governments to understand how they can best approach those issues. They do have very important roles to review financial matters and agencies, and with particular projects, and also in looking at the process of government to determine whether they are appropriate and what recommendations arise out of those.

In relation to this particular bill, it relates to their terms of appointment. I understand it was the Ombudsman who sought to make some recommendations to government, and now the Auditor-General has also been captured by this review. What we are seeking to amend through amendments that have been tabled, which I appreciate members considering, is that rather than the language that is used in the government's bill at clause 2(1), which talks about a term 'not exceeding 7 years' (which in other words is up to seven) and then enables a subsequent total of 10, the Liberal Party is of the view that we should explicitly state that it is a term of seven years initially and then can be reappointed for up to a further three years to make that a total of 10.

We are also attracted to the amendments that have been tabled by other members. I think there are identical amendments from both the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Robert Simms in relation to the Auditor-General that that be for a simple 10 years and that it be a single appointment rather than one which is able to be reappointed.

I note that the Auditor-General wrote to all members via the Clerks to place on the record his particular concerns about officers who may be reaching the end of their first term and perhaps not scrutinising things as closely as they would in that period leading up to hoping to be reappointed. I am not inclined to agree that that should be an issue. I think these appointments are required to be frank and fearless and therefore we are not encouraged to agree with that particular view.

In saying that, I do thank them for their service. I look forward to the committee stage of the debate and just make those brief explanations in support of the Liberal Party's amendments.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (11:09): I rise briefly in support of the Statutes Amendment (Ombudsman and Auditor-General) (Terms of Office) Bill 2023. One of the cornerstones of a progressive society is the eradication of age discrimination and this bill takes a commendable step in that direction. The arbitrary age cut-off at 65 is an outdated concept that does not reflect the abilities and contributions of our older professionals.

As we have seen globally, many individuals remain at their professional peak well beyond this age. I am proud to remind this chamber that I successfully lobbied this government to remove the age limit on trainees. By eliminating this restriction, we have opened the door for individuals of all ages to pursue new opportunities.

By aligning South Australia with other jurisdictions, we are not only making a statement against age discrimination but also ensuring that we draw from the broadest talent pool possible. Moreover, fixed-term appointments as proposed might address any potential complacency issues. By setting a clear term, appointees are encouraged to be proactive and impactful within that time frame. It is paramount that we have contemporary, fair and effective processes and this bill is a step in the right direction.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:10): I rise to speak very briefly on the Statutes Amendment (Ombudsman and Auditor-General) (Terms of Office) Bill and to indicate that the Greens will be supporting the bill, albeit with amendments. The bill changes the term of the Ombudsman and Auditor-General to be fixed; that is, for seven years, with an option to extend to a maximum of 10 years. Currently, the legislation calls for those positions to expire when the office holder turns 65 years of age.

This bill removes the age discrimination precedent setting a term expiry at a certain age and will allow for applicants over the age of 65. It will also ensure that any younger person holding the role is not there for decades. All members of this place received a letter from the Auditor-General asking us to consider two recommendations; that is, to create a fixed term of 10 years and to not allow for reappointment after that term is complete.

I note that both the Greens and SA-Best have filed identical amendments and I indicate to the chamber that in the event that the amendment from the Hon. Connie Bonaros is successful the Greens will not proceed with our amendment—it would not be required. We will, of course, be supporting the amendment from the Hon. Connie Bonaros, which I anticipate will be dealt with first.

We note the amendments that have been filed by the opposition. Those amendments would allow for the reappointment of both the Auditor-General and the Ombudsman after their initial term. The Greens consider that to be against the spirit of the bill and therefore we are not in support of those amendments. I will make some general remarks about the Auditor-General, and I share the comments of the Hon. Michelle Lensink.

I want to put on the public record the appreciation of the Greens for the important work that these public officers do—that is, the Ombudsman and the Auditor-General. They are vital public roles that they perform. They offer fearless, independent advice. I share the concerns of the Hon. Michelle Lensink in relation to the Auditor-General's call to access cabinet documents not being actioned by the Malinauskas government.

This is a basic transparency measure. It is one that this house has supported when we supported the bill from the Hon. Heidi Girolamo and yet it has stalled in the lower house. That is very disappointing, because sunlight is the best disinfectant in our democracy and, really, the Auditor-General should have access to this vital information. I am not sure why the Malinauskas government is holding that up, but I do urge them to show leadership in this area of transparency, to listen to the calls of the Auditor-General and others and take action.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:13): I rise on behalf of SA-Best to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Ombudsman and Auditor-General) (Terms of Office) Bill 2023. At the outset, I echo the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Michelle Lensink regarding the role of both the Auditor-General and the Ombudsman, the fearless advice that those bodies provide, and also express our disappointment regarding the stalling of that previous bill dealing with cabinet documents.

The bill before us now has come on the eve of the retirement of the Ombudsman, Mr Wayne Lines, and the Auditor-General, Mr Andrew Richardson. We understand that the amendments to the Ombudsman Act that the government has proposed are at the suggestion or advice of the current Ombudsman. As others have said, the bill seeks to remove the compulsory retirement age of 65 and set a term limit of seven years, with a maximum of 10 years in total, replicating the terms of the heads of other integrity agencies, including the ICAC, the Judicial Conduct Commissioner and the Office for Public Integrity.

It also seeks to set those same terms for the Auditor-General. My understanding from the briefing was that, because this came at the request of the Ombudsman, the government's position was: we are going to have two vacancies so we will deal with them together. We wholeheartedly support the removal of the age discriminatory 65-year age for both positions, especially given that many Australians now are working well beyond 65—and, I would say, including my colleague. Did I just give away your age, Frank?

There is an expectation now that 65 is a discriminatory age to choose. I think it flows from that that there are probably other age limits in other pieces of legislation that we could also review at the same time, but that is a discussion for another day.

We are less comfortable with the remaining amendments, having regard to the unique role of the Auditor. The Auditor-General, as we have said, is tasked with reviewing budgets and putting under the microscope what the government is telling the public, particularly in the area of budget expenditure. That is directly what that previous cabinet documents bill feeds into.

Without the critical eye of the Auditor-General we would be left with no alternative but to trust the executive to order its own expenditure and accounts. It continues to go against the grain of independence that the reviewer's position is subject to appointment and reappointment by the very same executive, which is something I will comment on more in a moment.

The outgoing Auditor-General, as has been referenced, wrote to all members of parliament to share his concerns about the proposed amendments to the Public Finance and Audit Act. I think it is appropriate that we table that letter, and I seek to do so.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In that correspondence, the Auditor outlined why he considered a term of up to seven years as being too short and as being too closely aligned to election cycles. He also took issue with the possibility of reappointment, something which only remains in Victoria and the Northern Territory. Those jurisdictions can be distinguished from South Australia.

We are the only Australian jurisdiction where the appointment rests solely in the hands of the executive. South Australia's weak independent safeguards have actually been highlighted in successive reviews by the Australasian Council of Auditors General, including in the Independence of Auditors General.

In scoring and ranking jurisdictions, the reviews have had regard to who makes the appointment, the extent of the involvement of parliament, how the term of appointment is determined, whether reappointment is possible, who makes the reappointment, and who determines remuneration. We have not ranked at all well in those reviews.

In the latest 2020 update, South Australia continued its ranking as one of the weakest jurisdictions in terms of independence, mostly due to the executive having direct control of the appointment, the term length and the remuneration process. In relation to the remuneration determination, the Australasian Council of Auditors General highlighted:

Remuneration and the determination of other terms and conditions of employment is considered among the statutory safeguards because it is a key determinant of status and rank, and has a major impact on the calibre of persons who might be attracted to the role. Reducing remuneration could be used to effectively downgrade the status of the Auditor-General. The capacity of the Executive to influence remuneration is therefore of importance, as is the transparency of the process by which remuneration is determined.

The review goes on to identify the commonwealth, New South Wales, Western Australia and the ACT as jurisdictions where remuneration is determined by an independent tribunal. On that note, I foreshadow that I will be moving an amendment along the lines of what those review outcomes show and also what the Auditor-General has recommended, that the remuneration be armed with the task of setting the pay of the Auditor-General as opposed to the executive. The review noted:

Eligibility for reappointment has been recognised as an undesirable practice by the [International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions] because it might compromise independence. Where an incumbent is eligible for reappointment, as the time for reappointment approaches, the incumbent could become reluctant to criticise, or seek prominence by being overly critical or controversial. An option for reappointment could also enable the Executive to exert pressure on an incumbent. This is more likely if the Executive makes the appointment, and less [likely] where the appointment is made through a more public Parliamentary appointment process.

As I said, we have filed an amendment to remove the possibility of reappointment, as has the Hon. Robert Simms. I think it is fair to say that the amendments that were filed by the opposition were probably done predating the advice that was received from the Auditor. I am hoping there is a consensus that, given we have that advice, at this stage we are open to supporting the advice of the Auditor-General, at least between the houses and limited to the Auditor-General in scope.

Of course, had we had the benefit of more time and perhaps greater scope in the bill, we may have sought to implement some safeguards in the appointment process, such as a requirement for the executive to consult with the parliamentary committee, appointment directly by parliament or a parliamentary committee, or perhaps the capacity for parliament or a committee to veto or recommend an appointment.

I do intend to test the appetite of the Attorney on reviewing the appointment and remuneration processes in a moment, particularly in light of the Auditor-General's Report of 2023, 'Modernising SA public sector and strengthening audit independence', which was tabled earlier this week. I also, as I said, intend to test the appetite of the government in terms of ensuring there is a review of this piece of legislation, in line with what the Auditor himself has said, given that it has been some time since this legislation has been the subject of review, given that our ranking is of such low standing and given all the issues that the Auditor-General has highlighted in those reviews.

I will just say, on that point of review, I understand the government took this opportunity to basically kill two birds with one stone, and we have advice in relation to the Ombudsman but now we also have advice in relation to the Auditor. In terms of consistency, I think it is worth noting that there are a number of appointments that are made throughout government and I think it is a little bit unfair to say there is consistency when we have other appointments that do not fit within that same bracket that the Attorney will refer to.

My feedback to the Attorney has certainly been that if you want consistency across the board, then go and look at all those appointments and review all of them and make them consistent. In this instance, I think there is justification for what the Auditor has asked for because I think their role is unique compared even, for instance, to the Ombudsman, in terms of the work they undertake, and so I am strongly supportive of what the Auditor has said.

In relation to the report that was tabled this week—and I will do this now rather than when we get to the amendments—the report recommends that the Public Finance and Audit Act be reviewed to clearly establish all the powers and features of contemporary public sector audit and strengthen the Auditor-General's independence. The act has provided a workable basis for most of the Auditor-General's responsibilities for many years, but, unlike other audit acts around Australia, it has had very few changes since it was passed in 1987. In reviewing it, the matters raised in this report should be considered.

The matters raised in that report are critical and I do not think they should be ignored. There is a review of the PFAA which states that it is a significant task and will ultimately be necessary to ensure that South Australia's public audit legislation clearly provides for all of the powers and functions of contemporary practice. This report, which I am sure honourable members have now had the opportunity to turn their minds to, provides some of the public audit principles that should be referenced in any such review. It is the Auditor's view that it should also look at establishing a dedicated audit act in line with what other jurisdictions are doing.

As I said, the Auditor has also made the point that under current legislation no parliamentary committee has an express oversight. The Auditor has made reference to the fact that parliament does not play an active role. They have made reference to the fact that auditing the whole-of-government financial statements should be a statutory requirement, that agencies that are being audited need the provisions around that auditing to be strengthened to ensure independence.

There are a number of other recommendations in relation to passenger transport, in relation to the Independent Auditor's Report, in relation to the audit of all accounts, in relation to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, in relation to the review mechanisms of the Auditor's performance, and other powers that would modernise that act.

There is nothing in there that we should be ignoring. We get these reports for a reason, and all of us should be concerned about what the Auditor is telling us in these reports, and we should be looking at those. I urge the government to support this review provision because it is unacceptable that South Australia remains the most vulnerable jurisdiction, according to the report that I referred to earlier, to executive influence. On that note, I indicate that we will be supporting the bill with amendments and will speak to the amendments as I move them.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:26): I thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Connie Bonaros for their contributions. There are a number of amendments on file that we will deal with as we get to them. I might just reiterate that the reason we have this bill before us, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros set out in her second reading contribution, is as a result of correspondence from the retiring current Ombudsman, who recommended the term and the length of term that is suggested in this bill of up to seven years.

We thought that was sensible and we took the opportunity to look at other similar integrity agency officers, such as the Auditor-General. We thought it was a reasonable thing for consistency for integrity agencies, and the ICAC, the Office of Public Integrity and the Judicial Conduct Commissioner are all in line with what the Ombudsman had suggested in an appointment of up to seven years.

We respect the Auditor-General's views about the appointment. It is our view that it is a reasonable thing that these similar integrity agencies have a similar term, which is why we have suggested up to seven years for the Auditor-General. We acknowledge that the Auditor-General holds a different view, which speaks to the fierce independence in which the Auditor-General carries out his role, and we have some amendments filed. I will say from the outset that it is the government's preference that the bill, in the form that we put forward, is passed, but we recognise that the Legislative Council will have different views from the government from time to time, and certainly will on this one.

It will be our preference that no amendments are passed. We will find out when the amendments are put, but I suspect it will be the will of the chamber that the bill is amended. I suspect the amendments to do with the review clause and the remuneration that the Hon. Connie Bonaros has put forward will find favour with this chamber. I indicate that, once people indicate their views on it, we do not intend to divide but we will understand the will of the chamber.

The other sets of amendments that have been filed are in terms of the length of time of appointment. The opposition has amendments that change it from 'up to seven years' to 'a fixed term of seven years', and the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Robert Simms have amendments that give effect very strictly to the recommendation that the Auditor-General has made.

It is our view that the Liberal amendments are more in line with what other integrity agencies have—the ICAC commissioner, the Office for Public Integrity and the Judicial Conduct Commissioner. If it was looking at the two competing amendments and the length of time, we would prefer the bill as we put it, but I think the amendments from the opposition are closer to other integrity agencies with the seven years than the amendments of the Hon. Connie Bonaros and Hon. Robert Simms, but we will see what plays out in the chamber in relation to those amendments.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:30): I move contingent notice of motion No. 3 standing in my name:

That it be an instruction to the committee of the whole on the bill that it have power to consider a new clause to provide for a review of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987.

Motion carried.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: It was remiss of me in my second reading speech not to mention the key principle in this, which other members spoke to, namely, that the appointment should be for a fixed term and not merely expire once the person reaches the age of 65. Of course that is something we all agree with. Those other ways of doing things are certainly anachronistic, and we agree with all the sentiments about 65 being ageist.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros-3]—

Page 2, line 5—Delete '(Terms of Office)'

The amendments refer to the review provision, which we will consider shortly. Because we are inserting the review provision, we have to change the short title of the bill, therefore amendment No. 1 is necessary as a result of that. I will speak to the substantive amendment when we get to it, which is the review, but in effect, because we are inserting this, we need to change the short title of the bill. That is the purpose of this one.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, I have just been informed that really you should speak to the review now.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I can speak to the review now. I will not move it yet, but I will speak to it now. I have referred in my second reading to the need for a review in line with what the

Auditor-General has both written to us and also identified in the most recent report of 2023, which was provided to all of us in this place a couple of days ago, and also those other reports that, again, I have referred to during my second reading speech. There is something that I want to quote from the Auditor-General, which I think is important as a matter of record, from this most recent report:

South Australia ranks ninth of the 10 jurisdictions in the survey of independence

In each of the...surveys, South Australia has ranked ninth of the 10 jurisdictions covered. In the 2020 survey, six jurisdictions scored 327 or more points. At 262 points (up from 240...), South Australia was 80 points lower than top ranked ACT.

The survey acknowledged that, compared to the previous survey in 2013, [there had been] legislative amendments [which] had made a significant increase in independence.

However, it is important to note two principles:

[Firstly] the existence of an appropriate and effective constitutional/statutory/legal framework and of de facto application provisions of this framework—in 2020 South Australia remained the most vulnerable to Executive Government influence.

[Secondly] Financial and managerial/administrative autonomy and the availability of appropriate human, material, and monetary resources—South Australia was one of the jurisdictions where the legislation is silent regarding the budget for the audit office, leaving it under the direct control of the Executive Government.

They are two points that do need to be the subject of a review, together with everything else that the Auditor has asked for. I will say this: it is all well and good, with respect to the Attorney and the government, to say to us, 'This is what we think we need to do, and we do not necessarily think that there needs to be a review,' but I think I probably speak for some members when I say that, when it comes to the Auditor-General, we will be guided by the Auditor-General, not the government, in terms of the recommendations for independence and appropriate scrutiny.

I urge members to take into account what the Auditor has said and where South Australia is ranking, and also in relation to—we will get to the remuneration shortly—the budgets. It might not be this government's intention, but we cannot foresee what every future government will do. If we are the worst jurisdiction in terms of executive influence, there is absolutely nothing to prevent a future government from implementing a salary, for instance, that is not particularly attractive for someone to fill this role.

There is nothing preventing a future government from starving the Auditor's office of resources for an appropriate budget to be able to undertake the roles that they are prescribed to undertake. They are really the key reasons I think the Auditor has laid this out for us, and I just do not think they should be ignored. I think the government's position at a minimum should be to follow the advice of the Auditor-General.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Liberal opposition is supporting this set of amendments that the Hon. Ms Bonaros has spoken to very eloquently, I believe, so we will be supporting this amendment and the consequential ones.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens will also be supporting the amendment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government will not be supporting this amendment. We understand the motivation behind the amendment. This is a very simple, confined bill in terms of length of appointment and removing the age barrier, whereas this amendment, as we understand it, proposes a review of the entire Public Finance and Audit Act and how it works. But recognising that I think every other member of this chamber is supporting the amendment, I indicate that we do not intend to divide on this first one and the subsequent amendments in relation to this review provision.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Lensink-1]—

Page 2, line 8 [clause 2(1)]—Before 'expiring' insert 'a term'

Amendment No 2 [Lensink-1]—

Page 2, line 10 [clause 2(1)]—Delete 'not exceeding' and substitute 'an initial term of'

I spoke to these amendments in my second reading contribution but just for the sake of the committee debate: we have sought that it be an appointment fitting the seriousness of the role, so in effect these will affect both the appointment of the Ombudsman and the Auditor-General in identical ways. The effect of these will be that there will be a first appointment for seven years rather than what the government's clause says, which is open, and then an ability to have a subsequent reappointment, or however we should put it, for an additional three years, which we believe is consistent with other jurisdictions.

As the Hon. Ms Bonaros stated during the course of this debate, we did draft and file these amendments prior to the Auditor-General writing to all of us, but we continue to believe that these are the best way forward.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I indicated in my second reading summing-up, it is the government's preference that the bill goes through as we introduced it into this place. We think that brings it much more into line with the appointments for other integrity agencies, including the ICAC, the OPI and the Judicial Conduct Commissioner. However, we do recognise there is a will of this chamber to make a change.

As I indicated in the second reading summary, our preference is for the change to be more in line with the seven years, even though it is not the 'up to' but a fixed term of seven years that the opposition is moving rather than the 10 years for the Auditor-General proposed by the Hon. Connie Bonaros. As I have said, we prefer no change but we prefer this change, so I indicate we will be supporting the opposition's amendments.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I can speak to this amendment now before I speak to my amendment. I will just make the point that the reason we are moving the second set of amendments is precisely that they are based on the Auditor-General's advice to members of this parliament, acknowledging again that the Liberal amendments were filed prior to receipt of that advice.

If we are going to follow the Auditor-General's instructions when it comes to cabinet documents, when it comes to reviews, when it comes to all those other issues they have identified as things we ought to be considering to ensure there is no possibility of undue influence by the executive, and because we are the most vulnerable jurisdiction, then it follows, for me at least, that we ought to be following the advice of the Auditor-General in relation to the term of appointment because it has been carefully crafted to avoid all those other things that we have said we are concerned about.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I concur with the comment of the Hon. Connie Bonaros.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3.

The CHAIR: At clause 3 there are amendments in the name of the Hon. Mr Simms, the Hon. Ms Bonaros and the Hon. Ms Lensink. We will deal with the Hon. Ms Lensink's amendment first.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Lensink-1]—

Page 2, line 21 [clause 3(1)]—Delete 'a term not exceeding' and substitute 'an initial term of'

I have already spoken to this amendment. I think members understand the principles.

The CHAIR: These amendments are overlapping, so now we will go to the Hon. Ms Bonaros, and then we will work out which sequence I put them in.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros-1]—

Page 2, line 21 [clause 3(1)]—Delete 'not exceeding 7 years' and substitute 'of 10 years'

This amendment seeks to change '7 years' to '10 years' in line with the Auditor-General's Report. I will remind particularly the opposition on this point—I do not think I need to remind my friends on the crossbench. We have just talked about the dangers the Auditor-General has spoken of in terms of reappointments. I acknowledge that, while you can have an initial term of seven years and a reappointment for three, the Auditor himself has said he does not think that is a good outcome. There should be one appointment, 10 years maximum, and a salary set by the Remuneration Tribunal to minimise as much as possible any influence of the executive on the Auditor-General.

It is firmly our position that we should be following that advice, which is fearless and free from any political interference. I am not suggesting political interference, but the government has a preferred position; the Auditor has told us what their preferred position is for very good reason.

I do not think it is fair to say that there is consistency. I understand there is consistency among positions here, but when we were referred to the interstate jurisdictions I noted that there are subtle differences between all those jurisdictions and whether they do indeed allow reappointment or not. Those jurisdictions that do allow reappointment have other safeguards in place which we do not have in place. That is a really critical point. Without the safeguards, reappointment, the Auditor-General is telling us, just is not appropriate.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I want to indicate that the Greens support the amendment. Obviously, it is identical to the one I had intended to move—

The CHAIR: And you will now not be?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: —which I will now not be proceeding with. The Hon. Connie Bonaros has outlined the reasons for the amendment. The Greens certainly share the views that have been articulated by the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the rationale for the amendment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I reiterate very briefly the point that I have made before. Although I acknowledge what the Hon. Connie Bonaros has said that there are differences between different states around Australia in terms of length of time for appointment of Auditor-Generals, it is our view that it is preferable and there is merit in internal consistency in the integrity agencies. These competing amendments have different time frames. We prefer the opposition's time frame in preference to the time frames that are being suggested for the Auditor-General by the Hon. Connie Bonaros.

The CHAIR: What I am going to do is put the Hon. Ms Lensink's amendment first. If that should be successful, it in effect knocks out your amendment, the Hon. Ms Bonaros.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Thanks for the commentary; that's enough.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink's amendment carried; the Hon. C. Bonaros's amendment negated; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Bonaros-1]—

Page 3, line 8 [clause 4, inserted paragraph (c)]—Delete 'and is not reappointed'

Perhaps we can get some advice from those who know better than me, but if there is any suggestion under the previous amendments—and I have to say I am utterly disappointed where we have landed—that there can be a reappointment, then my position would be to ensure that we cannot have a reappointment. I am sure that I am wrong, based on the advice that is going to come back, but I just want to make sure first.

It is my understanding that in order to deal with my next amendment we will need to recommit clause 3, but in passing clause 3 we have also overlooked the amendment that I have in relation to the Remuneration Tribunal. In any event, the advice is that we have to recommit clause 3. That will achieve two ends: firstly, it will prevent a further reappointment for three years, so there will be an initial term of seven years with no reappointment for three; and, secondly, it will enable us to deal

with the Remuneration Tribunal setting the package of the Auditor-General as opposed to the executive. I am seeking on two fronts to recommit clause 3.

The CHAIR: So you have moved, the Hon. Ms Bonaros, your amendment at clause 4 and we are going to deal with that now. The recommittal will be at the end of this process. When I report progress, we will go back to the amendment that you have at clause 3. You have moved your amendment No. 3 [Bonaros-1] at clause 4.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I will not speak to this amendment again. As I said previously, it simply seeks to strike out the words 'and is not reappointed'. Therefore, if we stick with what we have at the moment, up until now we have seven years. This will prevent a further appointment for three years and will limit that at seven years. I think that is more in line with what the Auditor has said than where we were previously.

I also acknowledge, perhaps for the Attorney's sake, given we have ourselves into this little kerfuffle, that this might be an issue that we consider between the houses to ensure that we land on an appropriate term in line with that advice. I will certainly be seeking to move this amendment on the basis that there is no reappointment from the initial term.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her amendment. I indicate that the government will be opposing this amendment. As I have said, our preference is the bill that we introduced to parliament, which brings the Auditor-General and the Ombudsman much more in line with other heads of integrity agencies like ICAC, the OPI and the Judicial Conduct Commissioner.

I do wonder if the effect of having passed the Liberals' amendments for a term of seven years—in passing this and saying there is no possibility of reappointment—is actually going further away from what the Auditor-General recommended in his correspondence—

The CHAIR: Which it is.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —which was a 10-year term, because the possibility of reappointment could make it a 10-year term, whereas the effect of this amendment makes it just a seven-year term, which I think possibly takes it further away. Passing this, I suspect, will take it further away from what the Auditor-General has recommended, so we will be opposing it. It would not be on the basis of possibly taking it further away than what the Auditor-General recommended but on the basis of having it more in line with the terms of appointment for the heads of other integrity agencies.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The effect of this will be to limit it to just seven years. I wonder whether the Attorney might be open to negotiation between the houses. I think—and often this happens when we have multiple competing amendments—if we were to choose the third option then, from our point of view, this would be it. The first option is ours, and the second option would be for the straight 10 years, which was the original amendment by the Hon. Ms Bonaros. If the Attorney is happy to commit to negotiation between the houses on that basis, we will not support this amendment because this is probably the worst of the three options.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In response, I can indicate that we would be happy to consider it. I do not want that to be taken as 'we will make changes', but we absolutely would be happy to consider it between the houses.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I am going to make one point for the benefit of all members. I think this is important, and it is the only point I will make. This is the problem with wrapping up the Auditor-General's changes with the Ombudsman's changes prior to the advice being received from the Auditor-General. I acknowledge that, on both fronts, we might have got it wrong now, and so we should be looking at this outside because we might now be going against the advice of the Auditor. I acknowledge that. It might be the government's preferred position, but we have before us the Auditor-General's preferred position, which is what we have been trying to get through this place.

So I suggest that would be an appropriate course of action to ensure we are not moving further away from the Auditor-General's advice. The preferred position would still be to stick with the Auditor-General's advice, as given to all of us.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I worry that we might be starting to make a bit of a meal of an entree here, but I agree with the comments made by the Hon. Connie Bonaros. From our perspective, the

Greens were keen to honour the intent or the advice of the Auditor-General, and that is why we have moved amendments to give effect to that advice. Certainly, our view is that we should, as a parliament, try to follow the advice of those independent agencies. In terms of whether or not there is potential scope for amendments to be considered between the houses, I will leave that for the Attorney-General to consider.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

New clause 5.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Bonaros-3]—

Page 3, after line 8—Insert:

5—Insertion of section 42A

After section 42 insert:

42A—Review of Act

- (1) The Minister must cause a review of the operation of this Act to be undertaken, and a report on the review to be prepared and submitted to the Minister.
- (2) The review must be completed, and the report on the review submitted to the Minister, within 2 years of the commencement of this section.
- (3) The Minister must cause a copy of the report provided under this section to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.

I have already spoken to this amendment. It is the provision relating to a need for review in line with everything the Auditor-General has highlighted in the report that was handed down this week and subsequent reports to that.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens are supportive of the call for the review.

New clause inserted.

Schedule 1.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Bonaros-3]—

Page 3, line 14 [Schedule 1 clause 1(2)]—After 'Act' insert:

(other than clause 5)

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Bill recommitted.

Clause 3.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros-2]—

Page 3, after line 5—After subclause (2) insert:

(3) Section 24(4)—delete 'Governor' and substitute 'Remuneration Tribunal'

I move the amendment standing in my name, namely, that we delete 'Governor' and substitute 'Remuneration Tribunal'. In the report that I have referred to, the Auditor has stated:

Remuneration and the determination of other terms and conditions of employment is considered among the statutory safeguards because it is a key determinant of status and rank, and has a major impact on the calibre of persons who might be attracted to the role. Reducing remuneration could be used to effectively downgrade the status of the Auditor General. The capacity of the Executive to influence remuneration is therefore of importance, as is the transparency of the process by which remuneration is determined.

The Auditor goes on to say:

In New Zealand, the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Western Australia and now the Australian Capital Territory, remuneration is determined by an independent tribunal.

In those jurisdictions where they do not have the tribunal determining it, there are other safeguards; for instance, Queensland, which is obliged to consult with the parliamentary committee before determining remuneration, and Tasmania, where remuneration is determined by a statutory tie to the auditor-generals in other jurisdictions.

I think the amendment speaks for itself. If we are talking about lifting or eliminating as far as possible executive influence on the Auditor-General, then there has been made a very good case as to why this remuneration should be set by the tribunal and not by the executive of the day.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I support the amendment, and I want to thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for putting it forward. The points that she has made I think are very compelling. Certainly from the Greens' perspective, we have always been concerned about the potential for the executive to exert unfair influence over independent agencies, and one way that could potentially occur, or at least there could be a perception of that occurring, is through the capacity of the executive to influence the remuneration.

Carving that off and having an entirely independent body look at it, such as the Remuneration Tribunal, really does make sense. I want to thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for identifying this because I think it is a good addition to the bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I indicate that the government does not support the amendment. We understand what is trying to be done and why it is trying to be done, because it was a recommendation of the Auditor-General. However, as I have said before, one of the aims that we are trying to do with the bill before us is to bring consistency to similar officers in those integrity agencies. This will take the Auditor-General out of line with the head of ICAC, the head of OPI, the head of the Judicial Conduct Commission and the Ombudsman, but if that seems to be the wish of the Auditor-General and the will of the chamber, so be it.

Amendment carried; clause as further amended passed.

Bill reported with further amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:12): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (OBJECTS OF ACT AND BOARD ATTRIBUTES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 September 2023.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:13): I would like to thank all members of the council for their contributions on the second reading of the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill 2023. As has been indicated, the bill reinforces the government's commitment to stronger action on both climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation in recognition of the climate emergency that we are facing.

This government is committed to taking real action on climate change. The government is delivering on a broad range of actions to address climate change and to protect the environment and our quality of life, and to position the South Australian economy for resilience and growth at the same time. As outlined in my second reading explanation, this government is committed to statewide goals

to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by more than 50 per cent against 2005 emission levels by 2030, and to achieve net zero emissions by 2050.

The Environment Protection Authority, as the state's principal environment regulator, is well positioned to play a pivotal role in assisting the delivery of actions to demonstrate leadership and collaboration across government areas and to support industry in achieving a net zero emissions future.

The objects of the Environment Protection Act underpin functions of the Environment Protection Authority. The amendments contained in this bill will clarify the existing role of the Environment Protection Act and its application towards climate change to ensure that all stakeholders—business, government and the community—are aware of its ability to assist in providing the stated net zero future.

The Environment Protection Authority must have regard to the objects of the act when considering applications for environmental authorisations under the act and when considering development applications that are referred to under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. The objects of the Environment Protection Act also inform the environmental protection policymaking powers in part 5 of the act in that an environmental protection policy may be made for any purpose directed towards securing the objects of the act. Therefore, the proposed amendments will support future development of climate change focused environmental protection policies under the legislation.

The addition of the climate change knowledge and expertise to the membership of the board of the EPA will provide the necessary expertise and guidance on the board as the authority's regulation of climate change related matters evolves over time. The Environment Protection Authority has consulted with key stakeholders on the elements of this bill and the future work the agency intends to do on clarifying its role in regulating climate change matters through climate change environment protection policy, where the support for progressing this work was unanimous.

These amendments to the Environment Protection Act 1993, and further policy-related work to come, will facilitate the government's climate change agenda and assist the government to meet its greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets into the future.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: For the record, I would ask the Attorney to confirm that it is already the case that we can have a board member—and probably do have board members, given the EPA's published role last year—with experience specifically related to climate change.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. Yes, that is definitely the case. There is nothing that prohibits that, so you can already have that, but this makes an important clarification that it is a requirement into the future that there be a board member with those attributes.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I have a question for the minister in regard to stakeholder consultation. Were any primary industry stakeholders consulted in the preparation of this bill?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have access to a list, but I am happy to take it on notice and provide for the honourable member, if I can, who was consulted in relation to this bill. As I understand it, there were a bit over a dozen submitting stakeholders, but I am happy to take it on notice and provide a response.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 5) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:19): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION (COMMENCEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (12:20): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Social Workers Registration Act 2021.

Second Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (12:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce the Social Workers Registration (Commencement) Amendment Bill 2023. This bill amends the Social Workers Registration Act 2021. The Social Workers Registration Act 2021 was assented to on 9 December 2021, and it is due to commence on its two-year anniversary, as required under section 27(6) of the Legislation Interpretation Act 2021, on 9 December 2023.

As members would be aware, the introduction of a social worker registration scheme was supported by both major political parties in South Australia and the Greens on the basis that the registration of social workers will have a range of benefits, including improved public safety, higher standards of conduct and accountability through the provision of accessible mechanisms for complaints and review, and improved professional development opportunities for people within the profession.

The Social Workers Registration (Commencement) Amendment Bill 2023 seeks to amend two sections of the Social Workers Registration Act 2021: firstly, to replace section 2 to defer commencement of the act in favour of a date to be fixed by proclamation, and, secondly, to make a consequential amendment to section 68 to ensure that the opportunity to create transitional provisions by regulation remains under the act as amended.

Professor Sarah Wendt, a social work expert with a strong national and international reputation, commenced in the role of director for the social worker registration scheme on 18 September this year. Professor Wendt will be responsible for the development and implementation of the scheme, including recruiting staff, engaging a registrar and facilitating the appointment of a board.

As director, she will build on the stakeholder engagement work, including at a national level with the Australian Association of Social Workers and other jurisdictions, that has been undertaken by the Department for Child Protection over the past 12 to 18 months. She will also draw on the implementation plan, which was finalised and funded as part of the 2022-23 Mid-Year Budget Review.

I am pleased to confirm that funding has been committed to the scheme and, aside from some timing changes across the out years, the delayed commencement of the act will not have a budget impact. Any timing changes will be managed by the Department for Child Protection in discussions with the Department of Treasury and Finance as part of the budget process.

To ensure that the foundations have been properly laid for the scheme prior to the commencement of the act, the amendment bill is being introduced seeking to defer the legislation's commencement date to a time set by proclamation. This will ensure an operational registration scheme is in place at the time the act commences.

The amendment bill will also make a consequential amendment to section 68 of the act to ensure that the transitional regulation-making power of the principal act is maintained in the act as

amended. The transitional provisions are important as they enable the registration scheme to be introduced using a staged approach, which was always intended under the scheme's implementation plan.

Additionally, the staged implementation approach will prioritise systems and structures consistent with a future national approach. The preferred long-term approach in South Australia was and remains a national registration scheme, which is also the preference of the Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW).

While insufficient jurisdictional support exists at present for a national scheme, it will be important that the South Australian scheme is implemented in a way that positions it for transition to a national approach at a later stage should one subsequently be adopted. I commend the bill to the chamber and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Social Workers Registration Act 2021*

2—Substitution of section 2

This clause amends section 2 of the principal Act to disapply section 27(6) of the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021* in relation to the commencement of the Act, the operation of which would have seen the Act automatically commencing on the second anniversary of its assent. The proposed amendment will instead allow the Act to be brought into operation by proclamation after that second anniversary.

3—Amendment of section 68—Regulations and fee notices

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the transitional regulation making power in section 68 of the principal Act to reflect the amendment made by this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. H.M. Girolamo.

SPENT CONVICTIONS (PART 8A FINDINGS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:26): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Spent Convictions Act 2009. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Spent Convictions (Part 8A Findings) Amendment Bill 2023 I introduce today amends the Spent Convictions Act to bring findings made under part 8A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 within the spent convictions regime.

Part 8A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act sets out the process and outcomes that apply when a person is facing criminal charges but there is a question about whether they were mentally competent to commit the offence or are mentally unfit to stand trial. The Spent Convictions Act sets out a regime providing for eligible convictions to be 'spent' after a designated period of crime-free behaviour. In general, a spent conviction is not required or permitted to be disclosed to, and may not be considered by, employers or prospective employers.

A finding of not guilty by reason of mental incompetence or unfitness to stand trial under part 8A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act is not treated as a conviction for the purposes of the Spent Convictions Act. However, as part of the information release process for criminal history checks, part 8A findings are included along with convictions. This creates a situation where a person who is found

not guilty of an offence by reason of mental incompetence, or due to mental unfitness, can never apply to have that finding removed from their criminal record in the same way as a person who was instead convicted of the same offence.

This bill addresses this by requiring a part 8A finding to be treated as a conviction for the limited purpose of the Spent Convictions Act only. It is worth explaining, in general terms, how both part 8A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Spent Convictions Act operate at present, to put the changes contained in the bill in context.

In criminal matters, a court may make a finding of not guilty because of mental incompetence or mental unfitness to stand trial in accordance with part 8A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. A part 8A finding will be made when the court is satisfied that the objective elements of the offence are proven but the defendant is either found to have been mentally incompetent to commit the offence or mentally unfit to stand trial.

A person subject to a part 8A finding will be declared to be liable to supervision and may either be released unconditionally or be subject to supervision in the community or via detention. When a person is subject to supervision, the court must set a 'limiting term' equivalent to the length of imprisonment that would have been imposed if the person had been convicted of the offence. In this way, part 8A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act ensures that people who are so mentally unwell that they should not be held criminally responsible for their offending behaviour are not convicted, while ensuring community protection is achieved where required.

Turning now to the Spent Convictions Act, convictions for the most serious offences can never become spent. Convictions are only eligible to become spent if:

- a sentence of imprisonment was either not imposed at all or was 12 months or less (or 24 months' detention in the case of a juvenile); or
- they relate to a 'designated sex-related offence' (that is, offences involving consensual sexual activity); or
- they relate to a 'prescribed public decency offence' (offences against public decency by which homosexual behaviour was historically punished).

A conviction for an offence other than a sex offence will generally become spent automatically following a crime-free period (10 years post-conviction for adults or five years post-conviction for eligible juvenile offences). Once a conviction becomes spent, it is not required or permitted to be disclosed to, and may not be considered by, employers or prospective employers. However, the spent convictions regime is complex, containing rules about the treatment of convictions, exclusions to the rules, and exemptions to the exclusions.

Under schedule 1 of the Spent Convictions Act, several agencies and activities are exempted from the provisions that remove the need to disclose a spent conviction and create offences about disclosure of them. This means spent convictions information is still required to be provided where the exemptions apply. For example, justice agencies, intelligence agencies, the Parole Board, prescribed screening units, assessments relating to the care of children and assessments relating to employment as a police officer are some of the agencies and activities that come under these exemptions.

Under clauses 7 and 8 of schedule 1 of the Spent Convictions Act, spent convictions must still be disclosed and considered as part of assessing a person's fitness to care for vulnerable people and as part of a statutory assessment of fitness and propriety relating to an occupation, profession, position or activity (often referred to as a 'character test').

However, under section 13A of the Spent Convictions Act, a person may apply to a magistrate for an order that the exclusions in clauses 7 and 8 do not apply in relation to an offence. The magistrate is required to consider various factors before making such an order, including the circumstances and seriousness of the offending, whether the offence involved a vulnerable person, and whether the removal of the exclusion might present a risk to children, vulnerable people or the public, amongst other factors.

The effect of an 'exemption order' is that the applicant is permitted to revert to not having to disclose those convictions, including when assessing a person's fitness to care for vulnerable people. However, there is also a legislative exclusion to an exemption order permitting a prescribed screening unit to continue to access and rely on those convictions.

Similarly, a convicted person can apply to a magistrate under sections 8A, 8B and 8C of the Spent Convictions Act for a conviction for an 'eligible sex offence' (that is, one where no sentence of imprisonment was imposed), a 'designated sex offence' or a 'prescribed public decency offence' to be spent. These categories of offences do not become 'automatically' spent after the relevant period. Again, the Spent Convictions Act sets out several factors the magistrate must consider when deciding whether to order these convictions to become spent.

However, as explained at the outset, a part 8A finding is not a conviction. This means a part 8A finding does not become automatically spent in the same way a conviction for the same offence does. It also means that although the part 8A finding will appear on a person's criminal history, that person is not able to apply, under the Spent Convictions Act, to have the finding declared to be spent under sections 8A, 8B or 8C of the Spent Convictions Act, nor can they apply for an order under section 13A of the Spent Convictions Act.

This bill remedies these anomalies by providing that part 8A findings will be treated as if they were convictions for the limited purpose of the Spent Convictions Act. This means that people who have not been convicted of an offence, due to mental incompetence or unfitness to stand trial, are not treated more harshly than people who have been convicted of the same offence.

I commend the bill to the chamber and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Spent Convictions Act 2009*

3—Amendment of section 3—Preliminary

This clause makes sure that terminology used in the Act works in relation to Part 8A findings. References in the Act to a sentence of imprisonment will extend to limiting terms fixed under section 269O(2) of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* (or an equivalent under the law of another jurisdiction) and a finding by a court that the objective elements of an offence are established in proceedings under Part 8A of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* (or an equivalent under the law of any other jurisdiction) will be treated as a conviction under the Act.

4—Amendment of section 4—Meaning of spent conviction

This clause sets out when Part 8A findings that are treated as convictions for the purposes of the Act will be taken to be immediately spent.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Findings made before commencement

The amendments will apply in relation to a finding by a court whether the finding was made before or after the commencement of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. H.M. Girolamo.

ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to amend the *Advance Care Directives Act 2013* to improve the functioning of Advance Care Directive legislation in South Australia. This is necessary to continue supporting the community and health practitioners by having legislation that is up to date and appropriate for the task of achieving compliance with the Act.

The Bill enhances the operation of the Act in response to the statutory review of the Act that was conducted by Professor Wendy Lacey in 2019.

The *Advance Care Directives Act 2013* was passed by the South Australian Parliament in 2013 and commenced on 1 July 2014.

An Advance Care Directive enables a competent person to make decisions and give directions in relation to their future health care, accommodation arrangements and personal affairs; provides for the appointment of adults, known as substitute decision-makers, to make such decisions on behalf of the person if a person is not able to make them due to impaired decision-making capacity; ensures that health care is delivered to the person in a manner consistent with their wishes and instructions; facilitates the resolution of disputes relating to advance care directives; and provides protections for health practitioners and other persons giving effect to an advance care direction.

Section 62 of the Act provides for a review of its operations to be completed before the fifth anniversary of the commencement of the Act.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing engaged Professor Wendy Lacey to undertake the review which was conducted over a 10-week period from 10 April 2019 to the end of June 2019. Professor Lacey consulted extensively, with both targeted consultation with interested organisations, persons and professions; as well a broad invitation to contribute provided to members of the community.

The Lacey Review made 29 recommendations and was tabled in Parliament on 1 August 2019. The former Government's Response to the Review was tabled in Parliament on 23 July 2020 and supported, in full or in principle, 22 of the recommendations.

To guide the implementation of the recommendations of the Review, an Advance Care Planning Oversight Group and a Working Group were established by the Department for Health and Wellbeing. This ensures the implementation has been overseen by a broad range of stakeholders from the health, aged, disability, legal and community sectors, including the Australian Medical Association, Council on the Ageing and the Legal Services Commission South Australia.

The Malinauskas Labor Government is committed to continuing to implement the recommendations of the Lacey Review to improve the functioning and uptake of Advance Care Directives in South Australia.

This Bill has been drafted to implement the recommendations of the Review that recommend changes to the Act. It closely aligns with the Bill that was introduced into Parliament in 2021, which was subject to extensive consultation in 2021.

The Bill includes amendments on the following:

- Inclusion of references to digital copies of ACD documents
- Interaction with other Acts and laws
- Giving advance care directives where English is not the first language
- Requirements in relation to appointment of substitute decision makers and their empowerment
- Effect of advance care directives in suspected suicide or self-harm attempts
- Resolution of disputes by Public Advocate; and
- Referral of certain matters to Tribunal.

The Bill as introduced in the other place did not initially include an amendment to sections 19 and 36 to clarify the effect of an advance care directive on the provision of health care when a health practitioner reasonably suspects that a person has attempted suicide or self-harm. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing moved to amend sections 19 and 36 on 31 August 2022 to provide the opportunity for debate and a conscience vote on the matter.

In 2021, the former Minister for Health and Wellbeing, Hon Stephen Wade moved a similar amendment in this place to insert section 36A into the principal Act with the intent to address Professor Lacey's recommendation.

Members may recall that Bill to amend the Act did not pass before Parliament was dissolved for the 2022 State Election.

The amendments to sections 19 and 36 improve upon previous iterations of this legislation by ensuring additional safeguards are in place against misuse.

These additional safeguards include:

- that provisions written in to an advance care directive that explicitly refuse health care arising out of, or directly related to, a attempt of suicide or self-harm will no longer be binding provisions;
- that a health practitioner will need to have reasonable grounds for believing that a suicide or self-harm attempt has been made and that provision of health care is necessary to save the life of that person;
- that health practitioners will be required to record and report health care provided in contravention to a binding provision of an advance care directive;
- that these amendments will not compel health practitioners to provide treatment, nor force them to disregard binding provisions; and
- there are also further clarifying notes and examples on the effect of the amendments for the avoidance of doubt.

As I understand it, the debate that occurred in the other place on 31 August 2023 supported and commended the Bill to Parliament and subsequently passed without further amendment.

The Malinauskas Labor Government acknowledges the concern of some members of the community that the amendment will, in limited instances and scenarios envisaged by this particular amendment, remove the autonomy of the person to make their future decisions binding through an advance care directive. However, on balance we are confident the amendment supports health practitioners to provide the best care for our community.

The Government wants to thank all the key stakeholders for their work in working with the Department for Health and Wellbeing to try to reach what resulted in a consensus position in the other place and I hope will continue that way following today's debate.

We would also like to thank a few of the key people who have been instrumental in leading this work over many years, including the former minister of the other place the Hon. Martyn Evans for his work and his passionate advocacy in relation to advance care directives for many years. We also thank the Australian Medical Association and their officials, including Dr Chris Moy, and the Chief Psychiatrist, Professor John Brayley.

Strengthening Advance Care Directives legislation will support all South Australians to make clear legal arrangements for their future health care.

I commend this Bill to members.

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

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Advance Care Directives Act 2013*

3—Insertion of section 5A

This clause inserts new section 5A into the principal Act, providing for the recognition of certain digital copies of advance care directives.

4—Insertion of section 8A

This clause inserts new section 8A into the principal Act, setting out the relationship between the principal Act and other Acts and laws.

5—Amendment of section 14—Giving advance care directives where English not first language

This clause amends section 14 of the principal Act to set out requirements and limitations relating to the use of interpreters under the Act.

6—Amendment of section 19—Binding and non-binding provisions

This clause amends section 19 of the principal Act to provide that a provision of an advance care directive that purports to be a refusal of health care arising out of, or directly related to, the attempted suicide or self-harm of the person who gave the advance care directive will be taken to be a non-binding provision.

7—Amendment of section 21—Requirements in relation to appointment of substitute decision-makers

This clause amends section 21 of the principal Act to clarify that there can be any number of substitute decision-makers under an advance care directive.

8—Substitution of section 22

This clause substitutes a new section 22 into the principal Act setting out the relationships between substitute decision-makers under an advance care directive and how they exercise their powers, including by providing for orders of precedence.

9—Amendment of section 24—Exercise of powers by substitute decision-maker

This clause amends section 24 of the principal Act to provide that substitute decision-makers under an advance care directive can produce certified or electronic copies of advance care directives rather than the original.

10—Amendment of section 36—Health practitioners to give effect to advance care directives

This clause amends section 36 of the principal Act to set out the way in which provisions of an advance care directive amounting to a refusal of consent operate, where a health practitioner reasonably suspects that the person giving the advance care directive has attempted suicide or has self harmed and that life saving health care is required. In such cases, the health practitioner may provide that treatment in contravention of a provision of the advance care directive to save the life of the person. The amended section also makes procedural and explanatory provisions in relation to such treatment, including the need for the health practitioner to make certain records.

11—Amendment of section 45—Resolution of disputes by Public Advocate

This clause amends section 45 of the principal Act to remove to the ability of the Public Advocate to make certain declarations relating to mediation under the section.

Schedule 1—Statute law revision of *Advance Care Directives Act 2013*

This Schedule is a statutes law revision exercise correcting obsolete references and gendered language in the principal Act.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL 2023

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

It gives me great pleasure to present to the house the 2023-24 state budget, the second budget delivered by the Malinauskas government. This budget is framed at a time when the state's economy has never been stronger. The South Australian labour market is breaking records, in March recording the lowest ever unemployment rate and, indeed, only today the highest ever number of people in work and the highest participation rate since monthly records commenced in 1978.

Our export figures have broken all records and population growth is stronger with positive interstate migration. Our retail sector bucks the national trend, with April figures the strongest in the nation. Both the Australian Bureau of Statistics and Business SA attribute these results to the extraordinary success of two new major events, the AFL Gather Round and LIV Golf. According to Tourism Research Australia, domestic overnight visitor expenditure for South Australia in March was up 35 per cent on the same month in 2022.

Our state's economy is now ranked second in the CommSec State of the States report. Even more encouragingly, the major economic opportunities before our state continue to grow and materialise.

The AUKUS agreement has resolved that South Australia will be the home of a new nuclear submarine building industry. The rest of the country and indeed the world, is scrambling to catch up to our state's leadership on both renewables and hydrogen. The decarbonisation and electrification of industry globally means our state's copper mining and broader resources industry stands on the cusp of exponential growth, and over the last year our state has emerged as the major events capital of the nation.

Yet we are not without our challenges. Over the past 12 months, households and small business have been hammered by the dual blows of soaring inflation and the fastest increase in interest rates in a generation. These cost-of-living pressures are compounded by soaring housing costs, driven by rapidly increasing house values, higher mortgage costs and rents and a supply of new homes that is not keeping pace with our population's needs. More

broadly, the national GP crisis is driving ever-increasing demands on our hospitals, already under pressure with the ongoing demands of COVID.

Our child protection system continues to strain under the demand of higher numbers of children coming into care.

Communities along the Murray have endured the river flooding to a level not seen for 50 years, inundating regional communities along its length, displacing people from their homes, businesses from their livelihoods, and farmers from their land.

I am pleased to report to the house of the 2023-24 state budget both builds on the progress and momentum of the last 12 months and addresses the challenges confronting our community. The budget provides substantial cost-of-living relief, allocates large increases in funding for health, housing and child protection, and invests in our economy. It does this while maintaining the government's commitment not to introduce any new taxes, or increase existing taxes, and continues our commitment to return the budget to surplus. Importantly, as the government's infrastructure program ramps up and debt increases, the impact on the state's finances is managed responsibly.

This government accepts its responsibility to support those most in need in our community as the cost of living soars. This budget allocates over \$470 million in the single largest cost-of-living assistance package ever deployed in our state to assist hundreds of thousands of South Australian households and small business as they deal with increasing fuel, grocery, energy and housing costs.

We have targeted these measures to ensure we are supporting the community without adding to inflation: there is no point giving with one hand, only for the Reserve Bank to take with another. Instead we have sought to directly reduce costs where we can, while improving existing supports.

We have partnered with the commonwealth government in a \$254 million Energy Bill Relief Plan, with a rebate of up to \$500 on 2023-24 electricity bills available to 420,000 eligible households, and up to \$650 available to a further 86,000 eligible small businesses. The \$127.2 million cost to the state budget is more than three times the amount of support provided in last budget's Cost of Living Concession increase.

The government has also indexed existing concessions at a further cost of \$44 million over the forward estimates, including the Cost of Living Concession, the state's existing energy concession, the water and sewerage concession and the medical heating and cooling concession by 8.64 per cent in 2023-24 to ensure existing supports remain in line with inflation. Together, these two measures can actually reduce next year's electricity bills for many South Australians.

This budget provides an additional \$57.2 million over four years to increase the payments it makes to non-government organisations providing disability, homelessness, housing and other support services, recognising that higher wages and inflation risk their capacity to maintain services to vulnerable South Australians.

This follows the additional \$55 million provided for the same purpose in the December Mid-Year Budget Review. Together, these amounts see funding boosted to these organisations by over \$110 million over five years.

The budget also provides free public transport and cheaper parking for thousands of workers in our metropolitan public hospitals, reducing transport costs for them to get to and from work, reducing these costs to workers by \$56.4 million over five years to 2026-27.

The budget also provides \$32.1 million over four years to increase payments by \$50 per child per fortnight to carers of children under 16 years in state care, on top of indexation, to recognise the impact higher costs of living are having on their efforts to support children in their care and also to encourage other families to become foster and kinship carers.

The budget has again allocated \$12 million in 2023-24 to continue the \$100 subsidy towards the school materials and services charge for the 2024 school year benefiting around 120,000 government school children. \$6.5 million over four years is provided to deliver approximately one million additional breakfasts and support the nutrition of students most in need through an increase in grant funding to Foodbank SA and Kickstart for Kids to expand their school breakfast programs.

Foodbank SA will also receive \$2 million of a \$4 million food relief package for charities to support those South Australians struggling with the cost of groceries, and \$1 million will be allocated for additional financial counselling services. A further \$4.2 million over four years increases the grant to The Smith Family to provide support for an additional 700 students per year in the Learning for Life program.

I am also pleased to say that this budget axes the asset sustainability levy introduced by the former Liberal government, providing \$740,000 per year in total relief to approximately 3,500 residents across the outback.

These initiatives build on previous cost-of-living support provided by the government, including last year's doubling of the Cost of Living Concession, free public transport for our seniors, as well as reductions in the vast majority of CTP premiums that were made possible through the competitive CTP scheme legislated by the previous Labor government. While inflation is forecast to reduce in the coming year, the government is prepared to consider further cost-of-living relief measures in the future to continue supporting our community.

Our housing market is failing to meet the needs of South Australians looking for safe, secure and affordable housing. The housing boom over the last two years has seen house prices and rents soar, pushing some into homelessness and many others into insecure, unaffordable and temporary housing. Last year's budget started the work of addressing this, committing to 400 new homes in public housing.

This year's budget massively expands these efforts, investing \$474.7 million in a comprehensive suite of measures to deliver more social housing and affordable homes, more support for people to buy their first home, greater protections for those who are renting, and more affordable rental opportunities.

In total, the funding in this budget supports the delivery of 3,600 new homes over five years and reduces the cost of housing for around a further 14,000 new homes, supporting a much-needed boost to the supply of housing across our state. Measures include:

- expanding our commitment to public housing by providing \$72 million over the forward estimates to increase the number of additional public houses from 400 to 564, but also stopping the sell-off of a further 580 public housing properties committed to by the previous Liberal government;
- committing to develop 700 new affordable homes, in partnership between Renewal SA, community housing providers and the commonwealth government's Housing Australia, across a range of development sites throughout the state to meet the state's commitment under the National Housing Accord;
- the single largest release of land in South Australia's history, providing 25,000 more blocks across Adelaide's northern and southern suburbs;
- establishing the Office for Regional Housing in Renewal SA, to work with local governments to commence five new key worker housing developments across regional centres;
- \$1.7 million over four years is committed to extend the Aspire homelessness program for a further 12 months to 31 December 2024; and
- residential tenancy reforms including increasing the weekly rent threshold for six-week bonds from \$250 to \$800 per week, banning rent bidding, protecting tenants' rights and information, and expanding eligibility for the private rental assistance program—just part of our rental protections.

The Malinauskas government is well aware that for young South Australians, home ownership has never felt further from their grasp. But we still believe the dream of home ownership should be achievable for young South Australians, and that's why this budget provides \$147.3 million over four years to abolish stamp duty for first-home buyers when they purchase or build a new home.

Effective from today, this will benefit approximately 3,800 first-home buyers a year. It will apply to new homes with a value of up to \$650,000 and, in addition, they will remain eligible for the existing First Home Owner Grant of \$15,000, which will also have its property value cap increased to \$650,000. These measures mean an eligible first-home buyer can receive total relief of up to \$44,580 on the purchase of a new property.

To further support first-home buyers, the budget provides \$714,000 over three years to enable HomeStart to introduce a 2 per cent deposit First Home Buyer Construction Loan, improving on our election commitment to deliver a 3 per cent deposit option. We want young South Australians achieving their dreams of home ownership, and this budget gives them the support to finally make this happen.

Since the Mid-Year Budget Review, the government has allocated a further \$470 million in the current 2022-23 financial year alone to boost resourcing across our health system. The budget continues providing additional funding for the health system to maintain higher levels of capacity, transition from the height of the pandemic response, and provide a suite of new measures to address ramping. In total the budget allocates \$2.3 billion in extra funding to health from 2022-23 to 2026-27. Combined with our commitment in last year's budget, this means the government has now increased operating funding to health by \$4.4 billion since coming to office.

In this current financial year alone, more than \$1.2 billion in additional operating funding has been allocated by the Malinauskas Labor government compared to the funding levels committed by the former Liberal government. This budget includes \$1.3 billion over five years to meet activity demand pressures in our hospitals and a further \$567 million over four years to assist health as it transitions from the height of the pandemic response.

Over the next four years, nearly \$200 million is provided for measures that seek to reduce ramping, these include:

- \$27.6 million over four years to increase medical staffing in major metropolitan hospitals on the weekends to increase the discharge of patients ready to leave hospital;
- \$17.6 million over five years tackling long-stay patients through individual patient supports, such as short-term services, equipment hire and minor home modifications;
- \$67.8 million over five years expanding the Adult Virtual Care Service; and

- \$2.1 million in 2023-24 establishing two new Emergency Department Avoidance Hubs in the western and northern suburbs.

Other investments we are making in health include:

- \$100.8 million over two years for the new Mount Barker hospital project;
- \$31.1 million over three years for the deployment of the Electronic Medical Record program across all regional Local Health Network hospitals; and
- \$20.1 million over two years to upgrade the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital to ensure it can continue delivering high-quality services while the new hospital is being built.

Reducing the number of children and young people in care requires a coordinated approach across government, the community and the child protection system. The budget provides \$216.6 million over five years for child protection and early intervention measures, including \$109.5 million for additional out-of-home care, and \$107.1 million for initiatives to start reducing demand on the child protection system. Measures include:

- \$35.7 million over five years to increase targeted intensive family support services;
- \$32.1 million over four years to increase carer payments;
- \$13.4 million over five years to increase family group conferencing services;
- \$6.1 million over four years for family support services for at-risk first-time parents; and
- \$4 million over four years to increase kinship care assessments.

The government shares the alarm of the community at the spike in the number of deaths on our roads this year. The budget provides \$98 million over five years for a comprehensive road safety package with measures including:

- \$40 million over three years to upgrade the intersection of Adelaide, Alexandrina, Wellington and Flaxley Roads in Mount Barker;
- \$31.2 million over five years for 15 new mobile speed detection cameras and 10 new mobile phone detection cameras, as well as the upgrade of 16 existing fixed speed cameras, with additional revenue generated to be reinvested in road safety initiatives;
- \$10 million over four years for regional road safety infrastructure upgrades, including audio tactile line marking, safety barriers, and rural junction activated warning systems at regional intersections;
- \$6.2 million over four years for additional Kangaroo Island road improvements and maintenance;
- \$6.2 million over four years for additional road safety campaigns; and
- \$3.8 million over five years to deliver the motorcycle RiderSafe reform, as part of the strengthened motorcycle licensing requirements.

Further, more than \$350 million is budgeted over the forward estimates for regional road maintenance by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport as part of its annual road maintenance program and the government will spend \$780 million over four years on road safety policing and support functions within SA Police and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

The budget contains a record \$21 billion investing program over the next four years, a huge increase over previous budgets, with \$5.3 billion allocated towards the Torrens to Darlington section of the north-south corridor, and \$1.2 billion over four years towards the new Women's and Children's Hospital. Other major new infrastructure projects funded in this budget include:

- \$348.9 million over four years for a new purpose-built facility for Forensic Science SA and the SAPOL Forensic Services Branch;
- \$55 million over three years to expand the facilities as part of the Adelaide Aquatic Centre project; and
- \$23.5 million over three years for upgrade works at the South Australian Aquatic and Leisure Centre at Oaklands Park.

The budget allocates \$20 million over four years to address critical works across the state's jetties by providing assistance to regional councils struggling to maintain these crucial community assets. There is also \$7.4 million in 2023-24 for continued replenishment of sand at West Beach and other Adelaide coastal areas, while the government undertakes its review of coastal sand management. The government is continuing its strong record of investing in public transport, with:

- \$23.5 million over four years to ensure the continuation of bus services across regional South Australia;

- \$8.7 million over five years to introduce a Lightsview to City Go Zone bus service; and
- \$7 million over three years to complete 'tap and pay' with credit or debit card and equivalent digital devices on the train network.

With a strong labour market comes the challenge for employers to recruit and maintain staffing levels. South Australia Police has not been immune to this pressure, and the budget provides:

- \$81.8 million over four years for the recruitment of an additional 189 sworn police security officers, to release more sworn police officers into frontline policing roles; and
- \$12.2 million over three years to accelerate police recruitment to restore sworn officer staffing levels to their funded levels.

In our prisons, the budget supports:

- \$30 million over three years to upgrade prisoner accommodation and staff facilities in two high security units at Port Augusta Prison;
- \$11.2 million over four years for an Aboriginal community-led initiative to reduce rates of Aboriginal incarceration;
- \$6.3 million over four years for the Work Ready, Release Ready Plus rehabilitation program in our prisons; and
- \$4.6 million over four years to secure and fit out a new Port Augusta Community Corrections Centre.

The Malinauskas Labor government continues its ambitious agenda in our education system. The royal commission established to enquire into the delivery of three-year old preschool is due to deliver its final report in August, and the budget holds significant provisions centrally for the commencement of this initiative, pending the report's recommendations into timing, staffing, delivery models and accessibility.

The five trade schools committed in last year's budget are progressing, and we look forward to the respective university councils considering a merger. This year's state budget provides \$100.2 million in school upgrades, including:

- \$64.7 million over four years for urgent capital works to address capacity pressures and condition and compliance works;
- \$25 million in 2023-24 to upgrade, repair and replace assets at over 50 metropolitan and regional school and preschool sites;
- \$10.5 million in 2024-25 to deliver new gymnasiums at Brahma Lodge Primary School, Hillcrest Primary School, Ingle Farm East Primary School and The Pines School;
- \$35 million over five years allocated for government and non-government schools to participate in the commonwealth-funded National Student Wellbeing Program; and
- \$15.8 million over four years allocated for regional school bus services to replace the existing bus fleet with four-wheel-drive buses on APY Lands, and to replace existing large buses in the regions.

The budget also allocates a further \$4 million over four years for autism support initiatives, building on the work led by the minister assisting the Premier, the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC, to assist schoolchildren and their parents and caregivers to receive better support.

In order for our state to secure the full advantages of the economic opportunities before us, we need to continue investing in improving skills in our workforce. Initiatives funded in the budget include:

- \$28 million over four years for a targeted increase in training subsidies for not-for-profit and industry-based training providers aligned with areas of skill demand and economic priorities;
- \$10.2 million over four years to establish a Regional Skills Development Fund that will ensure TAFE SA can offer more courses in rural and regional South Australia;
- \$9 million over three years for TAFE SA, not-for-profit and industry-based training providers to improve their facilities and equipment; and
- \$4.2 million over four years to continue the Group Training Organisations Boost program to support mature-aged apprentices.

I am pleased to report that this budget also continues to invest in the economic opportunities before our state. We are progressing well with the implementation of the Hydrogen Jobs Plan announced in last year's budget, and this year's budget allocates a further \$22 million to the Economic Recovery Fund announced last year.

The Northern Water Supply Project continues to develop as a critical opportunity for our state's mining, resources and energy industries, and the budget contains a provision for the government to partner with private sector

proponents to undertake the necessary environmental studies, final engineering and costings, to facilitate a final investment decision in 2024. Further initiatives included in the budget include:

- \$33 million over four years to expand the existing space presence at Lot Fourteen and attract, grow and retain space companies in South Australia;
- \$27.8 million over four years to support the racing industry with a higher share of the state's betting operations tax revenues to help them maintain the nearly 4,000 jobs the industry supports;
- \$25.4 million over five years to continue supporting the ongoing operations of six South Australian-based National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy facilities;
- \$20 million over four years to expand the Research and Innovation Fund and continued funding of the startup hub at Lot Fourteen;
- \$13.5 million over four years to extend the South Australian Video Game Development Rebate scheme; and
- \$5.5 million over four years to establish a new Office for AUKUS to support the implementation of the AUKUS submarine construction program at Osborne.

The budget also introduces a \$200 million Digital Investment Fund over five years to drive strategic and targeted investment in cybersecurity and digital initiatives across the public sector. The fund will allow the government to prioritise and release to the market a series of major cybersecurity and ICT platform replacements, providing a substantial opportunity for the state's cybersecurity and ICT sector to partner with government and generate further jobs and economic opportunity.

The last 12 months have shown what a targeted and ambitious strategy of investing in major events can deliver for our state. Put simply, since the last election our state has got its mojo back. In just over a year, we have regained the eyes of the nation—and the world—for our capacity to excel at hosting major events. The return of the Adelaide 500, the new Harvest Rock festival, record seasons of the Fringe, the Adelaide Festival and WOMAD were joined by two new stunning successes, the AFL Gather Round and LIV Golf.

In addition to the government's continued commitment to existing events, this budget commits a further \$20.8 million over four years for the Major Events Fund to secure new events and grow existing major events in South Australia.

To build on the success of the return of the Adelaide 500, the budget allocates an additional \$18 million over four years to install more shading for grandstand areas and to ensure the ongoing high quality of the event. Confirming the government's commitment to the arts, the budget provides \$2 million over four years to increase the Adelaide Film Festival Investment Fund.

The River Murray flood event quickly became one of the most significant natural disasters in our state's history, with over 3,000 properties inundated by flood waters. Our initial assistance package of \$51.6 million, announced in November, was designed to assist communities, businesses and councils prepare for the flood, and these funds were included in the Mid-Year Budget Review. Since that time, the government has committed a further \$142.8 million for relief efforts. We remain committed to working with affected communities to recover and rebuild after this catastrophic event.

Elsewhere in the emergency services, the budget provides:

- \$26.7 million over four years to enhance the state's aerial firefighting capability;
- \$5.6 million in 2022-23 for extraordinary fire response costs;
- \$1.9 million over four years to increase mental health and wellbeing support to more than 15,000 volunteers and staff in the sector; and
- \$1.3 million over four years for the purchase of a reserve of flood barriers, such as DefenCell, to guard against future flood risks.
- The budget continues the government's significant investment in primary industries and the regions, with new funding including:
 - \$25 million over two years to undertake significant emergency fruit fly response activities following the detection of further outbreaks across the Riverland;
 - \$7.7 million in the next financial year for the cost of remediating the Mintabie township;
 - \$6.3 million over four years to support industry through the extension of the current snapper fishery closure in the Spencer Gulf, West Coast and Gulf St Vincent fishing zones;
 - \$3.2 million over two years to support the implementation of individual electronic identification for sheep and goats; and

- \$3 million over four years to support the Outback Communities Authority in delivering improved public facilities and community services in outback townships. This is in addition to \$3.7 million over five years to cease the asset sustainability levy introduced by the previous government.

On Sunday 26 March 2023, South Australia became the first state in Australia to enact a First Nations voice to parliament. The government is committed to implementing the Uluru Statement from the Heart at a state level, starting with the Voice.

Reinforcing our commitment, this budget provides \$10.3 million over four years to establish and support the ongoing operations and to conduct the first two elections of the First Nations Voice to Parliament. This will be supported with other initiatives, including \$11.2 million over four years to continue the multiagency response to support the safety and wellbeing of Aboriginal visitors, \$5.6 million over four years to support the operations of Tauondi college and \$4.7 million over four years to ensure the state's partnership commitments under the National Agreement on Closing the Gap are met, including to increase funding to the South Australian Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisation Network as the state's peak body.

I am pleased to advise that this year's budget papers include a Women's Statement. The Malinauskas Labor government is committed to tackling gender inequality and promoting safety, wellbeing and opportunity for women and girls in South Australia. The statement identifies existing strategies and initiatives undertaken by the government in this regard, and the statement will feature in budget papers from now on, recognising the importance of government efforts in this area.

In total, the 2023-24 budget provides \$4.3 billion over the period 2023-24 to 2026-27, in addition to \$713 million in 2022-23 for new expenditure initiatives and revenue measures. State taxation revenues, including payroll tax, conveyance duty and gambling taxes, have been revised up in 2022-23 and across the forward estimates, reflecting the strong labour market and the broader economic conditions, including a resilient property market. GST revenue grants have also been revised up in 2023-24 and 2024-25, reflecting expected pool growth and an increase in South Australia's share of the national pool.

With additional spending pressures for flood response and the health and child protection systems, combined with a reduction in expected GST revenues this financial year since the release of the Mid-Year Budget Review, the budget estimates a net operating balance deficit for this current financial year of \$249 million. The budget returns to surplus from next year, with a net operating balance surplus forecast of \$250 million, with growing surpluses forecast across the forward estimates, reaching \$639 million by 2026-27.

As a result of the additional resources provided in the budget for key services and the continued investment in infrastructure, non-financial public sector net debt is projected to increase over the forward estimates to \$37.6 billion as at 30 June 2027.

Importantly, the key budget metric of the net debt to revenue ratio remains well below the levels forecast by the previous government. At the end of the current financial year the ratio is expected to be 100.5 per cent, some 20 percentage points less than the ratio forecast by the previous government in its last budget.

At the end of the forward estimates, this budget forecasts the ratio will reach 121.6 per cent, still eight percentage points lower—two full financial years later—than was forecast by the previous government. Not only does the budget maintain Labor's commitment at the last election not to impose any new taxes or tax increases, the indexation rate for government fees and charges has been limited to 4.8 per cent in 2023-24, and the emergency services levy bill for a median-valued metropolitan residential property will increase by around 4.8 per cent in 2023-24, well below the prevailing rate of inflation.

The budget does not impose cuts to frontline services or a broad savings task. Instead, the budget includes only one savings measure: a further reduction of at least 50 full-time equivalent executive positions across agencies, in addition to the 50 executive full-time equivalent savings required last year, all of which have been delivered.

The budget forecasts a slowing of economic growth to 1 per cent in 2023-24 and 1¼ per cent in 2024-25, consistent with slower national growth projected in the federal budget. After the strong performance of the state's labour market in recent times, employment growth also moderates to 1 per cent in 2023-24 and ¾ per cent in 2024-25, again consistent with the commonwealth's estimates of slower growth and a rising unemployment rate nationally. Inflation is also due to moderate to 3¾ per cent in 2023-24 and 3¼ per cent in 2024-25, before returning to the Reserve Bank's target band in 2025-26.

Putting a state budget together is an enormous task. I would like to thank the many staff in the Department of Treasury and Finance for their tremendous efforts in recent months: Under Treasurer Rick Persse, Deputy Under Treasurer Tammie Pribanic, Executive Director of Budget Branch Tricia Blight, and the many, many others who have put in an extraordinary amount of time and effort.

I would also like to thank the staff in my office, led by my Chief of Ataff, John Atkinson, for their diligence, assistance and advice over the past months. My thanks also go to my cabinet colleagues for their support, as well as to my caucus colleagues.

But the most important thanks of all go to my family, my wife, Antonia, and children, Ben, Isaac and Olivia. It is a difficult challenge to find some semblance of balance between work and being sufficiently present as a husband

and a father, and I cannot tell the house how much I appreciate their unstinting love, support and, given the length of this speech, endless patience as well.

This budget delivers on the government's key priorities of health and housing, while providing substantial cost-of-living support. The budget returns to surplus from next year and introduces no new taxes. This places the budget in a strong position for the government to be able to respond to further unexpected events and capitalise on the economic opportunities to further diversify and strengthen our economy through government investment.

This government is determined to deliver on all of this while continuing our record of responsibly managing the state's finances. I commend the budget to the house. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2023. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act*.

3—Interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

4—Issue and application of money

This clause provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in Schedule 1 to the Bill. Subclause (2) makes it clear that the appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act* is superseded by this Bill.

5—Application of money if functions or duties of agency are transferred

This clause is designed to ensure that where Parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency, the funds may be used by the responsible agency in accordance with Parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

6—Expenditure from Hospitals Fund

This clause provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the Hospitals Fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

7—Additional appropriation under other Acts

This clause makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this Bill is additional to authority provided in other Acts of Parliament, except, of course, in the *Supply Act*.

8—Overdraft limit

This clause sets a limit of \$150 million on the amount which the Government may borrow by way of overdraft.

Schedule 1—Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 2024

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. H.M. Girolamo.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The 2023-24 Budget is focussed on the government's priorities of a sustainable, efficient health system, more affordable housing, assistance towards cost of living pressures, and providing better public services for South Australians.

The Bill contains amendments to relevant legislation to implement measures announced in the 2023-24 Budget and other administrative amendments, including:

- As part of the government's plan for A Better Housing Future, introducing a 50 per cent land tax discount for eligible new build-to-rent residential construction projects. The discount will reduce the land value for land tax purposes by 50 per cent to the 2039-40 land tax year for eligible projects;
- Providing stamp duty relief for eligible first home buyers on the purchase of new homes valued up to \$650,000 and a corresponding increase to the First Home Owner Grant property value cap; and
- Various administrative amendments relating to the Emergency Services Levy.

Mr President, I turn now to a more specific discussion of the detail of these important amendments.

Emergency Services Funding Act 1998

- The Bill makes various amendments to the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998.
- Amendments are being made to allow the Commissioner of State Taxation to collect the Emergency Services Levy (ESL) from either a landowner and/or a private shack lessee.
- Currently, lessees of private shack sites are not specifically provided for as an 'owner' from which ESL can be collected, and Notices of Emergency Services Levy Assessments are issued to the lessors as the owners of the land.
- Owners of some privately leased shack site groups have requested that RevenueSA send separate ESL Notices to the lessees of the shack sites, as the responsibility of collecting the ESL from lessees can be burdensome.
- Following the changes, owners of privately leased shack sites could request the Commissioner of State Taxation to issue individual ESL bills to lessees, relieving the owner of the administrative difficulties of apportioning, collecting and paying the ESL for their shack group;
- An amendment is also being made to change references to Volunteer Marine Rescue SA Incorporated to a Volunteer Marine Rescue Organisation accredited by the State Marine Rescue Committee to be more in line with current marine rescue arrangements.

First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000

- The Bill also amends the First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000 to increase the property value cap for eligibility for the \$15,000 First Home Owner Grant from \$575,000 to \$650,000.
- When combined with the new stamp duty relief, an eligible first home buyer could now receive total relief of up to \$44,580 on the purchase of a new home valued at \$650,000.

Land Tax Act 1936

- This Bill introduces a 50 per cent land tax discount for eligible new build-to-rent properties. The discount reduces the land value of the parcel of land being used as an eligible build-to-rent property by 50 per cent until the 2039-40 land tax year.
- The criteria for an eligible build-to-rent property includes that a minimum lease term of at least three years must be offered to tenants to support more secure tenure arrangements. Further requirements to be deemed an eligible build-to-rent property can be outlined in regulations, including but not limited to the minimum number of build-to-rent dwellings or units within a property and requirements to support the development of new affordable housing in build-to-rent properties.
- Build-to-rent projects where construction commences from 1 July 2023 will be able to apply for relief.
- The reduction in land tax for eligible build-to-rent properties is designed to support the uptake of investment in residential rental housing, increasing the supply of housing and creating more opportunities for renters.
- The amendments are largely consistent with those included as part of the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) *Bill 2021* but ultimately not passed by Parliament at that time.

Stamp Duties Act 1923

- This Bill provides stamp duty relief for eligible first home buyers who enter into a contract to purchase a new home or vacant land to build a new home, on or after 15 June 2023.
- No stamp duty will be payable on the purchase of an eligible new home valued up to \$650,000 with relief progressively phasing out for properties valued up to \$700,000.

- For the purchase of vacant land on which a new home will be built, no stamp duty will be payable for vacant land valued up to \$400,000 with relief phasing out for land valued up to \$450,000.
- To be eligible for relief, the new home must be occupied as the principal place of residence, similar to existing requirements for the First Home Owner Grant, under the First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000.
- Stamp duty relief of up to \$29,580 will be available for eligible applicants under this measure.

Mr President, the 2023-24 Budget is a responsible budget focused on strengthening our health system, increasing the supply of affordable and appropriate housing, and alleviating cost of living pressures. The measures contained in this Bill support the objectives of this government to ensure South Australia remains an attractive place to live, work and do business.

I commend this Bill to the Council.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Emergency Services Funding Act 1998*

3—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause updates a reference in the definition of *emergency service* and amends the definition of *owner* to include a person who is entitled to the right of occupation of a River Murray shack lease.

4—Amendment of section 28—The Community Emergency Services Fund

This clause updates a reference in section 28(4)(a)(v).

Part 3—Amendment of *First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000*

5—Amendment of section 7—Entitlement to grant

This clause amends section 7 of the *First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000* so that no first home owner grant is payable where the market value of the relevant home exceeds \$650,000. Currently, the grant is not payable if the market value exceeds \$575,000.

Part 4—Amendment of *Land Tax Act 1936*

6—Insertion of section 7A

This clause inserts a new provision in the *Land Tax Act 1936* allowing for a 50% reduction in the taxable value of land (from 1 July 2023) where the Commissioner is satisfied that a building constructed on the land on and after 1 July 2023 is being used and occupied for a build-to-rent property in accordance with the provision. The provision will expire immediately before midnight on 30 June 2040.

Part 5—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923*

7—Insertion of sections 71DD and 71DE

This clause inserts two new sections.

71DD—Relief from duty in respect of certain purchases of new homes and land

Proposed section 71DD applies to a conveyance or transfer if the Commissioner of State Taxation is satisfied that—

- an applicant for relief under the section is a purchaser under a contract for the conveyance or transfer of a new home or vacant land on which a home is to be built; and
- the conveyance or transfer qualifies for relief under the section.

If section 71DD applies to a conveyance or transfer, the duty payable on the conveyance or transfer is as follows:

- if it is a conveyance or transfer of a new home and the market value of the home (including the land on which the home is situated) when the contract is entered into does not exceed \$650,000—no duty is payable;

- if it is a conveyance or transfer of a new home and the market value of the home when the contract is entered into exceeds \$650,000 but does not exceed \$700,000—the duty otherwise payable will be reduced in accordance with other provisions of the section;
- if it is a conveyance or transfer of vacant land and the market value of the land when the contract is entered into does not exceed \$400,000—no duty is payable;
- if it is a conveyance or transfer of vacant land and the market value of the land when the contract is entered into exceeds \$400,000 but does not exceed \$450,000—the duty otherwise payable will be reduced in accordance with other provisions of the section.

A conveyance or transfer qualifies for relief if—

- the contract for the conveyance or transfer was entered into on or after 15 June 2023; and
- the purchasers under the contract are at least 18 years of age (but this requirement operates subject to other provisions of the section); and
- at least 1 of the purchasers under the contract is an Australian citizen or permanent resident at the time application is made; and
- no purchaser under the contract, and no spouse or domestic partner of a purchaser under the contract, has—
- been a party to an earlier conveyance or transfer for which no duty, or a reduced rate of duty, was payable under the section; or
- before the commencement date of the contract, held a relevant interest in residential property in South Australia or another State and occupied the property as a place of residence for a continuous period of at least 6 months; and

the market value of the new home or vacant land when the contract is entered into does not exceed—

- in the case of a new home—\$700,000; and
- in the case of vacant land on which a home is to be built—\$450,000.

Subsection (4) of the new section imposes a requirement for purchasers to occupy a home on the land that is conveyed or transferred, including where the land that was vacant at the time of the relevant conveyance or transfer. Occupation must be for a continuous period of at least 6 months. For a new home, the period of occupation must commence within 12 months of the date on which the conveyance or transfer occurs. For vacant land, occupation must commence before the date falling 12 months after the date on which the purchaser was lawfully first able to use a home constructed on the land as a place of residence or, if this occurs earlier, before the date that is 36 months after the date on which the conveyance or transfer occurred. The Commissioner may vary a residence requirement or, in certain specified circumstances, determine that a conveyance or transfer qualifies for relief even though a purchaser has not satisfied the residence requirement. The Commissioner may also determine that a conveyance or transfer qualifies for relief despite a purchaser under the contract not being at least 18 years of age provided that the Commissioner is satisfied that the residence requirement will be satisfied. The Commissioner must also be satisfied that the application does not form part of a scheme to circumvent limitations on, or requirements affecting, eligibility or entitlement to relief.

An application can only be made by a natural person and must be made jointly by each person who will be an owner of the new home or land to which the application relates.

71DE—Duty payable if relief ceases to be available

This proposed section provides for the payment of duty at full rates where section 71DD ceases to apply to a conveyance or transfer because the Commissioner ceases to be satisfied that the section applies or there is a failure to comply with the residence requirement.

8—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

This clause deletes a redundant note from Schedule 2.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. H.M. Girolamo.

Sitting suspended from 12:36 to 14:15.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Inspector of the Independent Commission Against Corruption, the Office for Public Integrity, and Ombudsman SA—Report, 2022-23 [Ordered to be published]
Office for Public Integrity—Report, 2022-23 [Ordered to be published]
Ombudsman SA—Report, 2022-23

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

Regulations under National Schemes—
Education and Care Services National Law Act 2010—
Bassinets
Miscellaneous
Miscellaneous (No. 2)

By the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

The Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee—Report, 2022-23

Question Time

AVIAN BIRD FLU

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding avian influenza.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On 23 August, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Centre for Health Protection (CHP) announced it was closely monitoring a human case of avian influenza A (H5N6). The 27-year-old woman was admitted for treatment the month prior. The CHP did not disclose how or where she became infected with bird flu, nor the patient's outcome.

The current outbreak of avian influenza continues to cause devastation among wild and farmed birds globally as well as impacting several mammal populations. University of Sydney researchers collaborating with colleagues around the world confirmed last month that the number of animals dead is 'well into the millions': 40 per cent of Peruvian pelicans have died, 40 per cent of European Dalmatian pelicans have died, 62 per cent of Caspian terns have died and 90 per cent of the critical colony of great skuas in the Shetlands have died. The UK Animal and Plant Health Agency has described the outbreak as an international crisis.

I note the minister's response to questions taken on notice, which stated that preparedness was a high priority for all Australian state and territory governments, along with the poultry industry, and outlined areas of the South Australian government's HPAI (highly pathogenic avian influenza) preparedness, which included a reference to the \$6.8 million investment in EAD (emergency animal disease) preparedness.

Given the increasing risk of HPAI to people, wildlife and industry, and noting that communication was not a strategic pillar outlined in the chamber's last update, my questions to the minister are:

1. What specific communications to industry have the minister and her department made to assist with preparedness in the poultry and egg sectors?
2. What percentage of funding from the \$6.8 million pool around emergency animal disease preparedness is set aside for epidemiology and risk, operational preparedness, regional detection response, diagnostic capability and emergency response capability and capacity for avian influenza?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for her question. The

Department of Primary Industries and Regions is obviously aware of the increased risk of highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) to Australia, and PIRSA is working closely with other jurisdictions, industry and other relevant stakeholders to understand and address this increased risk.

Avian influenza is a disease caused by influenza A viruses, and these viruses are capable of infecting birds and mammals, including humans. These avian influenza viruses are constantly evolving and the situation is changing, resulting in the ongoing emergence of new variations of the virus. I am advised that new strains have appeared in recent years that are now circulating widely overseas.

As I think the honourable member referred to, highly pathogenic avian influenza has increased in circulation globally since approximately October 2021. There have been outbreaks in many areas, including the Americas, Europe, Asia and Africa. In addition to outbreaks in wild birds and poultry, other wildlife, including land and marine mammals, have also been affected. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions continues to undertake surveillance of those areas that might be at risk and is enhancing its preparedness activities to detect any incursion and be ready to respond to an outbreak.

In regard to the specific question about funds, the way it works in terms of preparedness is that often similar approaches are appropriate for preparedness for a wide range of exotic or emergency animal diseases and other high risks. So it's not a matter of saying, 'We will now stop doing this and we will do that.' There are always emerging risks, and there are changes to the risks that we face on a day-to-day basis, so I am very glad that PIRSA is doing preparedness across a range of different activities in readiness for the potential incursions of a range of different diseases, including HPAI.

AVIAN BIRD FLU

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: have the minister or her department made specific communications to industry to assist them with preparedness for the potential incursion of highly pathogenic avian influenza?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): I will take that question on notice and bring back a reply.

PASTORAL BOARD

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development around pastoral land. Does the minister believe that at least 50 per cent of board members on the Pastoral Board should be past or present pastoralists to ensure that there is practical experience and expertise on the board in managing pastoral land?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for her question. I seek your guidance, Mr President, as I think this topic is directly related to a bill before the other place. Is it permissible under standing orders to respond to that question?

The PRESIDENT: It's before the other place, so it doesn't prevent us from discussing it in this place.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you for that guidance, Mr President. There is already a provision in part 3 of the act for five of the six positions on the board to be for people with experience in pastoral leases. That includes three nominees who are nominated by the Minister for Primary Industries (obviously myself at present, and hopefully into the future), a nominee from Livestock SA and a nominee from Primary Producers SA. That enables there to be a very considerable engagement with those who have experience in pastoral land and, potentially, five out of the six positions could be held by such a person.

PASTORAL BOARD

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary: does the minister concede, though, that people with experience with pastoral leases does not necessarily equal people with practical experiences on managing pastoral land?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): My understanding is that there is the scope, out of those five of the six positions, to include the experience that is being referred to. Just for a little bit more background also for all members' information, it was prior to the last state election that the Malinauskas now government committed to a number of initiatives to support landholders across South Australia to care for land sustainably, and that included an additional \$1 million for the pastoral unit, according to my advice, to accelerate lease extensions, and \$6 million for heritage agreements.

Among them was a commitment to amend the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989 to allow for carbon farming and conservation on pastoral leases. There are minor amendments that are seeking to resolve an inconsistency between two sections of the act that caused legal uncertainty over the Pastoral Board's ability to approve non-pastoral uses. It is clear that there needs to be a wide range of experience on the board and my advice is that that is certainly allowed for in the act.

PASTORAL BOARD

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Final supplementary: does the minister believe that the presiding member on the board should be a pastoralist?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:26): It is always an interesting question, when it comes to a presiding member or chair of a committee and so on, whether the most important aspect is their particular experience or expertise on the subject matter or whether it is around, for example, governance—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and strategic direction and various other expertise. I think it's not a matter of, 'It must be this or it must be that,' it's a matter of the appropriate expertise for the specific position under consideration.

FLINDERS RANGES SACRED SITES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question regarding the Flinders Ranges sacred sites.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: *The Advertiser* reported last week as follows:

Flinders Ranges traditional owners say they are the victims of 'cultural genocide' after unauthorised earthworks destroyed sacred...sites metres from one of South Australia's most prized national parks.

In question time yesterday in the lower house, the Deputy Premier stated that she had not spoken to the traditional owners of the land. On 891 radio this morning, she commented that she didn't know the amount of destruction that had been done.

I note that on a certain member's social media account, posted yesterday, there were photos of the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs spending part of their day handing out yes cards in the city. It appears that the Deputy Premier chose to use her time campaigning for the Voice, rather than reaching out and listening to the genuine concerns of traditional owners of the land that sacred sites had been destroyed. My question to the minister is: has the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs contacted the traditional owners to listen to their concerns—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: —and discover the extent of the damage done?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, both sides! Minister, you should know better. The Hon. Mr Hunter, you should know better.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for her question. There were a couple of issues the honourable member raised. In terms of campaigning for a yes vote: absolutely, the Deputy Premier and I are campaigning and will continue to campaign as strongly as we can.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: People like the Deputy Premier, myself, the Hon. Robert Simms, a whole lot of members from this chamber, have been out at places like the Adelaide train station, early in the morning as commuters come in. We are firmly of the belief that this change will make for a better country and we will do everything in our power—as the Premier answered a question yesterday, reflecting that we think that this is a good change for the country—to be part of trying to bring it about.

In relation to the honourable member's question about Aboriginal heritage around the Beltana pastoral lease, it is something that I have talked to the Deputy Premier about, and it is also something that I have had a number of communications about with traditional owners, many of whom I have known for a number of decades, who are from that part of the world.

FLINDERS RANGES SACRED SITES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: what were the conversations that you had with those traditional owners about those sacred sites that were destroyed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:30): I have had a number of conversations with the traditional owners but with an expectation, I think, from those traditional owners, particularly about sites and some sites that are not appropriate to talk about in public, and I certainly won't be revealing the conversations I have had with people who have an expectation of privacy when they talk to me.

STEPPING INTO LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the recent Stepping into Leadership program graduation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his question. It was an absolute pleasure to attend the Stepping into Leadership graduation last week, as it was celebrating the achievements of the 15 graduates who took part in the most recent program. The Stepping into Leadership program is a key initiative supported by PIRSA recognising the important role that women play in agriculture, and empowering women in agribusiness across South Australia.

It has provided valuable professional development opportunities to over 150 women since its inception in 2012, and the most recent graduation was a great opportunity to meet and hear from some of the program's successful graduates about how the high-quality skills and training they received has contributed to building their careers and networks. The program is managed by Women Together Learning (known as WoTL for short), a not-for-profit organisation founded by Partners in Grain to create an organisation that includes women across all agricultural sectors and aims to provide insightful leadership through collaboration to elevate women's positive influence in the sector.

The graduates came from right across the state with participants from Eyre Peninsula, Mount Gambier, or near Mount Gambier, Taillem Bend, Strathalbyn, Clare, Naracoorte, McLaren Vale, Yorke Peninsula and many places in between, representing a fantastic cross-section of our agricultural industries and the frontline of the public sector working alongside those industries.

Programs like these are very important. We know that the contribution that rural and regional women make to the state is enormous, with women making up more than 30 per cent of the people working directly in the agricultural, forestry and fishing industries. It is my desire to see that number grow further, and our government, through my department, will continue to support a number of initiatives, such as the Stepping into Leadership program, that acknowledge and build upon the essential role of women in agriculture.

I was very pleased at the event to be able to confirm that PIRSA will commit funding to assist in the running of the program in 2024, which will support another 15 women to participate and go on to make impactful contributions to their communities and industries. I would like to take this opportunity to once again congratulate the 15 graduates: Skye, Sonia, Ellen, Jessamy, Nicole, Paige, Sarah, Ashleigh, Dili, Eileen, Shannon, Emily, Marissa, Susie and Fiona. I truly look forward to seeing you implement your skills across the ag industries and taking your place as leaders in your respective fields.

COMMISSIONER FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney a question about media reports today regarding the equal opportunity commissioner's most recent annual report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In today's *Advertiser* it was reported that state politicians are being attacked over the slow pace of tackling shocking allegations of indecent exposure, assault and sexual suggestions by MPs and their staff. The equal opportunity commissioner, Jodeen Carney, has lashed out in her annual report, tabled in parliament on Wednesday, labelling as astonishing and disappointing the lack of information. A damning inquiry into harassment in state parliament, released in March 2021, made 16 recommendations to combat bad behaviour within the corridors of Parliament House and in ministerial and MPs' electoral offices. In that report Ms Carney said:

The most recent update [to parliament] purporting to detail the implementation of the recommendations [had provided scant information]...the recommendations were barely referenced.

This is both astonishing and disappointing—

that is attributable to the commissioner—

South Australians are entitled to know the status of all recommendations made to address sexual harassment and discrimination in their Parliament and associated workplaces.

She added that it was impossible to predict what the review would find. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Does he intend to address the issues that have been raised by the equal opportunity commissioner?
2. Is there a time frame for meeting the recommendations addressing sexual harassment and discrimination in this workplace and associated workplaces?
3. What response can we expect from the government in relation to the findings of the commissioner in her annual report?

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. Certainly on 26 February 2021 the then acting equal opportunity commissioner presented the South Australian parliament with her independent review of harassment in the South Australian parliamentary workplace, the parliamentary workplace report.

This report was requested at the time by both houses of parliament. The parliamentary workplace report made 16 recommendations to improve how workplace harassment is managed and reported in Parliament House, as well as looking at ways to prevent harassment and improve current policies and procedures.

To progress the recommendations a joint committee on the equal opportunity commissioner's report into harassment was established to consider the review's recommendations. I am informed the committee was also responsible for drafting a code of conduct for members of parliament, which was tabled in parliament on 28 October 2021. The code of conduct is now enshrined in the standing orders of both houses.

The code of conduct explicitly requires members of parliament not to harass sexually, harass or discriminate against a member of their staff, another member of parliament, a staff member of another member of parliament, or a parliamentary staffer. It also established standards regarding conflicts of interest, the receipt of gifts, use of public resources and maintaining confidentiality.

The majority of the recommendations in the parliamentary workplace report are a matter for parliament's administration and its members. One recommendation that related to government, recommendation 1, related to the establishment of a centralised human resources function to provide services across the parliamentary workplace.

While not the responsibility of the Attorney-General's Department, I am advised that the new People and Culture unit commenced operation on 15 June 2022. The unit is independent from government and is responsible for developing policies, investigating complaints and providing training to members of parliament, and particularly parliamentary staff, about human resource matters. I look forward to continued improvements in the way this place operates.

COMMISSIONER FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:37): Supplementary: while it is possibly not the Attorney-General's remit, what is the progress on the recommendation with regard to liaising with Our Watch?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:37): I am pretty sure that is not one that falls within the ambit of the Attorney-General's Department, but I am happy to make inquiries and request an update from the parliamentary officers who are looking at implementing other parts of that report.

COMMISSIONER FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:38): Supplementary: what is being done in relation to the associated workplaces that the commissioner references in her report, and does the Attorney agree that this is reflecting poorly on all of us in here, given the scant public detail I have referred to?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for her question. I have read the report that was tabled this week—I can't remember what the associated workplaces relate to, but I am happy to take it on notice and bring back a response for the honourable member.

SENTENCING

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:38): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding delays in sentencing in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Last year, an offender from South Plympton pleaded guilty to seven charges, ranging from possessing and distributing extremist material to possessing documents that could be used for a terrorist attack, for offences committed between 14 January and 16 March in that year. In June this year, the District Court heard that, while in custody, the offender allegedly used a knife and sharpened toothbrush in violent incidents and had drawn ISIS-themed pictures. The court was asked to postpone his sentencing due to the need for him to be reassessed by a forensic psychologist. In response, the judge stated:

The defendant was committed to this court...last year, he appeared in this court in February, it was adjourned, now we're halfway through June...This court is becoming frustrated through lengthy delays by psychologists taking such a long time to prepare their reports...It's not infrequent now that somebody who gets committed to this court is not sentenced for somewhere between six and 12 months...That never used to be the case.

My question to the Attorney-General is: is the Attorney concerned that the delivery of justice is taking so long in South Australia that even District Court judges are publicly expressing their frustration, and, if not, why not?

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 his question and his constant interest in the area of keeping South Australians as safe as they possibly can be. In relation to the honourable member's question referring to the length of time for reports of psychiatrists to be provided to court, it is not something that has been raised directly with me; however, I will follow it up.

I do know that in a whole range of areas, and that includes various courts and tribunals, the provision of reports from those that provide professional services has been difficult over the last few years. There have been general workforce shortages in a whole range of areas, compounded by the interruption of COVID. I know a number of areas have had shortages in qualified people to provide a whole range of services, I expect including providing reports. I will follow that up for the honourable member.

SENTENCING

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:41): Supplementary: I thank the Attorney for his answer. Will the Attorney consider consultation with perhaps either the District Court or the Chief Justice in order to determine what might be appropriate in this matter and similar related matters?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:41): I will be very happy to follow that up. I have regular meetings with the heads of all the jurisdictions: the Chief Justice, who is in charge of the judiciary generally but also the Supreme Court, the Chief Judge of the District Court and the Chief Magistrate. At the next opportunity that I have with one of the heads of jurisdictions, I will raise that.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:41): This is my final question. It could not have been better if I wrote it myself.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: Of course, I did; sorry. My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Will the minister inform the council about the government's achievements in the industrial relations portfolio?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for her question and her complete outburst of truth and reality. It is entirely appropriate that the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos' final question in this council is on the subject of industrial relations. Her contribution to this policy area cannot be overstated, and it has laid the groundwork for many of the reforms now being implemented by this government.

The honourable member has been a stalwart champion of the rights of working people, and particularly working women, her whole life. The honourable member has distinguished herself as the first ever migrant workers' rights officer at the then Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union, now the United Workers Union, helping workers from non-English-speaking backgrounds understand their workplace rights. She took that experience to the Trade Union Training Authority, helping empower trade union officials and workplace representatives.

She then had a significant career as an industrial lawyer, firstly as a review officer at the Workers Compensation Tribunal and then as a workers compensation practitioner for over a decade, helping injured workers navigate the complex workers compensation system. Those experiences at the coalface of industrial relations, combined with the honourable member's natural tenacity and

force of personality, have armed her well to make a significant contribution in this place. The honourable member has rightly been called a leading voice for social justice and a conscience of this party on the issue of workers' rights.

The honourable member has served on a wide range of parliamentary committees in this place, investigating industrial relations issues. Those include committees on wage theft, the repeal of sex work offences, harassment in the parliament workplace, the privatisation of public services, ReturnToWorkSA and the gig economy, to name just a few. The honourable member's work on these committees has often shone an important light on issues affecting working people in South Australia and has served as a foundation for very significant policy reform.

Many of the industrial relations policies enacted by this government in its first 18 months reflect the tireless advocacy of the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos over many decades. In that time, we have repealed the unfair impairment assessment guidelines made by the former Treasurer and ensured that rules for assessing injured workers' compensation will always be subject to the scrutiny of this parliament. We have introduced legislation to restore workers' representation on the board of ReturnToWorkSA. We have supported the creation of parliamentary committees into work systems such as the aforementioned gig economy.

We have introduced 15 days of paid family and domestic violence leave for every public sector and local government worker in this state. We have made gender equality an object of the Fair Work Act. We are consulting on legislation to make it easier for injured workers to return to work and make the workers compensation system fairer for victims of dust diseases and terminal illnesses. We have banned the uncontrolled dry cutting of engineered tabletop stone and committed that if there is no decisive action taken nationally to deal with the issue, we reserve the right to go it alone with these dangerous materials in SA.

We have introduced new regulations on the management of psychosocial health and safety risks. We have made significant commitments to reform our work health and safety system, including fixing secrecy rules which keep injured workers and their families without as much information as they should have in investigations, and last sitting week, I think for the very first time in the couple of decades it has been an issue, this council passed a bill to deliver justice to the victims of workplace death and make industrial manslaughter a crime in this state.

It is just a very small sample of the work this government has undertaken in the industrial relations area, and on almost every one of these issues the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos has been a leading advocate within our party and within the community. Quite frankly, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos has made this a better Labor government. It is for that reason I can say that the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos leaves a significant legacy, one that precedes her time in this chamber and will certainly follow it.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE, BUCKLAND PARK

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on the topic of Aboriginal heritage laws and the Riverlea estate in Buckland Park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Under section 23 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988, it is an offence to damage, disturb or interfere with an Aboriginal site, object or remains without an authorisation from the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. On 12 July, footage emerged on social media showing the discovery of human remains found at the new Riverlea estate in the Walker Buckland Park development in the north of Adelaide.

Shortly after, I wrote to your office on 14 July requesting that you, as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, authorise an immediate cease of work and undertake all necessary investigations to ensure the protection of these remains with the guidance of traditional owners. I am still awaiting a response to that correspondence, although I do know that things did unfold in the media. My questions to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs are:

1. Can you please update the council on the actions that have been taken to protect these remains?

2. What is the status of the Walker Buckland Park development application under sections 21, 23 and 29(1)(b) of the Aboriginal Heritage Act?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this area. I will follow up on the correspondence. I apologise if something hasn't been responded to properly. I will certainly follow that up for the honourable member. There are, as the honourable member has indicated, applications on foot under the Aboriginal Heritage Act, particularly under section 23.

As the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, I am the decision-maker in relation to that application, so I will be choosing words rather carefully so that there is no possibility I could be prejudging the outcome in terms of an application under the Aboriginal Heritage Act. I expect within the next few months to receive a full report from my department with the results of consultations and submissions made in relation to that application.

I can inform the honourable member, however, that in late April this year my department received notification that Aboriginal ancestral remains had been discovered during project works. I am advised that Forensic Science SA made the determination that the discovery was Aboriginal historic remains. A number of sets of Aboriginal ancestral remains, I am informed, have now been discovered at that Riverlea site.

Certainly myself, through many conversations, and particularly my department, through their team, have been working very closely with the Kaurna community, largely through their native title body, the Kaurna Yerta Aboriginal Corporation (KYAC) to ensure they are managed appropriately. I am informed this has included processes to enable representatives of KYAC, the native title holders, to enter the burial site to be able to retrieve Aboriginal remains from the location in order for those remains to be properly protected and properly secured.

I am advised that there are now no works being undertaken in the area where remains have been found, and I have said there is an application under section 23 on foot from the developer, and I know there are consultations that have occurred and that continue to occur. I understand that there is, upcoming, a Kaurna community meeting facilitated by KYAC, the native title-holding group, in the coming weeks as part of what KYAC's view is about further works and protection of their heritage.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE, BUCKLAND PARK

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:50): Supplementary: if April was the date upon which discovery was first made, what happened between April and July that led to then footage of the human remains being disturbed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her question. I'm happy to have a look. I can't recall seeing video footage, but I'm happy to have a look at any footage that there may be. As I have said, there have been processes that have enabled KYAC representatives to enter the burial site to store and properly protect on site those ancestral remains. But I'm happy to have a look at any footage to see what part of the process that was.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, you have a supplementary?

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE, BUCKLAND PARK

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:50): Can the minister come back to the chamber and say whether the government and the developer carried out any Aboriginal heritage surveys of the area before they gave the green light to the development?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, in terms of Aboriginal heritage, it's not the government's place to give a green light for the development. As I have said, there is a process underway under section 23 of the Aboriginal Heritage

Act in relation to that heritage. I'm quite certain there would have been heritage surveys carried out as part of what the company does, and I certainly know that members of the Kaurna community through KYAC, the native title body, have been heavily involved in much of what's gone on in that area.

GIANT PINE SCALE

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on giant pine scale in trees in Highbury. Can the minister inform the chamber whether her department is paying for the Highbury clean-up of the cutting of the pine trees due to giant pine scale infestation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:52): I can take the specific question on notice. I'm not aware of what the payment arrangements are. I did respond to this question quite expansively yesterday in terms of the process and the various stakeholders who are involved with addressing the issue of giant pine scale and will bring back an answer to that specific question to the chamber.

AGTECH GROWTH FUND

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister tell the house about the recent announcement of the latest round of grant recipients from the AgTech Growth Fund?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for his question. The AgTech Growth Fund forms an important part of the government's agtech program. It's estimated that the return on realising the potential of agtech in South Australia is currently \$2.6 billion per year in gross additional value of agricultural production. This is the economic benefit that we can harness as a state if new technological innovations are adopted which better manage our scarce resources amidst a changing climate.

To support this opportunity the AgTech Growth Fund provides support for projects which solve critical industry challenges through grants of up to \$100,000. To be successful, projects must be sponsored by a primary producer, and in this way the fund brings together important players in the value chain of primary production, from producers to the developers of technological products, with the expectation that the solutions that are developed will be very, very closely related to the problems that are being addressed.

The second round of the AgTech Growth Fund closed on 2 May and focused on projects designed to improve primary producer drought resilience and climate adaptation, the measurement of sustainability credentials, and improved market access, achieved through enhanced traceability and credentialling. In total, 32 applications were received for the second round, and seven were successful in sharing funding of over \$600,000.

Successful applicants will use these grants to develop technologies to improve the efficiency of wool testing, to further develop a cordless shearing handpiece, to optimise smart irrigation systems, to improve the reporting of carbon stock data for wine grape growers, to develop software which provides real-time data to support decision making related to crop disease and pest models, and to improve dairy industry retail compliance data.

I look forward to seeing the progress of these successful projects, as well as the technological advances supported by the AgTech Growth Fund being disbursed broadly throughout industry sectors for the betterment of our industries and our state.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:55): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General about mental health services in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: In February this year, the Chief Executive of Ramsay Psychology, David McGrath, handed down his final report, 'Unmet mental health service need in South Australia

that could be met by the NGO sector', on behalf of the South Australian government. For months the government sat on the report despite mounting criticism from stakeholders in the community. It was belatedly released days after the Mental Health Coalition of South Australia began running a strong campaign urging health minister Chris Picton to act. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Why was the government apparently so reluctant to release this report?
2. When will the government commit the necessary \$125 million every year to fund support services for 19,000 people who cannot get the assistance they need?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her question. As she stated in the question, this is a matter that falls within the purview of the health department and the portfolio of the health minister, the Hon. Chris Picton, the member for Kurna, but I will be happy to refer those questions to him and bring back a reply.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about Aboriginal affairs. Minister, will you listen to South Australians if they vote no and repeal your State First Nations Voice or will you reject the result of the referendum on 14 October?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for her question and the opportunity to talk about one of the things I am most proud of in my working life: when we passed our First Nations Voice Bill in this South Australian parliament. It was a massive step forward and built on the shoulders of progressive, democratic reforms that this state has become known for. And not just that, it built upon the proud legacy we have over the last half a century in Aboriginal affairs.

In 1966, we became the first place in the country to legislate for Aboriginal land rights when then Attorney-General and Aboriginal affairs minister, Don Dunstan, passed the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act. We continued that under Liberal Premier Tonkin with the passage of what was then the Anangu Pitjantjatjara, now the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act, giving freehold title.

In 1997, two days after the federal government handed down the Bringing Them Home report, the then Liberal Premier, I think, or maybe Aboriginal Affairs minister, Dean Brown, apologised to the stolen generations in the South Australian parliament on behalf of the South Australian people—two days after the report was handed down.

We commenced Treaty negotiations in South Australia in 2016, becoming the first jurisdiction in Australia to do so. As we canvassed earlier this week, sir, and with your great advocacy previously, we became the first mainland state to introduce a Stolen Generations Reparation Scheme. We have a very proud history and a very proud tradition in this state, and we built on that with the passage of that legislation.

In fact, as the Premier has said a number of times, it was the very first policy we committed to in opposition. We released that policy to implement the Uluru Statement from the Heart way back in NAIDOC Week, so July of 2019. We have legislated and the parliament has seen fit that there will be a First Nations Voice. We have recognised that in our South Australian constitution by making amendments to the Constitution Act. There will be an election to give Aboriginal people a Voice.

There will be an election so that Aboriginal people have more of a say in the decisions that affect their lives. There will be an election so that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in this state can help governments do better by listening to them and not making decisions for them. We will be having this body.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (14:59): Supplementary: if the referendum fails, will the government continue to pursue its election commitments around Voice, Treaty, Truth and, if so, how?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:59): Regardless of what happens with the vote on October 14, we will be keeping our election commitment to implement the Uluru Statement. I can go and repeat every word I have just said, but it is something we believe is fundamentally good for this state. It is something we believe will be fundamentally good for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in South Australia: to have an advisory committee to be able to tell parliament and government more about the decisions that affect Aboriginal people's lives.

As we have canvassed this week, it is somewhat surprising that this has become a political issue in South Australia. We saw the last government under the then Premier, the member for Dunstan, Steven Marshall, put legislation before this very parliament, twice, to create an Aboriginal representative body. Some of the shortcomings of that particular model have been canvassed in various contributions this week, but it was the policy only a couple of short years ago of the South Australian Liberal Party to let Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in South Australia have more of a say in the decisions that affect their lives.

We know the Liberal Party in this state has taken a massive turn to the right and that's hardly surprising when the member for Barker, Tony Pasin, now controls the agenda of the South Australian Liberal Party. No, we will keep our election commitment. We will give Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander South Australians more of a say in the decisions that affect their lives. On March 16 next year, there will be elections for a First Nations Voice in this state.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:01): Supplementary: given that the then Liberal government announced in May 2021 they would bring a Voice to Parliament and have moved two pieces of legislation to effect such a thing, did they lie to the electorate at the 2022 election and should they now apologise?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Point of order: the use of the word 'lie' is inappropriate in parliament.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, answer the question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for her question. It does raise a very good point. This is not the Liberal Party that we have seen in the past. This is an exceptionally conservative, far-right version of the party. It's the same thing we are seeing in other states.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Enough!

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bourke, I manage to quieten the opposition and then you chime in. Minister, please finish your answer so we can move on. You are finished; okay.

RYMILL PARK SCULPTURE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Both sides, order! Minister! Attorney and the Leader of the Opposition, lead by example.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN: Will the minister inform the council about the *A Place of Reflection* in Rymill Park, which was recently opened by the City of Adelaide?

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 his question

and his interest in this area. It was a privilege to attend the recent launch of the *A Place of Reflection* at Rymill Park, hosted by the City of Adelaide.

The *A Place of Reflection* is a public artwork acknowledging the ongoing trauma felt by members of the stolen generations and a site to promote healing and reconciliation. It was a project of the City of Adelaide, which I am proud to say was supported by a \$100,000 contribution from the former state government through the Stolen Generations Reparation Scheme.

As members would be aware, the Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme was an important initiative of the previous Labor government and recognised the many injustices done by governments and institutions of the past. The scheme provided grants both to individuals and for projects such as this. It was launched during my previous term as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in 2015, with an \$11 million funding commitment. This project, *A Place of Reflection*, is just one of the projects that were funded through the scheme and an example of the important work those funds have contributed to.

For many Aboriginal people, the pain and trauma of the stolen generations continues to affect their daily lives. The *A Place of Reflection* is one way in which this can be publicly acknowledged and in which we can facilitate healing and through which we can recommit ourselves to ensuring that these sorts of things never happen again.

The centrepiece of *A Place of Reflection* is a remarkable sculpture created by Aunty Yvonne Koolmatrie and Karl Meyer. Aunty Yvonne is a Ngarrindjerri elder and artist, exceptionally well known internationally for her weaving, which is an important part of traditional Ngarrindjerri culture. The *A Place of Reflection* sculpture is made in the woven style of Aunty Yvonne's work and depicts a woman cradling her arms, with her baby missing. As Aunty Yvonne pointed out to us on the day, the woman is missing her eyes, mouth and ears—a symbol of what was taken away from families when their children were stolen. The site also features a steel coolamon for use in ceremony, and seating to provide a place for reflection and healing.

At the launch, we were welcomed to Kurna country by Jack Buckskin and his son. Aunty Yvonne shared stories about her experiences and the people whom she supported over the years. Alex Hill, a survivor of the stolen generations, spoke generously about his experiences of learning about the culture and the family he was taken from. Also present were Nunkuwarrin Yunti's Link-Up team, providing support during the discussion of difficult and traumatic topics. I would like to commend the City of Adelaide not only for this project but for their ongoing commitment to reconciliation. This is true not only for the current council, led by Lord Mayor Dr Jane Lomax-Smith, but also for previous councils.

Through measures like this we can continue to recognise that the stolen generations happened and that it was institutions such as these that created the environment and the laws that inflicted some of the worst pain on Aboriginal people in our history. All of us have work to do in the healing and the reconciliation process, and I know the *A Place of Reflection* will be an important part of that process for many years to come. I thank all those in the project for bringing it together.

TEACHERS' INDUSTRIAL ACTION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on the topic of the teachers' industrial action.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: On 1 September 2023, thousands of people gathered outside Parliament House, calling for better pay and more support for teachers in classrooms across public schools. On the day, more than 300 schools were closed or operating a reduced program. I should say that it was an honour to speak at the rally and show solidarity on behalf of the Greens.

On 17 September 2023, the South Australian branch of the Australian Education Union stated that a new offer had been given to the union by the Malinauskas government; however, the union still had concerns about the proposal, especially regarding non-instruction time for teachers. Therefore, my question to the minister is: what is the current status of negotiations with teachers,

and what action is the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector taking to meet the needs of teachers and support staff in our state's public schools?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for his question and his steadfast support of working people in South Australia over many years and over three levels of government now.

There are ongoing discussions between the government and the union that represents teachers in this state. They are respectful discussions, and at some stage we will find that middle common ground. These sorts of negotiations are sometimes protracted and are not always easy, but we are doing something very different to what the former government did. We are doing it in good faith and in a respectful manner.

We all remember the former government. The former minister for industrial relations, the Hon. Rob Lucas, would chastise and attempt to demean people as union bosses. I have to say, there is no more honourable thing, in my view, than being a union boss, dedicating your working life to helping working people—often helping some of the lowest paid people in society.

We respect unions, and certainly it is a new experience for me, finding myself on the other side of negotiating with public sector unions, but we have already done it with the nurses' union, with the firefighters' union and with the ambulance union, successfully by being respectful. The ambulance union, for example: our hardworking paramedics had not had a pay rise for years—I think it was over three years that they hadn't had a pay rise because of the belligerence of the previous government, because of the stubbornness, because of the ideological hatred that the Hon. Rob Lucas had for people representing workers in this state.

We have concluded negotiations and agreements with those three unions already. There are negotiations with the teachers' union currently going on and I have been happy to be a part of some of those negotiations. There are further negotiations occurring at a departmental level and I am sure we will come to a resolution in the not too distant future. I want to pay tribute to the people they represent as well: the teachers in this state, who educate the next generation of South Australians and do extraordinary work day in, day out.

TEACHERS' INDUSTRIAL ACTION

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:10): Supplementary: given the extraordinary work done by our teachers, will the government commit to actually paying them what they are worth?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his question. As I have said, those negotiations will continue and I am sure will land in the not too distant future.

PLANT PROTEIN

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries about plant protein.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: It was reported in the *Stock Journal* on Thursday 14 September that the plans to develop a plant protein facility, capable of producing 25,000 tonnes per year of high-value plant protein extract in South Australia, are under threat due to the cancellation of federal government funding to the tune of \$113 million. A South Australian government spokesperson has said, and I quote:

The Government of South Australia recognises the growing global demand for high-quality plant protein and the local jobs and export boost this industry can create.

It has now been reported in the past that three manufacturing sites were part of this project: one in the northern metropolitan suburbs and two in the regions. This proposal was intended to be a major job creator for the regions. My questions to the minister are:

1. As the Minister for Primary Industries, what has she done to advocate for the plant protein proposal to her federal colleagues since coming to government?

2. Will the state government indicate to this chamber what plans the state government is now considering for its \$65 million pledge to this project that was originally allocated?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for her question. It's certainly true that South Australia is well placed to lead the expansion of the plant-based protein sector as it produces a wide variety of cereals, pulses and other crops, such as hemp, that are considered to be good sources of plant protein.

In my recent visit with the industry delegation to the Netherlands, Belgium and France about six weeks ago, one of the things that we were looking at was a wide variety of aspects in regard to plant protein and the opportunities that are available as this becomes more and more popular and prevalent around the world.

PIRSA's SARDI has developed a program of research to support the South Australian grains industry to meet its 2030 vision to position South Australia as a global leader in plant-based food research. The plant-based protein program is underpinned by two key projects: foundational research for a new pulse protein industry and a plant-based food incubator.

The aims of these two projects are to develop new high-protein ingredients from pulses and grains, to understand opportunities for genetic improvement and agronomic management of high-protein pulse crops in South Australia, and to provide research and development infrastructure to support the development of plant-based foods.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am sorry that those opposite ask about plant-based protein—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and then are not interested enough to actually listen to the answer—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —about plant-based protein. The member opposite said what a great opportunity this was and yet they are not willing to sit and listen for a couple of minutes to the opportunities and the actions that are being taken.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, leader! That's enough! Finish, please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, Mr President.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, Attorney!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The plant-based protein program has delivered across the value chain in the following ways: agronomic management strategies for growers to target pulse grain for specific pulse protein markets. One of the things that we discovered when we were overseas, or certainly that I learnt more about, was the difference in the markets in terms of what they are seeking from specific pulse proteins.

The program has also delivered tools to identify new high-protein variants of common pulse species such as fava bean, and increased genetic gain in pulse breeding for grain protein content or protein compositional profile, and also methods for dry fractionating pulse grain to provide

protein-rich products for the food and the feed industries. It has also delivered new opportunities for food manufacturers to use high-protein ingredients in new products and value add to existing products.

A further outcome has been new end uses for pulse grains, providing new economic opportunities as well as risk management strategies for growers. Clearly, we are keen that in taking up new opportunities the risks are well understood, and assistance to provide risk management strategies is incredibly important. Establishing a plant-based protein manufacturing sector in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter, the Hon. Ms Girolamo and the honourable Leader of the Opposition, enough! Conclude your answer, please, minister.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Please conclude your remarks.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, and I certainly am keen to conclude my remarks except for the frequent and ongoing numerous interjections from those opposite who clearly don't really have an interest in this topic. Clearly, they are not really interested in finding out about plant protein. They just want to listen to the sound of their own voices. Look at them now.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: We can't get on with answering the question because of those shouting—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, if you have nothing further to add, sit down.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Establishing—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

An honourable member: She's just getting started.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: That's right, I'm just getting started. Establishing a plant-based protein manufacturing sector in South Australia has the potential to generate \$3 billion in retail sales, \$1 billion in manufacturing revenue, and up to 6,000 jobs by 2030. In terms of the specific question, I will refer it to the relevant minister in the other place, and am happy to bring back an answer to the chamber.

PLANT PROTEIN

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:18): Supplementary: will the minister tell the chamber what her favourite protein product is?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that is actually arising from the original answer, the Hon. Mr Hunter. No, it's not.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, it's not. Sit down. We now have extremely important business to attend to.

Motions

PNEVMATIKOS, HON. I.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:18): By leave, I move a motion without notice concerning the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos:

That this council acknowledges the meritorious service to the parliament of the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos since March 2018.

The PRESIDENT: Attorney-General, speak to the motion.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will sum up at the end.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:19): Some in this chamber will know that I have been facing challenges with my health. These issues have recently kicked up a notch. My cancer has returned and this battle I am facing needs to be my focus going forward.

Today, I am announcing my intention to step down from my position as a member of this parliament. So this is my last chance to say something in this chamber, and no-one can stop me. But, relax, nothing I say today is likely to be anything you have not heard before. I extend the benefit of the doubt in saying that all of us come into this place to improve the lives of South Australians. Regardless of where we sit in this room, we fight to bring better conditions to the people of South Australia and, by participating in this place, uphold the values of Australian democracy.

This fight did not start with me, nor will it end with me. Each generation must not only progress but fight to build on the progress that has been made. In making this speech I went back and looked at the first time I spoke in parliament. In that speech I said that my goal is to provide a voice on behalf of the South Australian community. These words are pertinent as we find ourselves on the precipice of change. On 14 October our democracy will be tested: if Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people should have both constitutional recognition and a Voice to federal parliament.

Historically, these voices have not been heard. Having a voice is one thing, but being heard is more important. Democracy depends on empowering people to exercise the rights they have fought for and earned. But to have the right is not the same thing as having the ability to exercise it. We are wilfully deceiving ourselves and others each time we let this misrepresentation stand. It is part of our job here to legislate to create the conditions for these rights to be freely exercised. Healthy democracy is in peril in most of the world. There is a concerning global trend towards authoritarianism, and the fight ahead will not be easy.

The Labor Party grew out of the union movement, unlike the experience in Europe and other countries. That helps us to understand the relationship that exists between the Labor Party and the union movement. It is about protest and fighting for rights at its core. Consequently, the labour movement has grown to include other individuals and groups in our society, be they environmental, migrant and refugee, and Indigenous. My guiding principles have been to represent workers, migrant and refugee communities, women and the organisations they all belong to. That has governed how I have worked in my role here.

I offer my sincere thanks to the various organisations and groups I have worked with. I will not thank any individuals today; the people involved with those organisations know who they are. Although I cannot list you all, it was my honour to advocate for you and with you in the chamber. We are lucky to have so many organisations that represent, support and empower our multicultural communities. My thanks go to all of those communities that have welcomed me to their events in my capacity as a member of parliament. For our multicultural organisations, these events are more than just dinner and dancing, they are an opportunity to raise concerns and look for remedies to address those concerns.

These organisations work tirelessly, with the aim of making South Australia a place where language, culture and heritage is never a barrier to health or to employment. I am proud to have brought motions to this parliament regarding the struggles of the Uyghurs, Palestinians, Armenians and Cypriots, amongst others, and with the help of their respective organisations: the Uyghur Tangritagh Women's Association, Australian Friends of Palestine, the Palestinian Advocacy Network and the Armenian National Committee of Australia. To have a successful multicultural society, we cannot shut the door to the past, because the past colours the present. Our history may not be shared, but it is common.

As a child of Greek migrants, I thank the ongoing support that I have received from GOCSA and the Cypriot community. I have likewise appreciated the support of the Greek Consul in helping

me to keep abreast of developments in Greece and issues that are of concern to the Greek community.

I would like to thank the Law Society for their many contributions to this parliament. The support and assistance they have provided to the Legislative Review Committee has been essential. Their input has ensured that the implications of subordinate legislation are clearly thought out and understood. Lawyers for Workers SA have played a critical role in informing discussion and debate on issues that this parliament has faced concerning myriad issues, but to mention a few: Return to Work, workers compensation, industrial manslaughter legislation, health and safety law. Thank you for your hard work.

Thanks to the Commissioner for Young People's office, who have assisted me in my debates and discussions about period poverty and consent and presented a young person's perspective through their various surveys. Thank you to SACOSS, Shelter SA and the Anti-Poverty Network, who have advised and assisted on issues of housing and cost of living. My sincere thanks to the brave, intelligent and brilliant people at SAAAC. Without you, our hard-won abortion law reform may never have happened. It was their contribution, their advice and support that enabled me and others in this parliament to debate those issues on decriminalisation of abortion law in this state.

Thank you to the Working Women's Centre for their advocacy and their input on issues that impact women, particularly with relation to sexual harassment and working conditions. To the McKell Institute, which have made important contributions to various committees on issues I have been passionate about, particularly the gig economy, Return to Work and wage theft: thank you. My thanks to everyone in SIDAC and SIN; an uphill battle is yet to come, and I will help in any way I can outside of parliament. Just because I am leaving this place does not mean I will not continue to be politically active, as I have always been.

Finally, to my comrades in the union movement, led by SA Unions: I have stood by you without question. You have been an important support, particularly when we debate issues of workers compensation, workers health and safety, wage theft, the gig economy and industrial manslaughter laws. Thank you for your solidarity. Your collaboration and contribution can never be underestimated.

Now I am going to break my rules in terms of not mentioning anyone in relation to my staff. To the fabulous, intelligent and brilliant Hannah, I say thank you so much. My past and current office managers—Hannah Southcombe, Zoe Dibb and Millie Scott—have provided the means for me to be able to do my work. Whether in organising my life with appointments, events and committee work, it is because of them that I stand here. Their loyalty and support means a lot to me. Thank you to my friends and family, who have supported me throughout, both in the good times and the bad times.

Equity, justice and good conscience are the principles I live and work by. Those were the principles I measured my actions against when I entered parliament, and they are the same principles I measure myself against now. All things that endure come from a base of strength. I come from strong foundations, and so does the labour movement. I know that our founding principles are strong and worth fighting for. I know my successor will serve the people of South Australia well.

Finally—well, it is not final, but one of my final comments: the most recent scan that I had of my body revealed five cancerous spots on my lungs. That is one for each year I have served in parliament. Mere coincidence? Maybe, but I am not taking any chances. I would just like to say thank you for all the good wishes that I received through various means, including the flowers from everyone. I will say that I will not miss the Lord's Prayer, I will not miss the oath to the monarchy, and I will certainly not miss question time. Thank you.

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

GREYHOUND RACING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

That this council—

1. Notes with concern:

- (a) the ongoing matters raised by the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds and the admission that live baiting has been occurring in this state; and
 - (b) that Greyhound Racing SA undertakes its own oversight of animal welfare and industry policies, and is the only state-based racing body in Australia that remains exempt from freedom of information laws.
2. Calls on the Malinauskas government to establish an independent inquiry into greyhound racing industry practices and governance in South Australia.

(Continued from 28 June 2023.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:30): I rise to conclude my remarks on my motion calling for an independent review of the greyhound racing industry. Before I lose the attention of the council, I seek leave to table documents—approximately 50 pages of photos.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: It is often said that dogs are humans' best friends but stories emerging from our greyhound racing industry in this state show that with friends like that, who would want enemies? Greyhounds, of course, as we know, are often because they are raced not afforded the same protections as every other breed of dog in this state.

Since 2015 in particular, when it was shown horrific and cruel practices such as live baiting were common in the greyhound racing industry, states and territories have generally attempted to establish some kind of regulation of the industry. Here in South Australia we certainly know that regulation does not lie largely within state jurisdiction.

Despite millions in taxpayer funding for the greyhound racing industry, Greyhound Racing SA still provides very little information on the dogs it exploits and kills. The South Australian state government has allowed animal welfare oversight to remain with the commercial dog racing body that has had responsibility for racing promotion since the early 2000s. There are two conflicting objectives there.

Curiously, Greyhound Racing SA is also the only state-based racing body in Australia that remains exempt from freedom of information, although that point is yet to be tested in the courts. It is something, however, it insists it enjoys as an organisation. That allows it to operate in secrecy. In the ACT, laws were introduced to ban greyhound racing and they remain in place. Some states such as New South Wales and Queensland have now established independent regulatory authorities governed by legislation. Tasmania has a model where a commercial entity oversees the implementation of regulatory requirements, as well as protecting and advancing commercial interests.

A recent review has identified many conflicts of interest and critical deficiencies with such a model and the Tasmanian government has now committed to reform that system. A survey from January commissioned by GREY2K USA Worldwide and the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds found that a clear majority of people in Australia, some 57 per cent, think that greyhound racing should be banned or phased out. An even larger majority, 69 per cent, oppose the government subsidising the greyhound industry.

Beautiful, gentle greyhounds are subjected to unimaginable cruelty, neglect and exploitation every single day in this country. The greyhound racing and gambling industry abuses, maims and kills these gentle animals for profit and for profit alone, discarding them callously when they are no longer there to make a buck.

Recently, there has been one exposé after another, first in our own state where gut-wrenching footage of greyhounds being kicked, beaten and pulled has finally forced the state government to promise an inquiry. Now we have evidence from Victoria that dozens of greyhounds have been left to die from racetrack injuries that their trainers refused to treat. This year so far has not really shown much improvement for greyhounds. Despite the industry's PR spin, all racetracks are dangerous and cause a range of injuries from fatal skull fractures to painful abrasions. Most fatalities are euthanasia for leg injuries.

The death of a greyhound at a weekend race meet on 10 September has sparked even more concerns about the conditions of the industry in our state. According to a stewards' report, one greyhound was euthanised and four others were injured after that race meet in Mount Gambier. That is more than half the animals that were raced in that race meet. One dead, four injured, one race. Ten-year-old Cadillac Hadlie died after she collided with another greyhound on the track, falling at almost 70 km/h. She reportedly suffered from a fractured wrist and was euthanised by the on-track vet.

As the racing industry does not disclose the number of casualties at each track, the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds analyses all publicly available stewards' reports to provide a complete picture of the suffering greyhounds are forced to endure every day on Australian tracks. As of this month, this year 87 dogs have died on Australian greyhound racing tracks and over 8,000 dogs have been injured.

Over 70 per cent of greyhounds are discarded annually. Many of them are never rehomed. The national rate of greyhound breeding in 2020-21 was about six times the industry's capacity to then rehome them—six times the industry's capacity to then rehome them. Breeding numbers are way too high to ever rehome all racing greyhounds.

This leaves volunteers and volunteer organisations to do the lion's share of rehoming despite the industry being more than financially capable of doing so. The greyhound industry's national turnover was \$9.4 billion in 2020-21.

Earlier this month, ABC Investigations uncovered a supply chain involving Australian agents identifying and procuring winning greyhounds for Chinese breeders:

Australian greyhounds are being purchased for up to \$220,000 each and exported to China where they are fuelling an underground racing industry by exploiting loopholes in Australia's regulations...

One good example is the case of Australian greyhound Katoby, which in September 2020, was exported to South Africa, according to microchip records obtained by greyhound welfare group Free the Hounds.

But Katoby ultimately ended up in China, appearing on the Chinese breeding website Greyhound YY. Videos posted on social media show Katoby advertised for breeding...

Katoby's last registered owner Daniel Flanagan told ABC Investigations he believed the dog was in fact being sent to Ireland, and he had obtained a passport from Greyhound Australasia for that transfer. He said he was not aware that Katoby was sent to South Africa or that the dog ended up in China...

Further microchip records obtained by Free the Hounds show two other greyhounds sent to the United States and the United Kingdom from Australia in 2020 appearing on the same Chinese breeding website as the other dogs...

In 2016, under the Coalition government, a NSW special commission of inquiry report by former High Court judge Michael McHugh strongly encouraged the federal government to take a more strident approach to regulating greyhound exports itself.

'The time is ripe for the Federal Government to step up to the plate. It is the only entity that can provide national leadership in respect of what is an important area concerning animal welfare. There is an opportunity for it to do so,' Mr McHugh wrote.

Since that time there have been no changes made to the way the federal government oversees greyhound exports.

I also wish to refer members of the council to the March report this year of the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds, which undertook an assessment of the effectiveness of Greyhound Racing South Australia as a regulator. In particular, they focused on Greyhound Racing SA's applications of sanctions and penalties in response to breaches of the rules and how well GRSA looks after the welfare of greyhounds that race on South Australian racetracks.

The Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds found that GRSA routinely prioritised continuity of racing over implementing sanctions that might deter breaches of the rules by other industry participants. As an example, two-thirds of people who presented greyhounds with banned substances—that is, substances that give a dog an unfair advantage over non-doped dogs—did not have to serve any period of suspension. The only consequence was to return any prize money won. It is clear that these penalties are too soft to be a genuine deterrent.

The Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds also found that Greyhound Racing SA's doping control program is antiquated and predictable, which makes it easy to plan doping programs around race days. As a result, it is certain that doping is more prevalent than detected by Greyhound Racing SA. Anyone who bets on South Australian greyhound races should be concerned about how level the playing field really is.

The Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds also identified that greyhound welfare plays second fiddle to marketing and commercial considerations. We know now that, despite assurances from Greyhound Racing SA, live baiting practices are still occurring in this state. We also know that the courts may well be powerless to truly act, given it is video footage that exposes these things, and that does not come from the industry itself, it comes from the animal advocates. We know that the courts will require those advocates to out themselves, which means that they cannot continue to expose the cruelty and the illegality, and in fact we continue to create a crime of exposing illegal activity when we should be focusing on ending the illegal activity.

Regardless of which side of the fence you sit on, we need to ensure transparency in any industry, particularly an industry that is so heavily kept afloat by the government. I think one day we will look back in disbelief that we allowed this industry that exploits such gentle animals to ever exist, and that we thought reviews and self-regulation could somehow fix the inherent systemic cruelty that comes with mixing animals and gambling. Animals are not property to be abused for profit. They are living, sentient beings. Anyone who has opened their homes to greyhounds knows how gentle and intelligent they can be.

Ultimately, the people in this state, according to the polls, want to see an end to greyhound racing, and I certainly look forward to seeing what comes of the Premier's announced inquiry that came, in no small part, as a result of not just this motion but, as I mentioned, the aforementioned investigations and exposés by the animal advocates of the cruelties.

I wish to note that at the start of my speech I tabled some documents, and I now wish to alert members of the council to what was in those documents. Since the Premier announced the state government would ensure what they call an independent inquiry and a review of greyhound racing in this state, I have had expressed to me concerns from those whistleblowers who have come to me, and in fact who led me to originally move this motion, and have been part, I believe, of pushing the government for an independent inquiry.

I note that, under the independent inquiry as it currently stands, submissions technically close at the end of this week. The appointment of the commissioner has caused some concerns with groups such as the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds, who have written to the Premier asking that whistleblowers be given protection. So far, under the terms of reference of that inquiry, whistleblowers are not protected. It may surprise some members, although it should not surprise all members, to know that it is not only the animal advocates who have come to me asking for whistleblower protection, it is also trainers themselves who have sought increased protection so that they can blow the whistle on what is going on within Greyhound Racing SA.

I refer members to the requests and online advocacy of the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds that they be given that whistleblower protection. It has not been afforded to them. It has not been made part of the terms of reference, and I call on the Minister for Racing to ensure that the terms of reference are changed to ensure that whistleblower protection, so that trainers may also come forward.

Those in the industry who deal with the rehoming of greyhounds have come to members of parliament like myself, and they have provided to me quite graphic and concerning and disturbing footage of what they have observed over many years. In the footage, in the photographs that I have tabled today, you will see pictures of concerns around health and veterinary care.

Some of the dogs, you will note, have pannus. While pannus is treatable, these are pictures of dogs who have been presented to the GAP program and the rehoming services with pannus so bad—and that should have been easy to treat and managed through eye drops—that dogs have arrived in the care of the rehomers almost blind. When trainers have been questioned as to why they do not treat that, they were told that the drops will show up on a drug test, so the trainer has chosen to let the dog become almost blind so that it can continue to be raced rather than be treated.

I have seen many pictures of this damage over the past few years and they are highly disturbing. Other members of the GAP program have talked about trainers who have turned up and demanded that their dogs be euthanised without even being assessed. Somehow it is seen as a cheap and easy way to have their dog put down so the trainers do not have to pay. When they have been told that that was not going to happen, one became verbally abusive and threatened staff and, in fact, had to be escorted off the premises.

There were official complaints made about that particular trainer. While they were informed that he had received a 'quiet word' and was asked to apologise to GAP staff, the bullying and the aggression towards the GAP staff was never formally addressed. The inquiry into it took not days, not weeks, not months, but years. That is not affording those volunteers and workers within this program—this program that is much lauded by Greyhound Racing SA—the dignity and respect that they deserve.

Another investigation was asked to be held when a different trainer ensured that his dogs were euthanised by using what has been called a loophole in the rules; that is, the trainer retired his greyhounds into his name and then took them to the vets to be euthanised. The investigation into that was paused because a more severe welfare case came to light, which goes to show that in fact the response to this is certainly not to the level that I think most South Australians would expect. The investigation into that took some years and concluded that, indeed, there was no penalty for that trainer's actions because he was right; it was a legitimate loophole that Greyhound Racing SA has not put any resources into to ensure that other trainers do not use it.

In terms of further footage and pictures that I have tabled today, other than pannus, you will see animals who have presented with highly worn teeth and were emaciated with extremely graphic and poor physical condition. It certainly does not take a vet to see that these animals have not been well loved and they have not been treated as our best friends. They have extreme balding, near blindness and emaciation. There are also photographs of the conditions that they have been kept in, which show algae in the water—if there is any water at all—rancid meat, and excrement uncleaned for more than many weeks.

These pictures, I think, need to find their way through the system in this independent inquiry, but I table them today because the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds does not have faith in this inquiry as it currently stands. There have been no protections provided for whistleblowers. These issues have been raised internally with Greyhound Racing SA over years and have not been appropriately addressed, and now the Premier has appointed somebody to undertake an inquiry that will take a total of one month, at this point, in terms of receiving all the information by the end of this week and then reporting to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

I also note that the coalition and I share their concerns, and I have raised with the Premier's office that I have attempted to take some of these issues to the minister herself and have been refused meetings in the past, so I do not hold great faith in this inquiry reporting to the minister. I urge the Premier to take on the job of receiving this report from the independent inquiry.

Time and time again, it will be the animal advocates who keep pushing this industry, but we know that money talks when it comes to animal cruelty and that our laws are sadly lacking when it comes to ensuring justice for these animals. The continued subjugation to the industry I think disappoints most South Australians. Overall, I think Australians want to see us do better. Certainly, an industry that is not self-regulating is the very least that the Malinauskas government should do. Looking at whether or not this industry can ever be made compliant with the Animal Welfare Act, were it to be properly applied and enforced through our courts, is something that should remain on the table.

I echo the concerns of the whistleblowers who have come to me, that they think this is yet another sham, but I will hold out some faith that the Malinauskas government so far has actually stepped up by at least ensuring this particular process. However, I urge the Malinauskas government to not let it fall before the final hurdle and to actually do this job properly.

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

CORONATION OF KING CHARLES III AND QUEEN CAMILLA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That this council—

1. Congratulates Their Majesties King Charles III and Queen Camilla on their coronations; and
2. Affirms our steadfast allegiance to the throne and trusts that His Majesty's reign will be filled with great happiness for His Majesty and the Queen and be an era of peace, unity and prosperity across the Commonwealth of Nations.

(Continued from 28 June 2023.)

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:52): I rise in support of this motion and extend my congratulations to King Charles III and Queen Camilla on their coronation, which occurred on 6 May 2023. In doing so, I think it is worth reflecting on the significance of the legacy left behind by the passing of her Majesty the late Queen Elizabeth II.

Her seven-decade reign of stability, continuity and unwavering commitment to the commonwealth and to peace is unmatched. Despite an array of significant global and personal challenges, Her late Majesty was a unifying symbol of strength and resilience. She embodied stoicism in the face of global uncertainties and proved to be an inspiring role model for world leaders and to those who choose to embark on a career of public service. Her sense of duty and commitment to the people of the Commonwealth of Nations is truly unrivalled, even when suffering through personal ailments towards the end of her reign. May Her late Majesty rest in peace and her legacy forever live on in the minds and hearts of our future generations.

I would like to briefly reflect on the coronation of King Charles III and Queen Camilla, which occurred in May earlier this year. While it has been less than five months since Their Majesties' coronations, more than 12 months have now passed since the death of our late Queen, and subsequently King Charles and Queen Camilla ascended to the throne. Hundreds of millions of people tuned in to watch the longest serving heir apparent and Prince of Wales in British history be crowned on that momentous day.

Like his late mother, King Charles has led a life of contributing to charitable causes and of passionate advocacy. His establishment of the Prince's Trust in 1976 embodies his commitment to improving the lives of young people in the United Kingdom. The Prince's Trust was kickstarted thanks to Prince Charles' donation of his £7,400 naval severance pay, with the trust's primary mission to assist vulnerable young people facing unemployment or struggling academically.

Each year, it helps to support approximately 60,000 young people and has managed to achieve great success, with three out of four participants transitioning to employment, education, volunteering or further training. The Prince's Trust has expanded worldwide, including here in Australia, and now positively impacts over a million young individuals, has fostered 125,000 entrepreneurs and provided business support for nearly 400,000 people.

One of the services offered by the Prince's Trust Australia that I found particularly interesting is their Launch Lab veterans program. This program, among other similar offerings, assists veterans to explore and start up their own business ventures, with tailored services to suit their circumstances. Whatever stage of the journey a veteran is on, the Prince's Trust Australia can assist with face-to-face sessions, and even runs a yearly enterprise accelerator program that can help establish businesses looking to rapidly scale.

While Prince Charles has been a steadfast advocate for young people, the environment and conservation, Queen Camilla's charitable legacy has centred on causes to improve women's health and welfare, illiteracy, animal welfare and poverty. Since 1994, Camilla has been an active campaigner for osteoporosis and also raised awareness about issues such as rape and sexual abuse.

Having lost her mother to the disease, Queen Camilla has been an active campaigner in raising awareness of osteoporosis, her commitment earning her several honours and awards. For over 22 years, she was the President of the Royal Osteoporosis Society, which is a significant

contributor to research and innovation, as well as offering support to sufferers of the disease and their families.

The legacy left behind by the late Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II will almost certainly not be matched, but I have great faith, however, that King Charles III and Queen Camilla will continue in the same tradition of charitable giving and passionate advocacy embodying the commitment and respectfulness that we witnessed from our late monarch. I offer my congratulations and pledge my steadfast allegiance to the throne, His Majesty and Queen Camilla and commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:56): I would like to thank honourable members for their contribution to this motion and their indication to support it. It is time that we bring this motion to a vote. The motion congratulates Their Majesties King Charles III and Queen Camilla on their coronation and affirms our steadfast allegiance to the throne.

As members of the South Australian parliament, we serve in His Majesty's parliament, and as such it is appropriate that we celebrate and commemorate our head of state. It is surprising and disappointing that the government chose to remain silent and made no formal address to His Majesty concerning his coronation and that of Queen Camilla. Their silence necessitated my moving of a private member's motion.

The constitutional monarch serves as a unifying figurehead for our country and represents the continuity of the Australian state and its institutions, providing a sense of stability and a sense of tradition. I would like to take the opportunity again to wish Their Majesties King Charles III and Queen Camilla a long and peaceful reign over the entire commonwealth.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL POLICE REMEMBRANCE DAY

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:57): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that 29 September 2023 is National Police Remembrance Day.
2. Acknowledges that the purpose of National Police Remembrance Day is to:
 - (a) honour and remember all police officers who have been killed on duty or because of their duties; and
 - (b) provide an opportunity to commemorate officers whose death did not occur as a consequence of their duty.
3. Reflects on the brave sacrifices made by those police officers memorialised and provides its condolences to the family members, friends and colleagues of all those police officers who have passed.

Each year, on 29 September, we observe National Police Remembrance Day. Services, vigils and marches are held across Australia to commemorate and honour all police officers who have died in the line of duty. It is also a day that honours the service of all police officers and former police officers who have passed away, regardless of the cause.

The services that take place around the nation each year are a well-deserved act of commemoration for those who dedicated their working lives to keeping our community safe, particularly the 61 officers who have lost their lives in service to the South Australian community. Their sacrifices are never forgotten.

All are remembered, beginning with Mounted Constable John Dunning Carter, aged only 22, and Lance Corporal William Murray Wickham, aged 24, who were the first officers of the South Australian police force to lose their lives in the performance of their duty. They were en route to Overland Corner, about 30 kilometres east of Waikerie, having been sent to help resolve a local disturbance. Both officers sadly drowned while trying to cross the River Murray in a canoe that was not suitable for the task.

The stories of each of the further 59 police officers in South Australia who have lost their lives during or as a result of the performance of their duties is recorded and remembered. The many

organisations who advocate and support our police, including their mighty union, the Police Association of South Australia, continue to make sure those stories are never forgotten.

Over the modern history of our state, some of our police officers have lost their lives fighting bushfires, attending traffic incidents, trying to apprehend or subdue suspects, and frequently through numerous motor vehicle accidents, amongst a range of other circumstances. Despite the best efforts of all who are concerned with trying to make policing as safe as possible, it is an occupation that is understood to involve a degree of danger.

Police officers are people who turn up to their shift each day recognising that they may be called upon to face significant risks in the course of their work. Despite this, they bravely get on with the job. But no matter how brave, police officers are human like the rest of us. They have families and loved ones to whom they hope to return home at the end of each shift, and their loved ones likewise hope the person they cherish will return home safely to them each day.

Policing can also be a demanding and stressful vocation. It is important to acknowledge that the nature of the job can take a substantial toll on an individual's mental health and wellbeing. Like other types of first responders, many police endure distressing and sometimes highly traumatic experiences in the course of their work. As is the case with the danger inherent in policing, trauma, too, is something that police officers know they are likely to face in their working life, and it, too, they face bravely.

No amount of bravery can be expected to insulate human beings from the effects of traumatic experiences, particularly when those experiences compound over the course of time. On National Police Remembrance Day we remember police officers who have tragically lost their lives to suicide, knowing that for too many of them the impact of their experiences in service to our community may have been a consequential factor in their suffering.

Our police form part of the critical frontline in nearly every sort of incident and event in South Australia. From keeping the peace to saving lives, our community depends on the essential work police do every day. I greatly value the crucial work South Australian police officers play in making our community a safer place and a better place. A lot is asked of our police officers and they do their utmost to deliver it with integrity, reliability and care.

On Police Remembrance Day every police officer who has served our community rightly deserves to have their service remembered, and for those officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice we particularly remember that they each gave their lives in the performance of their sworn duty to protect our community.

No act of remembrance can match the gravity of that ultimate sacrifice, but I hope that the broader South Australian police family, the Police Association of South Australia and most especially the families of our police officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty will be assured by a vote of this council that we recognise, that we greatly appreciate, and that we regard very highly the work of SA Police. I commend the motion.

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

NATIONAL FORESTRY DAY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (16:03): By leave, I move my motion in an amended form:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that Tuesday 22 August 2023 is National Forestry Day, celebrating the important work of our nation's forest industries;
2. Notes the contribution of the forest industry to our state's jobs and economy;
3. Acknowledges the important role that the forestry industry plays in combating climate change through growing trees that absorb carbon and making sustainable and renewable products; and
4. Recognises the vital importance of the forestry industry in supplying essential products that Australians use every day and that continue to build a nation.

It is particularly pleasing to be able to move this motion as the Minister for Forest Industries in South Australia. As I have said on many occasions in this place, the forestry industry in South Australia is a key employer and plays an enormous role in contributing to the state's economic prosperity. According to the South Australian Forest Products Association, the forest industry employs both directly and indirectly over 21,000 people, many of whom reside in the South-East of our state, and the industry contributes over \$1.4 billion in economic value every year.

Within the industry I often hear the remark that the best time to plant a tree was yesterday, but the second best time is today. Of course, that is because it takes many years of dedication from planting a tree until it is ready to harvest, usually around 32 years in South Australia in the Green Triangle if we are talking about *pinus radiata*. The Malinauskas government is committed to getting more trees in the ground and we are continuing to work with the industry to make this happen.

Members in this place may have seen or heard the ultimate renewable advertisements that have been playing recently across various media channels. A key message they have sought to convey is that wood is sustainable; sustainable wood comes from sustainably managed forests that operate with a future in mind.

In Australia, forests are sustainably managed from planting through to harvest, maximising resource utilisation, increasing the amount of carbon dioxide removed from the atmosphere and increasing carbon dioxide stored in wood products. In South Australia the average *pinus radiata* tree stores 30 kilograms of carbon every single year. When that is multiplied by the average plantation age of 32 years, it is clear to see the environmental benefits and the way the industry assists in decarbonisation. The South Australian forest industry has an impressive story to tell:

- 4.64 million tonnes of CO₂ is sequestered every year from the atmosphere;
- 60 per cent of Australia's agricultural timbers, such as poles, posts and fencing products, come from South Australia;
- 48 per cent of packing and industrial grade timber comes from South Australia; and
- 25 per cent of the nation's particle board and 35 per cent of Australia's locally produced house framing and interior sawn wood is produced in SA.

I am extremely pleased to have the privilege of being the Minister for Forest Industries at such an exciting time for the forest industry in South Australia.

The Malinauskas Labor government made a suite of election commitments for the forest industry in the lead-up to the 2022 election, which are now being delivered. Some of these commitments include:

- \$15 million for the establishment of a centre for excellence to create a long-term forestry research and development capability in Mount Gambier;
- \$2 million to replace fire towers with new technology, to provide a landscape-level fire detection program; and
- \$2 million to develop a forest products domestic manufacturing and infrastructure master plan.

They are just a few from that suite of commitments. I look forward to being able to update members in this place about these and our other election commitments over the coming months.

Another exciting development currently underway within the forestry industry that I believe is worth highlighting is the soon to be completed, Australian-first, state-of-the-art CLT (cross-laminated timber) and GLT (glue-laminated timber) combined manufacturing facility, which is set to open in Tarpeena in the state's South-East in the near future.

CLT and GLT products are being embraced across the world and have the ability to replace concrete and steel for the construction of large buildings. Every cubic metre of CLT or GLT will store 631 kilograms of carbon, and enable the construction of buildings that can store carbon rather than create more greenhouse gases. I have previously had the opportunity to tour the site under

construction and I look forward to being able to attend the opening in the near future. I commend the motion to the council and seek the council's support.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:07): National Forestry Day, which was held on Tuesday 22 August this year, is an annual moment for us to really reflect on the significance of our forests and the role they play in preserving our environment, economy and way of life. South Australia is blessed with a diverse range of landscapes, from arid regions to lush woodlands. Our forests, both natural and cultivated, have long been a vital part of our heritage and an essential contributor to the growth of our state.

We have often heard the term 'forests are the lungs of the earth'; they absorb carbon dioxide and there is a growing demand for forests as a carbon market, offsetting corporate and industrial emissions. Preserving and expanding our forests is an effective way to mitigate climate challenges. South Australia has a significant role to play in this effort as our forests, both sustainably managed systems and natural landscapes, are also called on for carbon sinking and storage. In fact, South Australian forests are estimated to sequester 4.64 million tonnes of CO₂ each year.

In broad terms of our economy, forestry plays a pivotal role. In our economy the timber industry provides employment to thousands of South Australians and contributes significantly in particular to our regional communities. Moreover, it supplies the raw materials for construction, furniture, paper and countless other products that we use in our daily lives. While there is, of course, the benefit of raw material, the value add to our economy can be multiplied when we utilise local businesses for product development and value add.

Keeping local sawmills in business is a key component, ensuring that our economy continues to benefit from the forestry industry as local family-owned sawmills are important employers in several regional towns right across our state, but particularly in the South-East. Our forests are also a hub for outdoor recreation and tourism. South Australia's beautiful national parks and forests attract visitors from all over the world. Our forests offer recreation opportunities, such as hiking, camping, birdwatching and much more. National Forestry Day reminds us of the importance of maintaining those spaces for future generations to enjoy.

I would like to take a moment to place on the record some points of interest about the timber industry, the commercial, cultivated side of forestry in South Australia. According to the SA Forest Products Association (SAFPA), our forestry industry comprises approximately 1.9 million hectares of forests and plantations and supports over 21,300 jobs directly and indirectly. They also note that the industry contributes \$2.95 billion per annum to gross state product. Our forests produce a wide range of timber products, including hardwood, softwood and specialty timbers. Our pine and eucalyptus species are the most heavily planted in South Australia.

We have implemented sustainable forest management practices and are home to forests certified by the Forest Stewardship Council. This certification ensures that forests are managed in an environmentally and socially responsible manner. These facts and figures illustrate the importance of forestry in South Australia, especially for the regional communities that manage timber plantations. My colleague the Hon. Ben Hood will speak more on the impact that the industry has on his own local community in the South-East at a later date.

National Forestry Day is not just a celebration of our trees and woodlands, it is a celebration of our history, it is a celebration of our current day and it is a celebration of our future. The South Australian Liberal Party supports sustainable forestry practices and a sustainable local industry.

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

WORLD TOURISM DAY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:12): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that Wednesday 27 September is World Tourism Day;
2. Recognises that the United Nations World Tourism Organization has set this year's theme to be 'Tourism and Green Investments';

3. Supports the sector's strategy to increase South Australia's visitor economy to an annual \$12.8 billion by 2030 and generate an additional 16,000 jobs; and
4. Recognises the economic and social benefits that tourism operators deliver in South Australia, particularly in our regions and the positive flow-on impacts that tourism has on key industries such as agriculture, wine, retail, education, real estate and transport.

The stars were supposed to align yesterday: it was 27 September, World Tourism Day. This has been postponed until today, but it is still within a week, so today it is a great honour to acknowledge that Wednesday 27 September was World Tourism Day.

Tourism is a global industry that involves people travelling to different destinations for leisure, for visiting family members, for study purposes and for business or conferences. Most of us, if not all of us, in our lifetime would be a tourist in one form or another, whether it is touring in our own backyards or exploring destinations overseas. Tourism plays a most important role in the country's economy around the world, generating revenue, creating jobs and promoting cultural exchanges.

Tourists often seek diverse experiences, including visiting natural wonders, historical sites and vibrant cities. On the job statistics alone, the tourism sector supports the livelihoods of millions of individuals and their families around the world. Statista research published a report in August this year stating that global employment in the travel and tourism sector totalled 295 million in 2022. This figure is expected to grow to 320 million in 2023. In Australia, some 60,000 people are employed in tourism jobs. That was reported in the September quarter of 2022.

The South Australian Tourism Commission's website states that tourism employs 40,400 South Australians. In addition, the Australian Hotels Association commissioned a report about the economic contribution of the hotel industry in South Australia in 2016. The report prepared by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies recorded some 26,250 people being employed in the hotel industry across metropolitan and country regions.

World Tourism Day is held every year on 27 September by the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), which is the leading international organisation in the field of tourism and promotes tourism as a driver of economic growth, inclusive development and environmental sustainability.

This will be the 43rd iteration of World Tourism Day, and this year's theme is tourism and green investment, underscoring the increasing importance of environmentally responsible tourism practices. This year's theme marks the need to invest in people, the planet and prosperity, which has been identified as a key priority for the sector and a call to action to the international community, governments, multilateral financial institutions, development partners and private sector investors to unite around a new tourism investment strategy.

In Australia, the travel and tourism industry is the largest service export industry and accounts for approximately 10 per cent of total export industries and is a key economic driver, contributing over \$A50 billion to GDP in recent years. As shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, I am grateful for the opportunity to work with key stakeholders and operators from across the tourism, travel and hospitality industry.

The constant question for the tourism industry has been whether South Australia can stay competitive over other states and overseas countries. How do we deal with labour shortages, rising inflation, industrial relations issues, taxation, infrastructure issues, security and cross-border regulation, visa issues and uncertain economic conditions? These are some of the challenges the tourism industry has been confronted with.

The industry has shown tremendous resilience and capability to handle unprecedented challenges and disruptions during COVID and applied innovative approaches to manoeuvre themselves out of stormy weather and recalibrate the direction of tourism investment. On this note, I want to place my special thanks on the record and give a big shout-out to industry champions, business leaders, operators, employees and personnel in the tourism and hospitality sector in South Australia.

I am committed to working with the industry, and I am encouraged by the industry-led tourist sector vision and strategy to develop the South Australian Visitor Economy Sector Plan 2030. I am

proud to say that it was launched by the former Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall, in August 2019 under the Liberal government. The plan sets a bold ambition to grow our visitor economy to an annual \$12.8 billion by 2030, generating 52,000 jobs. I am pleased that the Labor government has continued to support this plan.

I would also like to acknowledge the incredible hard work, commitment, passion and resilience of our tourism industry to collectively build a strong South Australian tourism brand and for making enormous contributions to generate jobs, social benefits and prosperity for our cities, regions, the economy and our community.

World Tourism Day is a significant day to celebrate, to raise worldwide sustainability issues and foster greater understanding of the importance of tourism and its social, cultural, political and economic value. This year's theme highlights how ecotourism has become both a reason for travelling and also a way in which to promote the green transformation of the tourism industry. Nature-based tourism accounts for 20 to 40 per cent of the global tourism industry and positions South Australia uniquely as one of the premier destinations for international and domestic visitors due to our distinct flora, fauna and natural assets, most of which are spread out across regional South Australia.

It is also important to recognise that tourism contributes to environmental conservation and the preservation of cultural heritage as it encourages the protection of natural resources and historical landmarks. Sustainable tourism practices are increasingly emphasised to balance economic benefits with environmental and social responsibility.

It is a great honour to work closely with the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. David Speirs, member for Black, to advocate for nature-based tourism policies in South Australia. The member for Black is a committed conservationist from his primary school days. The Hon. David Speirs was an exceptional Minister for Environment under the Marshall Liberal government, and he worked hard to reinvestigate the environment portfolio with reforms and initiatives.

I would like to take this opportunity to outline some of his achievements. The Leader of the Opposition has been recognised for being one of the most reformist environment ministers in Australia when it comes to creating opportunities for nature-based tourism activities by connecting people to nature. He extensively expanded South Australia's mountain biking network and initiated the state's first epic loop trail, in the Mount Remarkable National Park. This will lead to a huge lift in mountain biking tourism in South Australia, transforming tourism opportunities in the Upper Spencer Gulf and Southern Flinders Ranges communities.

Mountain biking in South Australia was also enhanced by improved trails in the Glenthorne National Park and in our reservoir precincts. Sadly, other significant mountain biking projects at Hindmarsh Valley National Park on the Fleurieu Peninsula and at Fox Creek in the northern Adelaide Hills were axed by the Labor government upon coming to office. This is very disappointing, and the Liberal Party is calling on the Labor government to reconsider these projects.

The former Liberal government, under the leadership of the Hon. David Speirs as environment minister, pioneered the opening of South Australia's reservoirs, something that was long said to be impossible to achieve. Not surprisingly, he is fondly known as the minister for reservoirs for this achievement. Nine reservoirs across the state were opened for a range of recreational opportunities, including Hope Valley, South Para, Mount Bold, Happy Valley and Myponga.

In terms of nature-based tourism uplift, the opening of Myponga Reservoir was particularly powerful in activating a township. The member for Black has been regularly quoted as saying the project turned Myponga township from a 'try through to a drive to' destination. He also joked it is now time to 'stay longa in Myponga'.

That project has seen a range of activity-based and tourism businesses open and grow, from the beautiful Valley of Yore cafe to the Reservoir General store to Myponga Kayak Hire and a range of Airbnb and other accommodation options across the western Fleurieu. The opening of the reservoirs also incentivises visitors to visit other nearby tourist destinations.

Another fantastic initiative for our community under the former Liberal government worth mentioning today is the Wild South Coast Way. It was developed as essentially a walk within a walk,

creating a high-quality multiday walk within the existing Heysen Trail between Cape Jervis and Victor Harbor along the southern coast of the Fleurieu Peninsula. This high-quality enhancement of the Heysen Trail included upgrades of its campgrounds, toilets and interpretive signage and the development of the Goondooloo Ridge lookout at Deep Creek National Park. This walk has enabled a range of tourism providers to leverage their own projects, such as guided walking tours, accommodation and cultural experiences.

The Hon. David Speirs was also responsible for establishing Green Adelaide, a new body charged with the bold greening of metropolitan Adelaide. The Green Adelaide initiative provided funding to increase the green spaces in the CBD. The greening project improves the perception of Adelaide as a destination committed to environmental sustainability. Green walls and roofs are an effective and alternative way to improve the visual amenity of the city, which improves wellbeing and encourages people to spend more time in an area which helps stimulate our economy. They are also a way to reducing heat impacts where there is little space for street trees and parks.

The Green Adelaide initiative was part of an effort to push for Adelaide to become an internationally known National Park City and promote Adelaide to international tourists.

Today, it is important for us to recognise the economic and social benefits that tourism operators deliver in South Australia, particularly in our regions, and the positive flow-on impacts that tourism has on key industries such as agriculture, wine, retail, education, real estate and transport.

Regional tourism is critical to the state's visitor economy. It generates 13,000 direct and 6,000 indirect tourism regional jobs. Tourism in regional and rural areas can rejuvenate local economies and communities because it is an easy access sector for micro and small enterprises and for the self-employed, who make up a significant part of the tourism sector and community level entrepreneurship in general.

One of the focuses for World Tourism Day this year calls for the sector to invest in education and skills development in all areas to promote added value jobs and resilience, digitisation and innovation programs to generate more opportunities for women and youth. Investments in innovation, entrepreneurship and digitisation, and its cross-sectorial impact, have a multiplier potential to strengthen strategic large global and regional projects and to also stimulate tourism recovery and safeguard jobs, which in turn creates conditions needed for future growth.

Today, we celebrate and acknowledge the success and aspirations of our amazing tourism industry and recognise the hardworking and innovative individuals who commit their lives to the tourism and hospitality sectors. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them once again for working hard in the sector and for their resilience.

I take this opportunity to call for greater government investment from the state and federal governments to consider the next steps on how we can rethink, rebuild and reimagine how we invest in our people, our planet and our prosperity as we work towards a tourism industry of sustainable growth and economic development. On that note, happy World Tourism Day, everyone. I commend the motion.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (16:26): I rise to support the motion and to recognise and celebrate that yesterday, Wednesday 27 September, was World Tourism Day. It should not just be another day on the calendar. It should be a reminder to us, a call to action, and an opportunity to reflect on the vast potential and challenges of our tourism sector, particularly in our regions. It will not surprise you that I am going to focus on the regions in my speech.

As a lifelong regional bloke and someone who enjoys nothing more than getting out into our regions, I wholeheartedly commend regional—

The Hon. R.B. Martin: Shooting ducks.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: I did not hear that contribution from—

The PRESIDENT: Interjections are out of order, so you do not need to hear them. Just play on.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: I don't know; it could have been of value. I highly doubt it, but still.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Just go on.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: I wholeheartedly commend regional tourism's contribution to our economy and the opportunities to take advantage of South Australia's diverse attractions, activities, natural landscapes, hospitality, wineries and a chance to escape the doldrums of city life. The data shows that regional South Australia is a powerhouse of our tourism industry, whether looking at the total number of stays or overnight trips, visitor nights, or expenditure, regional South Australia contributes significantly more to the economy than the metropolitan market.

That is until we come to the year ending March 2023 and—from results released only yesterday—June 2023, there was a reversal in overnight trip figures, with Adelaide taking the mantle. However, for the year ending June 2023, both visitor nights and number of overnight trips to regional South Australia were double those in Adelaide, while the share of the daytrip expenditure in the regions was almost 60 per cent higher than that spent in the big city.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Maybe. While the regions are still punching above their weight for most of the recent year ending June 2023, major events set in Adelaide drew expenditure away from the country and into the CBD. This consequently saw a 70 per cent increase in overnight expenditure year on year in Adelaide, whereas expenditure in regional South Australia only grew by 30 per cent. I think we need to talk about the need for critical infrastructure in our regions. We need to ensure that we have the things that people want to see in our regions so that they stay a night, and stay another night.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: They could get a train.

The PRESIDENT: Interjections are out of order. Stop badgering the honourable member.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: This is not helping my Facebook reels, I can tell you, all this interjecting. I do note with great interest, however, that today's brand new advertising campaign from SATC, with a television advertisement that focuses on our regions, is great. I welcome the ad and I hope it draws more tourists and expenditure back to our regions, although I did note that there was not a lot of the Limestone Coast in that ad. I would have liked to have seen that beautiful Robe Obelisk, the Blue Lake and the Kilsby Sinkhole in the South-East. Do yourself a favour and get to the Kilsby Sinkhole in the South-East; it is amazing.

Having said that, though, it is disheartening that a motion highlighting regional tourism significance, proposed by the member for Mount Gambier a few weeks ago in the other place, found resonance with only a handful of members from the government. There were only two, in fact: the member for Newland and the member for Adelaide. By contrast, six of our side of the parliamentary benches recognised that it was a very important motion to contribute to. The silence from the tourism minister on that motion was not just surprising, it was reflecting of the priorities and the gaps in our tourism strategy.

Yet, amidst these challenges, let's hope that they change their tack. Thankfully we have seen a lift in the regional contribution per tourism dollar spent in the state, with regional SA now accounting for 48¢ in the dollar. This suggests that a more significant investment is required in our regions as their contribution to the state economy grows. A key priority in the South Australian Regional Visitor Strategy 2025 is to improve regional nature trails, highlighted as an area of high visitor demand.

Just think about linking up the Great South West Walk, going past Port Mac, all the way up our beautiful rugged coastlines in Canunda. I would love to walk it and I think everyone else would too. This aligns well with the United Nations World Tourism Organisation, which has set this year's theme of World Tourism Day 2023: Tourism and Green Investments. With regional tourism's primary attractions being our state's natural landscapes, investing in nature-based tourism is one of sustainability and it adheres to the theme of green investments.

I have proudly been a strong advocate for the South-East to capitalise on our amazing natural attractions, none so much as Mount Gambier's Crater Lakes area. It has so much potential for eco and adventure tourism. Can you imagine kayaking on the Blue Lake—it would be absolutely amazing. Our former Minister for Environment and Water, the Leader of the Opposition, David Speirs, opened up reservoirs around South Australia, with kayaking on Happy Valley. Of course, we have Glenthorne as well, but if we could kayak on the Blue Lake I think it would be up there with the Great Barrier Reef and Uluru.

World-class running trails and mountain bike precincts are in the Crater Lakes area and zip-lines from Centenary Tower into the Valley Lake would be absolutely amazing, and of course celebrating our ancient Indigenous history in Mount Gambier. The City of Mount Gambier and RecFish SA have a fantastic project they are trying to get off the ground: stocking Murray cod and trout in the Valley Lake. I am looking forward to taking my kids down there and dropping a line in as well. It will be fantastic.

We go from the natural landscapes and water activities in Eyre Peninsula to the Clare and Barossa Valley's vast food and wine experiences—not forgetting the amazing Coonawarra. Of course, in the South-East there is Mount Gambier's Blue Lake, Little Blue, and the world heritage Naracoorte Caves. I tell you what, with all that is going on with that, plus the seven other regions in our state, our state does not fall short of regional tourism opportunities.

By better utilising our existing regional tourism bodies, we can capitalise on the untapped potential in our country's areas as we strive to achieve the sector's goal of generating \$12.8 billion annually over the next six years. When working towards the 2030 strategy, better engagement and co-development with the regions will be crucial to ensuring the right mix of attractions to maximise economic benefit and ensure sustainability in regional tourism.

In supporting this motion, I underscore the importance of bolstering regional tourism. My unwavering focus, and I know the unwavering focus of the Hon. Jing Lee and of course the opposition, will remain on holding this government to account in our regional heartlands. Every region, every community, every individual in South Australia deserves the benefit of the promise of tourism.

As we reflect on World Tourism Day, I urge the chamber to recognise the immense value of our regions and to champion their cause. Let this be our clarion call, our commitment to the people of South Australia and our pledge to make regional tourism the cornerstone of our strategy. Let's not mark World Tourism Day: let's make every day a celebration of the tourism potential of our regions.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.E. Hanson.

Bills

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION (TISSUE DONATION STATEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:35): The Greens are supportive of this bill. This bill allows the next of kin of a deceased person to request that a tissue donation statement be included on any certificate, issued under the act, certifying the death of a person. It also enables the next of kin of a deceased person to request that an intended tissue donation statement be included on any certificate, issued under the act, certifying death. The Greens support granting formal recognition of a life-saving gift at the request of the family or next of kin of the deceased.

I want to commend the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for putting this issue on the agenda and for putting this bill forward. It is an important issue that she has highlighted, one that I think will impact many South Australian families, so we do appreciate her advocacy in this regard.

For someone who is seriously ill, an organ or a tissue transplant can mean the difference between life and death, being healthy or sick, seeing or being blind, or being active or never walking

again. Transplants enable people to resume an active role in their family, their workplace and their community. Tissue donation includes bones, tendons, cartilage, connective tissue, skin, corneas and heart valves and vessels.

While an organ donor can save up to seven lives, a tissue donor can impact the lives of as many as 75 people. Since 2013, more than 38,000 deceased and living tissue donations have been made. Unlike organs, many more people can become eye and tissue donors, as these can be donated following death outside of hospital and tissue can be stored for longer periods of time. Tissues for donation must be removed within 12 to 24 hours after a person dies, and the donor does not need to be maintained on a ventilator.

In 2022, there were 2,748 tissue donors, which is 17 per cent of deceased persons, and in 2021 there were 3,307. The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted on elective surgeries, including joint replacement surgery, resulting in a decrease in living tissue donations. I understand that eight out of 10 families give consent to donation when their family member is registered to be a donor, but this number drops to just four out of 10 families when the family is unaware that the deceased person had that wish. The decision to donate a loved one's organs and tissues will be a difficult one for many families to make, especially at a time of great loss. The generosity of those families ought to be acknowledged and commended.

I hope that this is one of those instances where we see this house rise above politics and see all sides of this chamber support it. I cannot imagine why there would not be universal support for such a sensible proposition. With that, I commend the bill.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:38): I, too, rise to speak in support of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration (Tissue Donation Statements) Amendment Bill 2022, on behalf of SA-Best. We have already had an outline of what the bill seeks to do to provide the option of acknowledging organ and tissue donation on a death certificate upon the application of the next of kin.

I, too, commend the mover for bringing the bill to this place for debate. It is a simple way of recognising that a person's final act on Earth was selfless and compassionate, something which may provide comfort to grieving families and loved ones. It would extend to circumstances where donation was intended but did not proceed.

As we have heard, the bill is based loosely upon legislation in the ACT that passed in 2021. Though not expressly legislated here, there is also a second option of a letter from the Chief Minister of the ACT, which I understand could be replicated here but does not need to be prescribed in the legislation itself. The only caveat in the bill, which makes perfect sense given that every jurisdiction has its own legislation when it comes to births, deaths and marriages, is that the death must have occurred in South Australia as the jurisdiction tasked with issuing the death certificate.

According to the 2022 Australian Donation and Transplantation Activity Report, there are about 1,800 Australians on the transplant list. Only about 2 per cent of people who die in hospital meet donor criteria, which includes dying in an intensive care unit or emergency department, which is why intended donor rates need to be high.

I will just mention that I met some time ago with DonateLife to discuss the opt-out model for donation, as is the case in Spain, for example. At first glance, it does seem like a bit of a no-brainer. An opt-out model would serve to vastly increase donor numbers and ultimately save lives. But, as it turned out, DonateLife themselves at the time were supportive of our current opt-in model and I understand that position remains unchanged. It is something that we have talked about sometimes in this place, but I guess at the time I was not quite expecting that response from DonateLife. However, they are the experts in this area and they tell us the reasons why they think the current model we have works well.

It is currently left to the families to make the final decision and, though it is not definitive, registering on the Organ Donor Register helps in their decision-making. We know that because families of people who had expressed their wish via the register are far more likely to consent to donation. In 2022, 80 per cent of families gave consent when their family member was registered, 60 per cent gave consent when they otherwise knew their wishes, compared with only 40 per cent when they were not registered and had not been made aware.

These rates show just how important registration and, indeed, conversations with family and loved ones are when it comes to organ donation. Hopefully this bill will also serve a dual purpose, both in terms of providing comfort to those families in their time of grief and also, importantly, in terms of encouraging more organ donation. With that, I commend, once again, the mover of this bill for bringing it to this place.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (16:41): This bill proposes formal recognition on a death certificate of a person who has donated or expressed an intention to donate an organ or other tissue through processes managed by the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages. I would like to thank and acknowledge the passionate advocates for this model of recognition and understand the government will give further consideration on how we can recognise these remarkable individuals. The selfless act of giving the gift of life to those in need is a testament to the boundless compassion that exists in humanity and is worthy of recognition.

The Organ and Tissue Authority and DonatLife network do a fantastic job recognising this selfless act and are committed to acknowledging organ and tissue donation through activities and events and should be commended. However, the scope of this bill is quite broad. There are a number of identified risks, implementation issues, low take-up of this type of scheme in the ACT, and well-respected recognition systems already in place. On this basis, we intend to undertake further work on an appropriate way to recognise organ tissue donors. Some of the concerns identified by government agencies, I am advised, include:

- the sharing of information for this purpose, including disclosure, privacy and data sharing arrangements;
- the scope of the bill in terms of the definitions of 'tissue' and 'donor', which may include not only deceased organ donors but all living organ and tissue donors and intended donors, as well as kidney, blood and other tissue donations;
- the potential for the amendments to be applied retrospectively;
- the evidence that would be required to support tissue donation statements and how this information could be verified at the time of death, including whether a person may have withdrawn their intention to donate prior to death;
- whether the process in South Australia for recording an organ donation on a driver's licence constitutes an intention in writing; and
- the potential for more than one million South Australians being eligible for recognition on their death certificate, not including blood donors.

I look forward to the relevant ministers looking at ways we can further recognise the selfless act of those donors giving life to others.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:44): I would like to thank all honourable members for their contributions, in particular the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Connie Bonaros for their support. I also acknowledge the comments of the Hon. Reggie Martin, although I am disappointed that the government have not indicated their support. As the Hon. Rob Simms pointed out, this should be above politics. I hope that the government reconsiders its position between the houses.

Whilst this bill is not earth-shattering, it is important. It is important because it provides donor families who have experienced trauma and the devastating circumstances of losing a loved one—often tragically and without warning—with the chance to acknowledge that loved one by a simple statement on their death certificate in regard to the gift that they provided to let others live out their full lives.

This started because a dear friend of mine lost his wife and, in discussions, he suggested that he would have appreciated having the choice to acknowledge her gift of life to others on her death certificate. I started having conversations with other donor families in similar circumstances, and kept getting the same response; that is, they would appreciate the choice and the symbolism of

that statement. I acknowledge that it is not going to be for everyone, but that is why it is an opt-in scheme.

I would also like to echo the words of the Hon. Connie Bonaros and place on the record that in the ACT, where similar legislation has been passed, the Chief Minister also provides the family of organ donors with the opportunity to receive a letter of acknowledgement from him or her. It is my understanding, and certainly the case in the ACT, that this is an administrative process that does not need legislative change. It was also the view in the ACT, at the time the legislation passed, that these two processes should be separated because some families may wish to have a formal acknowledgement on the death certificate but not receive a letter, and vice versa. Clearly, that needs to be the choice of the family.

There have also been some concerns raised by the government about whether this piece of legislation would reduce donation rates. I would just like to put on the record that there is evidence from around the world that acknowledgement of organ donation on death certificates has actually raised the organ donation rates. The top three tissue donation nations in the world—Spain, Croatia, and Belgium—all have the option for the donation to be acknowledged on the death certificate. The cornerstone of tissue donation policy for these three leading nations includes strong public education campaigns, collaboration with hospital and medical professionals, and support recognition for donor families.

It is obviously hard to know whether there is cause and effect but I would like to think that this is because when donor families have as good an experience as possible in what are otherwise such tragic circumstances, they are more likely to tell other families and individuals about that process, about that experience, and encourage more people to consider organ donation.

Finally, it is important that in addition to encouraging registration, we ensure that we are opening up the dialogue around organ and tissue donation in our community. This is a particularly important conversation for families because, as the Hon. Robert Simms pointed out, in Australia your family will always be asked to agree to organ donation. Registering and discussing one's decision provides the family with some certainty in a time of great uncertainty and tremendous grief. I firmly believe that this bill also assists with these conversations going forward, and so I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Centofanti-1]—

Page 3, lines 15 to 23 [clause 3, inserted section 39A(6), definition of *intended tissue donor*]—

Delete the definition of *intended tissue donor* and substitute:

intended tissue donor—a deceased person was an intended tissue donor if consent or authority to remove an organ or other tissue from the person's body was given in accordance with the *Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1983*, but removal of the organ or other tissue did not proceed;

Amendment No 2 [Centofanti-1]—

Page 3, line 27 [clause 3, inserted section 39A(6), definition of *tissue donor*]—After 'consent' insert 'or authority'

These amendments seek to alter the definition of 'intended tissue donor'. After consultation with the Organ and Tissue Authority on their definition of 'intended tissue donor', I felt that an amendment was important to better align with their national definition and to better reflect the object of the bill so that an intended donor is someone whose next of kin has given the consent or authority for that organ donation in accordance with the act, but for a variety of reasons, which are usually medical, the removal or donation of that organ or tissue could not proceed.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:51): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

WADE, THE HON. S.G.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That this council—

1. Notes the recent retirement of the Hon. Stephen Wade MLC after 16 years of service to the people and Parliament of South Australia;
2. Recognises his leadership as Minister for Health and Wellbeing throughout the COVID-19 pandemic; and
3. Wishes him well in his retirement from parliament and the years ahead.

(Continued from 30 August 2023.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:52): I rise to speak briefly on behalf of SA-Best on this motion, celebrating the retirement of a 16-year veteran and gentleman of this place, the Hon. Stephen Wade. We have all spoken of the Hon. Mr Wade's time as health minister for the short time that the Liberal Party were in government, between 2018 and 2022, and before that he was shadow attorney. We would all have to agree that, if you want someone to be obsessed with their portfolios, then Stephen was absolutely your man for the job. At no time, though, did we see his level of commitment to his work greater than when he was health minister.

Some would say—I would say—that he inherited a complete and utter health basket case, and what is undoubtedly true is that it was a hell of a job that few of us would envy, on top of which he served the people of South Australia diligently through its most challenging time, the COVID pandemic. Yet, behind the scenes, I know that Stephen never missed a call from me, and I am sure he never missed a call from anybody in this place when we contacted him to help on individual cases, on matters that people had brought to us.

I cannot count the number of times during that pandemic and outside of it when I would send Stephen a text message or ring him and ask him to help with an issue that had been brought to my attention, and each and every time he personally made the effort to look into those matters and address them as Minister for Health. I am extremely grateful for that, and I am sure I speak for many of us when I say how grateful we are that he showed that level of commitment not just to the people he helped but also to us.

As we know, during the pandemic, his face was splashed all over the news with his trustworthy colleague Professor Nicola Spurrier on an almost daily basis, and he did not miss a beat, basically, during that whole thing. I think the funniest moment I had with him one day was in the lift when he told me, 'It's like being a pig in mud,' when we had all these Aqium stations erected all over Parliament House, because we both had a fondness for Aqium that certainly predated any COVID outbreak in this jurisdiction. We had some laughs when that was the case.

Of course, that is not the only legacy that Stephen leaves behind. I think it is also worth mentioning the role that he played in terms of the establishment of the suicide prevention register, mental health issues and the abortion debate, the role he undertook in that and the way he conducted himself during that debate. I personally worked closely with Stephen on the Donor Conception Register at the time he was here. I am extremely grateful for the support and the commitment he gave to that. I am also, by the same token, extremely grateful that we are now seeing another bill

that is going to come from this government to follow on from the work he did while he was health minister.

What I loved most, though, about our colleague was his ability to leave things in this chamber. In here, he was ruthless in the way he conducted himself in terms of trying to get a point across. Talk about screaming matches; we saw some of those involving Stephen. But what you always knew was that, if you bumped into him three minutes later in the corridor, you would not know anything had happened. I remember one occasion in particular—I remember what it was, too, but I am not going to say—when he was standing right here in my face, and we were exchanging words. I can tell you it was a challenge.

Then the bells suspended, and we left the chamber. We walked down to the cars together, and we were having a laugh about something. That literally happened within the course of five minutes. He did not take things outside of this chamber, but he certainly defended his position with the conviction that he did in here. I was always grateful for that. I think I was grateful, like many of us, for the kind gestures that he made, the text messages, the cards. He is a good man, and when I say 'gentleman' I mean that in every respect of the word.

I am sad, but not surprised in the slightest, that he left in the way he did. In short, on behalf of SA-Best, I want to wish Stephen well in the continuation of his journey. I think the fact that he left in the way he did speaks volumes about the humble and good man that he is. Above all, though, and despite being able to provide so much more politically, I am glad he made the decision to head off into the sunset and enjoy life outside of this place, to smell the roses and spend time with his loved ones and family. I wish him and his family well into the future.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:58): I also rise to recognise the significant contribution of Stephen Wade to this place. I obviously only had a short opportunity to work with him, having joined the parliament myself in 2021, but I did have a huge respect for his work ethic and service to the people of South Australia. I want to reflect on some of the contributions that he made.

Stephen Wade moved to Adelaide in 1974, a graduate in law and economics at Adelaide University. He had a professional career before entering politics: a corporate governance consultant and parliamentary adviser, a former chair of the board of Julia Farr Services and a member of the board of SA Dental Service. It was in 2006 that he filled a casual vacancy following the retirement of the Hon. Angus Redford.

Often when one reflects on the contributions of members of parliament, they look back at their first speeches, and I think there are some words from the Hon. Stephen Wade that are worth revisiting. He talked at length about the importance of the separation between church and state. He believed that religious values and principles should be brought to politics but that there should be a separation between the church and the state, an important distinction, I believe, still today. He also said on leadership, and I quote from that speech:

I believe that parliamentarians who merely follow populist trends do the people a disservice and dishonour the leadership role that parliamentarians should exercise in our community.

He said:

Leadership can bring out the best in people...leaders should try to show the way to help bring out the best in the community they serve. Leaders should not just parrot community sentiment.

Very wise words when they were said by Mr Wade back in 2006, and very important words, I think, for us to reflect on in this chamber today.

I want to briefly reflect on Mr Wade's significant work in dealing with the pandemic. It was really a once-in-a-century event. It is hard to imagine a more challenging series of circumstances that could confront a health minister. I know that Mr Wade worked tirelessly during that pandemic to provide the best leadership he could in terms of responding to that crisis.

When I first joined the parliament, I observed the work that he was doing on the assisted dying legislation. He played an integral role in getting that through the parliament, working closely with the Hon. Kyam Maher and others who had been advocating for that reform. I think it is fair to

say that Mr Wade played a critical role in trying to get that through, and that has been a life-changing reform in terms of helping many South Australians.

With that, I conclude my remarks and I wish he and his wife, Tracey, and their family all the best for the next chapter of their lives together.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:01): I stand to speak briefly about the Hon. Stephen Wade and to acknowledge his achievements and qualities. The Hon. Stephen Wade served in the Legislative Council from May 2006 until he announced his retirement in January 2023. As honourable members would know, he held various shadow ministry portfolios during his first 10 years in this place before becoming Minister for Health and Wellbeing during the Liberal government from 2018 to 2022.

Since I entered parliament in May 2014, Stephen's modest and respectful manner was something I remembered him for. When he was the Minister for Health, I had reason to approach him for assistance and I found him to be very friendly and always willing to ask his staff to assist me. One issue involved a banh mi food poisoning outbreak from one of the banh mi stores, which received wide coverage from the media.

I visited many of Adelaide's banh mi stores to offer my support. I was told the media coverage had resulted in more than a 30 per cent reduction in trade. I also learned that the outbreak was more likely caused by the chicken eggs used to make the banh mi butter rather than hygiene practices. As honourable members would be aware, eggs are very often the cause of salmonella outbreaks if not handled correctly.

I discussed this issue with Stephen, looking at how we could help reduce the impact this was having on small family businesses. Keeping in mind that this outbreak came from one business, I did not want SA Health to impose restrictions that completely decimated the banh mi industry without considering all possible causes. It was good of Stephen to offer to work with me and the Vietnamese business community to assist them to overcome the effects of the salmonella outbreak. It was certainly a helpful and gracious offer.

Many honourable members would be aware of my interest in and advocacy for the pharmacy industry as well as my association with the Vietnamese community working in this sector. Stephen was always happy to listen and respond to the issues I raised with him, and I valued his input.

COVID was a difficult time for us all; however, it was an especially challenging time for health ministers across all jurisdictions. I would like to acknowledge the Hon. Stephen Wade's work as South Australia's health minister in keeping our community safe. As we all know, it was a busy period that challenged our health system in a way that we had not experienced before.

His leadership in working closely with many stakeholders, including the health department in collaboration with Nicola Spurrier, Grant Stevens and the then Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall MP, is to be commended. Stephen Wade also shared many ministerial councils during this time. He will no doubt be noted in South Australia's history as the health minister who successfully guided our state through a COVID pandemic that we knew little about and that had swept all over the world.

Everyone in this place will be aware of Stephen's leadership and approachability. These qualities earned the respect of members from all sides of politics. Stephen Wade's 17-year, dedicated service to the South Australian community is certainly worthy of acknowledgement. Now that he is out of parliament, he can have more time with his family. As many honourable members know, our families are often neglected due to the nature of our work and service. I wish the Hon. Stephen Wade and his family good health and happiness for the future.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:06): I rise with some sadness because I had a great fondness for the former honourable Stephen Wade, who will continue to be honourable. Every departure from this place has an impact. It is a very intimate chamber of 22 of us, and when one person goes it shifts the balance in different ways every time.

Certainly, reflecting on not having had Stephen Wade here now for some months and finally getting to the point where we conclude the speeches in his valedictory, and not having him here to hear them because he does not wish to be lauded by us, really does sum up Stephen Wade. I have

not heard the words 'deja vu all over again' for some months, but I am sure I will again, sometime when I catch up with Stephen.

One of the first bills I ever worked with Stephen on as a crossbencher—a new Greens elected crossbencher in 2010-2011—was the South Australian Public Health Bill. He and I were negotiating with the then minister John Hill's office to ensure human rights were placed in that South Australian Public Health Bill in case of what we thought was the unlikely event of a pandemic. Certainly, as we debated the bill we thought perhaps some small-scale outbreaks but certainly not a global pandemic.

I am pleased to say that in that debate Stephen and I bonded quite a lot on some of the things people have already reflected on—that is, the nature of Stephen Wade's politics as a moderate, as a liberal, as somebody who believed in the rule of law, in human rights and in the separation of church and state, even though he was a man of faith, of informed debate and of respect for democracy.

It was at that point in the debate that there were some sticking points about ensuring human rights if people were to be detained or incarcerated under said 'did not think it was going to happen' pandemic, and he and I were standing firm against the then Labor government's attempt not to have such provisions to allow people to have respect for the full breadth of those human rights. I remember the minister's adviser ringing me and saying, 'What on earth are you doing? You're a Green; you're meant to be a communist' and me informing the minister's adviser that the Cold War was now over and one could have economic, social and civil and political rights, and they no longer needed to be arbitrarily divided.

Stephen held positions in this place, as has been mentioned: shadow attorney-general, shadow health and then health minister. One of the roles that does not go down in the formal CV is that he was also the self-appointed whip of the crossbench. Right from the first day I was here he would try to whip us. We were not necessarily willing, but we went along with it regardless.

Sometimes we let Stephen believe that he really was our whip, but he did so because he wished to have a conciliatory approach to the debate in this place. I have to say that the cross-party whipping meetings are probably some testament, although they came from a suggestion from crossbench members themselves, but it goes a long way, I think, to the culture that Stephen brought to this place.

He was passionate about human rights, as I have mentioned, and certainly he and I shared a commitment to the rights of asylum seekers and refugees, and he lived that commitment as well to Aboriginal people, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander justice. He was the person, when I put up a stolen generations reparations tribunal bill, who saw a way forward and created a path by referring that to a parliamentary committee.

I will admit, and only the former Clerk used to know this and Stephen Wade and myself, we did not actually have the ability to refer that to a parliamentary committee, except nobody checked the standing orders and so they believed us, but the outcome was great. Technically, we needed both houses of parliament to make that referral, but nobody looked at the fine print, and that is one of the things that Stephen did know. He knew to look at the fine print and then perhaps to ignore it when the cause was worth it.

He was incredibly supportive of myself and Kelly Vincent over many years. We worked with him on issues of disability and child protection and general progress around things like gender-affirming health care. He was somebody, I think, who fits into what politicians like to call in the lexicon doctors' wives—the moral middle class—except, of course, Stephen is a doctor's husband. He believed in human rights. He did not see that his religion should be used to divide people but rather to lift people up and to unite people.

He was also very instrumental in the decriminalisation of abortion in this state after 50 years of having the medical profession and pregnant people at risk of criminalisation, and so I pay tribute to him for his leadership. He was the right person at the right place to be health minister because in that aforementioned public health debate he also strongly advocated, as did I, for a Chief Public Health Officer standing alone as a separate position to the Chief Health Officer—20/20 hindsight

shows that that was, again, the right decision. We were fortunate to have a Chief Public Health Officer in place once we encountered that pandemic.

At the time of the pandemic, many of us were thrown into turmoil in our personal and professional lives right across the state and, of course, the globe. I remember speaking to Stephen in the early days about the workload, the excessive stress of having people's lives in the balance. I do remember a debate in this place where hanging over us was the potential of mass graves and mass deaths had we not trod a path that was in the end the one that kept South Australians safe and alive. He said to me at the time, 'No, I don't feel the stress, I don't feel the pressure, I don't feel a burden because I have purpose.'

Stephen always had purpose. He will be very much missed by myself and I think this place. I hope to see more people like Stephen Wade come into this place, and that there be that *deja vu* all over again.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:14): I wish to add my appreciation and commend the Hon. Stephen Wade. As a parliamentarian, I have only known Stephen since 2018. A lot of complimentary words have been said about Stephen today and they are all very much deserved.

When the Liberals came into office in 2018, Stephen inherited what you could only say was a poisoned chalice. The health system was left in a bloated mess through Labor's Transforming Health disaster. I think I often said to him, 'Stephen, you really have the hardest job in government,' because that is what health really is. It became doubly hard for him because he had to steer the state through the most difficult time in its history, and that was the COVID-19 pandemic.

I know that the Hon. Robert Simms called it a once-in-a-century pandemic or health crisis. I think it was more than that. If you look back through history I do not think we have had one individual event that actually affected the entire world. It actually affected every living human person on earth when it struck, that is how significant that event was. It virtually shut down the world and we were all entrapped in our own country.

He had to work through those challenges because, let's face it, these were challenges that were unheard of. We had not seen or experienced anything like that. Everything was a whole learning curve for everybody who was involved, from the Premier at the time, Steven Marshall, through to the police commissioner, Nicola Spurrier and others who were involved—even members in this place. This was a whole new experience that we had to go through, and right at the forefront was the health, the security and the safety of South Australians.

As an event, I think it was a global catastrophe that was probably in my lifetime the biggest news event that I have ever had to go through. As health minister, Stephen had to make some difficult and controversial decisions. History will probably be a judge of them; however, they had to be made. They were tough decisions and I think he made those decisions with alacrity and professionalism, never wavering from what he thought was in the best interests of South Australians. The Liberals and Steven Marshall were fortunate to have someone with the exceptional work ethic of Stephen Wade in their ranks.

From a personal point of view, I always had a very cordial and professional relationship with him. I found him to be a real decent, honest and principled person. As my colleague mentioned, you could fire him up in debate or during question time, but he would always greet you with a smile afterwards and was always quite warm.

He responded positively, sometimes with some annoyance, to the long questions that I would often throw at him, but he would always provide accurate answers where they were required. If he took them on notice, I would always be assured that I would get an accurate response and a timely response from him. My correspondence was always promptly addressed and when I advocated for constituents who had poor outcomes from the health system, or needed assistance particularly during COVID, Stephen and his staff—and staff at SA Health—were very quick to help.

I am just thinking about what the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Tung Ngo said. My office had to take a lot of calls from people who were impacted by COVID in one way or the other and I am thinking about the many calls that his office would have had to take from others and the pressure that office would have been under.

I would like to particularly thank Stephen for really moving mountains when one of my constituents, who had to travel from overseas to come to see his dying mother during COVID, had been locked out by the lockdowns at the border. He could not make it from Queensland into South Australia, and time was critical for him to be able to see his mum before she died. Stephen certainly worked exceptionally hard to try to assist that family to be reunited during a time of grief. That is the sort of person that he was. He would help where he possibly could.

I know, from what I have heard here, that he served this parliament with distinction. He should be proud of his contributions, including one that has not been mentioned here. I know we have heard about the other reforms that he helped move through this place, but one in particular that I was pretty passionate about was the establishment of the office for ageing and wellbeing, and his advocacy for it. He was quite passionate about meeting the challenges of the aged-care sector.

Finally, and quite ironically, I am always going to remember Stephen for one thing, and that is that he gave me my first and only dose of COVID while we exchanged greetings one day on the steps of Parliament House—but it was a mild case. In closing, I would like to wish Stephen, Tracey and the family all the very best and really thank him for his long and dedicated service to making South Australia a better and a safer place.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:21): It gives me great pleasure to rise to speak briefly to this motion and to wish our former colleague the Hon. Stephen Wade the very best in his retirement. As many members have said, Stephen was actually a decent human.

On his election to this place in 2006, the Hon. Stephen Wade referred to himself as a fortunate member in being appointed to this place to fill a casual vacancy whilst, earlier in the year, many of his colleagues, many members of his party room, had lost their seats at the election. When the Hon. Stephen Wade took that opportunity to come into this place, he shared his views about the necessity, when speaking in this place, of the separation between church and state. He set out his desire to be a member of the Legislative Council who would truly serve every corner of South Australia and not just be an echo chamber for public opinion. I think that vision for what he would do certainly rang true throughout his time in this place.

The Hon. Stephen Wade held countless shadow portfolios during his time in opposition, particularly in important social policy areas and as shadow attorney-general in this parliament for a number of years. Throughout all of his time, he was a fierce advocate for health, for people living with a disability, for men, for older South Australians and for many other causes.

I do not think many would at all envy the position the Hon. Stephen Wade had to hold as the Minister for Health during the early and uncertain days of the COVID-19 pandemic, when none of us were really sure about what was happening in the world and how the world would look. He should be commended for stepping up to the plate and leading this state through what was an unparalleled difficult time.

I want to reflect on, as others have, the Hon. Stephen Wade's willingness to personally help out people during the COVID pandemic. I know that I rang the Hon. Stephen Wade a number of times when I had issues or concerns raised with me by members of the Aboriginal community during COVID: people who faced isolation and could not get back to country and people who were in communities who were under federal biosecurity lockdowns. Every time I personally called the Hon. Stephen Wade he would deal with it and have someone get back to me. It was a great credit to his personal humanity and his desire to see individuals looked after.

Whilst we have not always been on the same page on everything, as honourable members have mentioned, I had a huge amount of respect for the Hon. Stephen Wade during his contributions on the voluntary assisted dying debate in this parliament during our last term. I distinctly remember one of the Hon. Stephen Wade's early contributions to the debate where he said:

While my Christian faith teaches me that euthanasia is not an option for me, in a pluralist society other people will hold differing views and should have the freedom to live their lives according to their values and their moral codes...

I think that speaks volumes of the sorts of values the Hon. Stephen Wade brought to this place and during that debate, having the health minister on the other side of the chamber, as we were passing

difficult and technical legislation, almost riding shotgun in being able to help the passage of it. I and many other South Australians will forever be grateful to the Hon. Stephen Wade.

The Hon. Stephen Wade almost always wore his heart on his sleeve. You did not have to guess what he was feeling or what his emotions were. I would have loved to have played poker against the Hon. Stephen Wade—you could have made a lot of money very quickly, I suspect.

One of my favourite contributions was early in the time when we were in opposition and the Liberal Party were in government. The Hon. Stephen Wade, as health minister, had a bill to establish local health networks. While the bill was still going through the parliament, they had advertised for positions to be filled on local health networks, so as an enthusiastic new Leader of the Opposition in this place I had given notice of a privileges motion for taking the chamber for granted because the bill had not passed.

I can remember that evening and the next morning going around to all the crossbenchers and asking, 'Come on, will you support this?' and quite justifiably they said, 'No, Kyam. Pull your head in. That's a tiny technical little thing. Of course, we won't be supporting that against Stephen Wade. We quite like Stephen Wade.'

I remember the next day, knowing that I had absolutely no support whatsoever for this motion, getting up and saying something along the lines of, 'I think the minister has learnt his lesson, so I won't be proceeding with this motion.' Then we went to the next item on the agenda and the former President, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, when the Hon. Stephen Wade got up, obviously having spent a long time getting ready to give a defence of this motion, did not allow him to proceed. He very perceptively called me gutless, in very colourful language, for not proceeding with the motion.

I had a great exchange with the Hon. Stephen Wade on the night he announced his retirement when he feigned he could not remember the contribution whatsoever. I want to thank the Hon. Stephen Wade for his contribution, his service to this state, and wish him and his family all the very best in the next stage of their lives.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:27): I will be very brief. I just want to thank all the honourable members who have contributed to this very important motion: the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Dennis Hood, the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, the Hon. Laura Henderson, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Robert Simms, the Hon. Tung Ngo, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. Kyam Maher.

The Hon. Stephen Wade was an exceptional member of this chamber, one who will be incredibly missed. He made an outstanding contribution not only to this parliament but to the health and wellbeing of this state during the term of the Marshall Liberal government and obviously during the term of that once-in-a-lifetime pandemic. We wish him and his wife, Tracey, all the best in their life after parliament, one which, I am sure, will be full of community, connection, the pursuit of new skills and the occasional bush walk. With those words, I commend the motion to the chamber.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUCCESSION BILL

Final Stages

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

No 1. Clause 51, page 24, lines 20 and 21 [clause 51(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

- (3) A person is only eligible—
 - (a) for appointment as the Registrar or acting Registrar if the person is a legal practitioner of at least 5 years standing; or
 - (b) for appointment as a deputy if the person is a legal practitioner.

No 2. Schedule 2, page 70, after line 20—After Part 4 insert:

Part 4A—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923*

8A—Amendment of section 71CB—Exemption from duty in respect of certain transfers between spouses etc or former spouses etc

(1) Section 71CB—after subsection (2) insert:

(2a) An instrument executed after the commencement of this subsection is exempt from stamp duty if the sole effect of the instrument is to transfer to the spouse or domestic partner of a deceased person an interest in a dwelling acquired by the spouse or domestic partner from the deceased's estate in consequence of an election made by the spouse or domestic partner under section 102 of the *Succession Act 2022*.

(2) Section 71CB(4)—after 'instrument' first occurring insert:
described in subsection (2)

(3) Section 71CB(6)—delete 'This' and substitute:
Subject to subsection (2a), this

8B—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

Schedule 2, Part 2, clause 16—after item 27 insert:

27A An agreement for the distribution of an intestate estate, or part of an intestate estate, approved by the Supreme Court under section 111 of the *Succession Act 2022*.

At 17:29 the council adjourned until Tuesday 17 October 2023 at 14:15.