

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL****Tuesday, 17 October 2023**

**The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 14:17 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.

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

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Members***MEMBER, NEW**

The President produced a commission from Her Excellency the Governor authorising him to administer the oath of allegiance to members of the Legislative Council.

The President produced a letter from the Clerk of the Assembly of Members notifying that the Assembly of Members of both houses of parliament had elected Mrs Mira El Dannawi to fill the vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos.

The Hon. Mira El Dannawi, who made an affirmation of allegiance, took her seat in the Legislative Council, in place of the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos (resigned).

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY**

**The PRESIDENT (14:23):** I lay on the table the minutes of the Assembly of Members of both houses held on 17 October 2023 to fill the vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos.

Ordered to be published.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Report by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption titled Integrity State:

Corruption prevention recommendations [Ordered to be published]

Independent Commission Against Corruption: Report, 2022-23 [Ordered to be published]

Annual Report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2023—

Report 8 of 2023 [Ordered to be published]

Part A: Executive Summary

Part B: Controls Opinion

Part C: Agency and Audit Reports

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

Auditor-General's Department: Report, 2022-23  
Regulations under Acts—  
    Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010—  
        Amendment of Law—No 2  
    Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016—  
        Amendment of Act, Schedule 1  
        Guidelines

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

Reports, 2022-23  
    Assumed Identities and Witness Protection  
    Commissioner for Victims' Rights  
    Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board  
    Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board Actuarial Review  
    South Australian Administrative and Civil Tribunal

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

District Council By-laws—  
    Mount Remarkable—No 4 – Local Government Land  
    Orroroo Carrieton  
        No 1—Permits and Penalties  
        No 2—Moveable Signs  
        No 3—Local Government Land  
        No 4—Roads  
        No 5—Dogs  
        No 6—Cats  
        No 7—Waste Management  
Regulations under Acts—  
    Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Speed Limits on Beaches  
    Road Traffic Act 1961—  
        Miscellaneous—Speed Limits on Beaches  
        Road Rules-Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions—  
            Speed Limits on Beaches

*Parliamentary Committees*

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY**

**The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:24):** I bring up the report of the joint committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

*Ministerial Statement*

**ABORIGINAL REMAINS, RIVERLEA PARK**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:26):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement in relation to Aboriginal heritage.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** I rise to provide an update on the discovery of Aboriginal ancestral remains within the Riverlea Park development project. Multiple historical burials were found during project earthworks at two sites. Forensics SA has confirmed that those remains are Aboriginal ancestral remains. Two isolated bone fragments have also been discovered at other project locations. Forensics SA also say these are very likely to be historic Aboriginal remains.

The first discovery of remains was on 27 April 2023. On 6 June 2023, in accordance with the wishes of the Kurna Yerta Aboriginal Corporation, a direction was issued under the Aboriginal Heritage Act requiring the developer, the Walker Corporation, to allow KYAC to excavate within the first discovery area. This was sought to ensure the exposed remains were protected from the elements and was performed by KYAC heritage monitors in a culturally sensitive manner.

However, during that excavation work the increased scale of the burial site became apparent, and on 23 August 2023 the direction was rescinded, with the treatment of those remains to be determined through the developer's application for authorisation under section 23 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act.

I am advised that no excavation of any Aboriginal remains has occurred within the project since 23 August 2023. If any further burials are discovered, they must be avoided unless and until the corporation receives authority under the Aboriginal Heritage Act to move or otherwise manage them.

In total, as of today, I am advised that 29 sets of remains and two isolated bone fragments have been identified across the entirety of the project area. I am advised that all works have ceased in the two burial sites identified.

As the body that represents Kurna people's native title rights and interests, KYAC has worked in close partnership with the Walker Corporation for several years to ensure any discoveries of Aboriginal heritage were treated respectfully and in compliance with the act. Archaeologists from Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation remain in regular communication with KYAC, the developer and other stakeholders, including through onsite visits and inspections.

I am advised that in March 2023, prior to the first discovery, the developer had applied for an authorisation under the Aboriginal Heritage Act in relation to the project. Over the past months, the department for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has been consulting with traditional owners and other interested Aboriginal people about that application. The department expects to finalise that consultation and deliver a report in the coming months.

The final management of all Aboriginal heritage within the project boundaries will therefore be decided via that authorisation request. As this matter remains subject to an active authorisation request under the Aboriginal Heritage Act, in the interests of procedural fairness there will be limited public statements about the matter at this time.

I reiterate and emphasise that no excavation of Aboriginal remains is currently permitted or occurring within the project and that KYAC and the Walker Corporation are working in close cooperation to ensure this is managed appropriately and in accordance with the law.

#### *Question Time*

### **FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about the State Voice to Parliament.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** After the federal referendum results on Saturday night there have been many commentators suggesting that the point of difference in the referendum debate was not one of goodwill or ill will towards Indigenous Australia but about a fundamental disagreement over the model chosen to achieve a widely desired outcome for Indigenous communities, that is, a raising of remote community Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander life expectancy, health outcomes, and educational achievements to the Australian average. My questions to the minister are:

1. What evidence does the minister have to demonstrate that the majority of South Australians are aware that a State Voice exists?
2. Does the minister believe that the majority of South Australians support a State Voice to Parliament?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:36):** I thank the honourable member for her question. The evidence that exists of support for this was the last state election. This was the very first policy the then Labor opposition announced way back in NAIDOC Week of 2019. And do you know what? The South Australian people voted, as they have in five of the last six elections, for a Labor government who said they were going to implement it, and that's exactly what we are doing. I wish to reiterate that this government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** —will respect the wishes of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in South Australia. This government will respect the aspirations, the legitimate aspirations of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in this state. I am bitterly disappointed that the referendum on the weekend didn't succeed; however, they are two very separate issues. The referendum at the weekend was about constitutional change. What we are proposing and what will be happening in South Australia—

*There being a disturbance in the gallery:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Sit down, Attorney-General. This is the people's chamber and you are very welcome in the gallery, but you will stay silent. I won't tolerate interjections from the gallery.

*There being a disturbance in the gallery:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Excuse me. Order! You will remain silent or you will be asked to leave, and I don't want to have to do that. Remain silent. The opposition will listen to the answer in silence. Attorney-General, conclude your answer, please.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Thank you, sir. What will be happening in March of next year is an election for the South Australian First Nations Voice to Parliament. What that will elect will be a series of Local First Nations Voices. This is something even the federal leadership of the Liberal Party has suggested should happen. It is something that they had advocated for. It's a call that we have heeded and that we will be acting on. Elevating the voices of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander South Australians was, up until very recently, a bipartisan endeavour in this state. I will read a quote:

Aboriginal people have long called for their voice to be heard in Parliamentary and Government decision-making processes. Too often, Aboriginal representation, advocacy and influence is absent and decisions are made for Aboriginal people by others.

The Parliament of South Australia wants to ensure that the voice of Aboriginal people is heard by the Parliament and the Government of South Australia. When their voice is heard, Aboriginal self-determination becomes a step closer.

That was said by the then Deputy Premier of the Liberal Party, Dan van Holst Pellekaan, less than two years ago in December 2021.

Less than a year ago, the shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs, the member for Heysen, Josh Teague, moved a motion in the other house of this parliament and I will read that motion. The motion moved by the Liberal Party less than a year ago on 16 November 2022 says:

That this house—

- (a) encourages all South Australians to recognise our First Nations people as the oldest continuous culture in the world; and
- (b) calls on the Malinauskas Labor government to take positive action to establish an Indigenous Voice to the South Australian parliament by continuing the work of the Marshall Liberal government to achieve this historic outcome.

These two things sound very familiar: recognising First Nations people as the oldest living culture on the planet and establishing a Voice to Parliament—two very familiar refrains.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** When we passed this historic legislation—

*The Hon. L.A. Henderson interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order, the Hon. Mrs Henderson!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** I've got to say that this is one Aboriginal voice that won't be silenced today.

*There being a disturbance in the gallery:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** When we passed this legislation in this chamber back in March, the Hon. Dennis Hood made some very generous comments that were echoed and reiterated by Josh Teague, the member for Heysen in the other place. He talked about the fact that, although this wasn't the model that they would have chosen—they preferred their Aboriginal Representative Body Bill that the previous government put up—they would support it. This is a quote from Josh Teague:

...I will support it and I will do all I can as one individual member in here and as the member of our party with responsibility for improvement in this portfolio area to do all I can to ensure its success.

'To ensure its success'. We expect and call on the Liberal opposition to stand true to their word: to do all that they can to ensure this success.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** As I have said, I know there are many Aboriginal people who are exceptionally disappointed at the referendum result. More than that, I know many Aboriginal people see this as a personal form of rejection, some sort of repudiation of their culture, identity and their place in this land. I get that, but that's not what this is about. Really, this was the 37<sup>th</sup> time out of 45 attempts that Australians haven't wanted to change the constitution. We just don't do that very often. We don't do that very often.

It is now incumbent on all those who raised concerns—all of those policymakers who advocated for a no vote, all those who had a mantra of 'practical, positive solutions'—to come forward with those. Now is the time for those who objected to this because they wanted to see other things done, to tell us what those other things are.

One of the things I have seen as a result of this referendum campaign—as difficult as it has been at times—is it has elevated the issues that affect Aboriginal people to a national conversation. It has elevated those issues: the unacceptable levels of disadvantage so many Aboriginal people face on a daily basis and the racism that Aboriginal people face on a daily basis are now part of our national conversation and it is something that won't go away.

The other thing that this has done is that it has galvanised not just the previous generations but a future generation of Aboriginal advocates. Leaders I have known for decades have messaged me, have contacted me over the last couple of days to tell me they still have the fire in their belly. They are keen to keep the cause moving. There are those national figures who have committed their entire lives, in many cases through generations of activism, and who have forged the path for Aboriginal rights in this country, who have been so instrumental in South Australia.

I am thinking of people like Charlie Perkins' daughter Rachel, who has spent so much time here over the last couple of months; Noel Pearson; Megan Davis; Tanya Hosch; and, of course, Linda Burney. There is a new generation of young activists who are emerging. It was a great pleasure to see the development of a number of those through the Yes23 campaign, national spokespeople like Dean Parkin and Jade Ritchie who we will be hearing a whole lot more from in the years ahead.

Respected and emerging leaders in South Australia will continue to carry this torch. There are many, many of them but some of them who have worked so hard and been so prominent over the last few months are people like Sally Scales, Mel Clarke, Dale Agius, Dwayne Coulthard, Ngalangku Tjangu Thomas, Arrin Hazelbane and Jakirah Telfer. These are people who have started

a cause that they will continue and we will be hearing much more of them in the future. To conclude, we will be having these elections.

*There being a disturbance in the gallery.*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Please, the gallery, remain silent.

#### FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

**The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:44):** Supplementary: will the government reconsider their rejection of the children and young persons visitor legislation I put forward early in the year aimed at improving the safety of all children in care, in which Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children are over-represented? You have asked what the alternatives are. Will you reconsider that?

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Game, a supplementary question has to be arising from the answer. I could draw no link at all, so that is not a supplementary question.

#### FEDERAL VOICE TO PARLIAMENT REFERENDUM

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:45):** Supplementary: does the Attorney-General view the result at the weekend as a repudiation and rejection of Indigenous Australians?

*There being a disturbance in the gallery.*

**The PRESIDENT:** Again, can we please be quiet in the gallery.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:45):** I thank the honourable member for his question. No, I don't. I see this, as I said, as the 37<sup>th</sup> time out of 45 attempts that Australians have not wanted to change the constitution. However, I do completely understand how many people do feel that, how many people do feel that the 97 per cent of non-Aboriginal Australians have voted and passed judgement on them. I understand that feeling. I absolutely do; however, this is, in my view, merely Australia's conservative aversion to changing the constitution.

#### FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:45):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about the state-based Voice to Parliament.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** On the day of the referendum in which South Australia's public voted overwhelmingly against an enshrined Federal Voice to Parliament, the Premier posted a tweet informing the South Australian public that he had voted yes. Subsequent comments under that tweet over the next 24 to 48 hours and beyond were overwhelmingly in their disagreement, and included remarks such as the following:

Do the right thing Peter, respect the people's vote. We don't want a voice to parliament in SA.

Time to drop the SA Voice and treat all Australians equally.

Premier Pete, the people have spoken. Time to repeal this divisive legislation which was passed without the people's consent. Now you know the majority are not with you on this.

60% of SA disagrees with you.

Repeal SA Voice!

Seeing as South Australia overwhelmingly rejected the voice, the expectation is now that you remove the state based one.

My question to the minister is: why won't his government listen to the overwhelming majority of South Australians who have voted against a federal enshrined Voice to Parliament, and simply do not want South Australia to go down the path of a similar State Voice?

**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. I am happy to repeat much of what I have said before because the honourable member clearly wasn't

listening. I have to say, if the opposition want to take their policy development ideas from comments on social media they are most welcome to, and that is probably why they will spend the next 20 years out of government. They are most welcome to do that. As I have said, there are significant differences between what we are doing in South Australia and the proposal to change the federal constitution.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition! The Hon. Mrs Henderson! The Hon. Ms Girolamo! Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** There are very significant differences between the two things. In fact, I might quote from a news article report only from today that quotes the Liberal's very own Senator Kerryne Liddle when it says:

But Senator Liddle, an SA Liberal, echoed Mr Malinauskas's distinction between a legislated and a constitutionally enshrined Voice.

It goes on to say:

The difference between the proposed, now-defeated Voice proposition and the SA Voice is that the SA Voice is legislated, not enshrined within the constitution.

Perhaps if the honourable member listened to their own Aboriginal members of their party rather than social media comments they might be slightly more informed. But I tell you what we will continue to do: we will continue to consult with Aboriginal people, with Aboriginal communities, with Aboriginal elders and Aboriginal leaders to come up with our policy in Aboriginal affairs.

I will issue a challenge to the Leader of the Opposition, who will get up and ask the next question. When she gets up and asks the next question, I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to outline their Aboriginal affairs policies. By this time in the last electoral cycle we had announced a whole suite of Aboriginal affairs policies. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to get up—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** —when she gets to her feet, and name just three Aboriginal leaders that the Liberal Party has consulted with in the development of their Aboriginal affairs policy. If the Leader of the Opposition can't do that, it's going to be very telling.

#### FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:49):** Supplementary—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition, you have a supplementary question arising from the answer.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Arising from the answer: did the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs change the South Australian constitution when he legislated for the Voice?

**The PRESIDENT:** You did mention the constitution.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:49):** I thank the honourable member for her question. By an act of parliament, we referenced the Voice in our South Australian constitution. But I would encourage—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** I understand that the honourable Leader of the Opposition here is having a go at her colleague Senator Liddle, and I don't think that's particularly edifying, but that's her choice.

**FEDERAL VOICE TO PARLIAMENT REFERENDUM**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:50):** My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about the federal referendum.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter, you don't have to comment on everything. The honourable Leader of the Opposition, please.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** With the minister's government advocating strongly for the yes campaign and given the significant no vote in regional South Australia, does the minister concede—

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Point of order: the member did not seek leave of this council for the making of a brief explanation, and she has gone into debating rather than directly asking the minister a question. She has not sought leave and she has not been granted leave to go into debating.

**The PRESIDENT:** The honourable Leader of the Opposition, ask your question, please.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Does the minister concede that her government is out of touch with the regions of our state, or does her government think that regional people in South Australia got it wrong?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:51):** I am happy to answer that on behalf of the honourable member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** As Leader of the Government and portfolio holder for Aboriginal affairs—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Let me give one example to the honourable member. In the most remote areas of South Australia, in the APY lands, the vote in favour was in excess of three-quarters—75 per cent. Ta; the end.

**ADELAIDE FILM FESTIVAL**

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about some of the excellent work by First Nations filmmakers on display at this year's Adelaide Film Festival?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:52):** I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. It is always a great pleasure to talk in this chamber about the excellence in our South Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. The Adelaide Film Festival is a standout event on the South Australian events calendar each and every year. Adelaide truly punches above its weight when it comes to attracting this sort of talent at these sorts of festivals.

The Adelaide Film Festival launches tomorrow, and I would like to take this opportunity to share a few of the exciting works on show from First Nations writers, directors and producers. The First Nations First Films event on Sunday at the Mercury Cinema provides a platform for short film forms and up-and-coming talent. There will be three films screened during this event. *Tambo* is one of those, written by Travis Akbar, a man from the Eastern Goldfields of Western Australia. This film is a depiction of a First Nations soldier returned from Gallipoli and the torment he faces after the return.



*Black Time, White Time* will also be screened, a movie written by Tammy Coleman Zweck, a Kokatha screenwriter, producer and director. Tammy is a 2021 Mercury CX Springboard Program scholarship recipient. The film is about a young girl who must quickly learn Auslan in order to communicate with her deaf aunt. The final short film is *The Getaway*, written by emerging Ngarrindjeri and Kurna writer, Adam Jenkins. *The Getaway* is a short horror film where the main character Kyle's silencing of his culture becomes his downfall.

Next Thursday, 26 October, the Adelaide Film Festival Youth Gala will display a number of short films from primary, middle and senior school students. I would particularly like to mention, in the middle school category, *Drive Safely in Mimili*. It was directed by Danna from the Mimili Anangu School on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands. The film stars a number of students from the secondary class, who inform viewers of safety on the road.

Finally, Margaret Pomeranz AM will sit down in conversation on Saturday 21 October with Sally Riley, described as Australia's leading advocate for First Nations voices in film and television. The interview will cover the journey and invaluable work in ensuring that First Nations voices and stories are told and controlled by First Nations artists. I commend all of these worthwhile film projects as part of the Adelaide Film Festival to all South Australians.

### FLAG PROTOCOLS

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:54):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General and the Premier in the other place a question about protocol.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** To my disappointment, while driving through Victoria Square today I noticed the Aboriginal flag was at half-mast alongside the Australian flag at full-mast. The flags atop Parliament House and elsewhere remain at full-mast. State and federal protocols state the appropriate uses and flying of the flags. Flags can only be flown at half-mast together in times of mourning the death of distinguished persons and/or significant national commemorative occasions, such as ANZAC Day. The Australian flag takes precedence.

I understand some sections of the Indigenous community have proclaimed an unofficial week of silence to express their disappointment at the result. However, an official period of mourning has not been declared for any event as far as I am aware, nor has there been a death of an important person in the Indigenous community. I have never witnessed differences in the heights of our flags at once. It was either authorised or the actions of someone acting alone.

What is on display in Victoria Square can be viewed as an affront directed at all Australians following a democratic vote, provoking more division. It's time for our leaders to appeal for calm and understanding. My question to the Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs is:

1. Did he or the government authorise or endorse the Aboriginal flag to be flown at half-mast and for what reason, when the government's own protocol office has accepted guidelines?
2. Can he understand the offence this will cause and is in breach of state and federal protocols?
3. Will the government now direct that proper protocols be followed and flags flown at the appropriate full-mast?

**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 his questions. I am happy to find out, but I suspect the flag the honourable member is referring to is the Adelaide City Council's flag. I am happy to pass on the honourable member's comments to the Adelaide City Council for their information.

### FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on the topic of the state-based Voice to Parliament.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE:** During the debate and committee stage of the government's state-based Voice, the minister said, and I quote:

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.

He further stated:

Getting this bedded down is our first priority, but we absolutely are committed to the other components of Treaty and Truth.

My question to the minister is: is the government still committed to implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart in full—in full—here in South Australia with Voice, Treaty and Truth, including the Makarrata agreements and reparations, and, if so, when?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:58):** I thank the honourable member for her question. I was tempted just to answer yes and then sit back down, but I might give a slightly fuller answer. As the honourable member correctly points out, way back in 2019—that would have been a few months ago in this stage of the electoral cycle—we did release a commitment to the implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart in a South Australian context. We did the first part of that in line with many of those who gathered at Uluru in May of 2017, sequenced it with Voice as the first component.

We have passed that legislation. On 16 March next year, there will be elections where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people will get to choose from their own who represents them in a series of Local Voices, and those Local Voices will decide who sits on the statewide Voice to our parliament and to our government. This is very similar to the quotes I read out earlier, eerily similar to what the Liberal Party had said numerous times over the last two years.

Once the Voice is up and running, we intend to consult with the Voice about the process for Treaty and Truth. We started way back in 2016, the first jurisdiction anywhere in the country, a Treaty process in South Australia. We consulted with Aboriginal nations, Aboriginal communities and Aboriginal people and we got a fair way along. We had intense discussions and negotiations with Adnyamathanha, with Narrunga and with Ngarrindjeri nations about those treaties. We signed the Buthera Agreement with the Narrunga Nation before the last state election. We led the country in Treaty discussions and Treaty implementation.

Unfortunately, there was an election and, as so often happens and so devastatingly happens for Aboriginal people, there was an about face. There were two steps forward and two steps backward when the incoming government, the new Premier, Steven Marshall, who had responsibility for Aboriginal affairs, wasn't prepared to take on the title of minister for Aboriginal affairs, but had responsibility for the policy areas—his very first decision was to scrap the Treaty process in South Australia.

Since then, we have seen most other jurisdictions take up the mantle. Victoria are very well progressed with their First Peoples' Assembly. They had their second four-yearly elections for the First Peoples' Assembly that represent Aboriginal Victorians in their Treaty discussions with the government. Queensland has committed to Treaty discussions with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Queensland. The Northern Territory have released their Treaty Commission report. The incoming New South Wales government has committed to Treaty and has a minister responsible for the implementation of Treaty in that state. In Western Australia, the South West Native Title agreement, the Noongar Settlement, has every single element of a Treaty except in the name.

We are now shamefully lagging behind the rest of Australia on Treaty, and we intend to remedy that. We intend to consult with our elected First Nations Voice about the processes going forward. That won't be the Treaty negotiating body but we will seek their views about the processes going forward, and we are committed to truth-telling. Yes, we are committed to the implementation in full.

*There being a disturbance in the gallery:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

### **REGIONAL INVESTMENT PIPELINE DATA**

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:02):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the regional investment pipeline data included in Regional Development South Australia's recently published Regional Blueprint 2023, and explain how the government's policies are tailored at supporting regional investment and economic development?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:02):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Each year, the Regional Development Australia Network in South Australia publishes regional investment data as part of its Regional Blueprint. This data provides a rigorous calculation of the regional investment intentions of both the public and private sectors over the next five-year period.

In 2023, the RDA network assessed more than 1,000 proposed projects to estimate the state's regional investment pipeline at a staggering \$62.56 billion. This represents a significant increase on the \$44.6 billion figure calculated last year. In fact, what we have seen since the regional investment pipeline figures were first published in September 2020 is a steady and significant increase from the \$27.8 billion figure calculated at that time. What this indicates is a growing confidence in the economic potential of regional South Australia across a range of industry sectors.

The 2023 data reveals that the most significant capital investment opportunities are associated with the renewable energy, manufacturing and mining projects located in the northern parts of the state. These investments will contribute to the fulfillment of a key mission outlined in the South Australian Economic Statement, namely to capitalise on the global green transition by using the state's sustainability credentials and natural endowment to provide green energy, products and services to the world.

Across the rest of the state's regions, major investments are also planned in agriculture, wine, food and beverage processing, tourism, creative industries, health care and social assistance. I was asked how the government's policies are targeted at supporting this regional investment and economic development. We know that many regional businesses continue to grapple with challenges such as those associated with the shortages in skills and housing, so I will just briefly outline investment in those two areas. The government has:

- invested \$10.2 million to establish the Regional Skills Development Fund to ensure that TAFE SA can offer more courses in rural and regional South Australia, courses which align with the needs of local industry;
- invested \$3.5 million over five years for a dedicated Office for Regional Housing to work with local government, economic development agencies, and employers to address housing shortages in regions; and
- amended planning regulations to fast track the construction of temporary work accommodation in certain regional locations.

The ongoing delivery of regional investment will continue to be driven by collaboration between federal, state and local governments in addition to businesses, peak bodies and the RDA network. I would like to thank the RDA network for compiling the data and insights that are contained in the Regional Blueprint, in particular the regional investment pipeline, which is a very valuable resource for all stakeholders involved in supporting regional development.

### **ABORIGINAL REMAINS, RIVERLEA PARK**

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:05):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question regarding Aboriginal heritage and the Buckland Park housing development Riverlea.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** On Thursday 28 September, I asked the minister a question regarding Aboriginal remains discovered at the new Riverlea estate in the Walker Buckland Park

development north of Adelaide. It had been estimated that at least 31 individuals had been uncovered in two areas and that more than 1,200 artefacts, including spear and boomerang tips, had been found in the development.

I thank the minister for his letter dated 11 October addressing my concerns regarding issuing a stop-work order to ensure that discoveries were managed with cultural sensitivity, respect and in accordance with the Aboriginal Heritage Act. However, it has since been stated online that some individuals may have taken Aboriginal artefacts home as souvenirs. 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. This offence carries a penalty of \$10,000 or six months' imprisonment.

My question to the minister is: can the minister please advise whether or not this so-called 'souveniring' has taken place and, if so, what action has the minister or his department taken to ensure the safe retrieval of those artefacts as well as to address that situation?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:07):** I thank the honourable member for her question and for her advocacy over many years for Aboriginal people in South Australia.

In relation to the question the honourable member asks about the removal of items from the Riverlea development area, I am not aware of any such removal of items. I am advised, as I mentioned in my ministerial statement, that the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation department is in regular contact with the Kurna Yerta Aboriginal Corporation and the developer as well as onsite Kurna monitors. I am informed that discussions happen multiple times a day on many occasions. I am also informed that the remains are closely monitored and are securely stored inside the development compound with a security presence, I am advised, 24 hours a day.

As I said, I am not aware of any evidence for an assertion that may have appeared online. I occasionally get informed of assertions that have appeared online in relation to this as well as other projects and other things that occur; often it is something someone has heard that has been put up online. Such is the nature of social media.

If there were any instances of removal of Aboriginal remains or the disturbance of Aboriginal heritage occurring outside of any authorisation, that would likely constitute an offence under the Aboriginal Heritage Act, and I would like to reaffirm, in unequivocal terms, that anyone who does that would open themselves up to prosecution under that legislation.

### REGIONAL RADIATION TREATMENT SERVICES

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:08):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Given that the minister's government is visiting the seat of MacKillop next week, can the people of the South-East expect the state government to make any announcement about delivering radiotherapy services?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:09):** I thank the honourable member for her question. It is certainly the case that cabinet will be visiting the South-East next week; we have a country cabinet located in Naracoorte.

Country cabinet, of course, is something we reinstated, as a government, upon winning the election in March last year, and it is something that continues to be widely appreciated, as evidenced by the most recent one held up in the Hills, which had pretty much standing room only. I think it was over 600 people attending the forum.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Unfortunately, we hear those opposite snickering and laughing and making comments about the fact that the Hills community was listened to by our government, which is something that I think the Hills community will be very interested to hear about the way that they are viewed by those opposite. In fact, regional residents overall have spoken on a number of occasions in various places about how much they value country cabinet and how disappointed they were with the Liberal government when they were in government, because they refused to engage in that sort of forum and—

**The PRESIDENT:** You may want to talk about the topic.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Sorry?

**The PRESIDENT:** You may want to talk to the answer.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** She asked me about country cabinet in MacKillop next week, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** It's a serious question about radiotherapy.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** And, yes, they have certainly said how much they appreciate it and how disappointed they were with the Liberals axing it when they were in government. Of course, that was reflected in some of the reports that came out post-election from the Liberals saying how out of touch they were—the Liberals were—with the various country communities and how they didn't want to listen. In terms of the radiation therapy—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! We are now talking about the radiotherapy, so silence.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** In terms of the radiation therapy, members might recall that this was something that was put forward—there was federal funding available—in the term of the previous Liberal government, but the then state Liberal government didn't wish to proceed with it, so they didn't progress it any further. Since coming to government, the Malinauskas Labor government has actually put in place steps to investigate the feasibility of a radiation treatment centre in the South-East, and that process is ongoing.

As far as I am aware, that hasn't yet had a report issued. Certainly, I will take that on notice and ask the Minister for Health in the other place whether there is any report released, but to my understanding that is not the case as yet. But certainly, I am really pleased that the Malinauskas Labor government has taken some action to progress this, remembering that it was the Liberals, both state and federal, who refused this particular project.

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** They walked away.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** They walked away from it. They did nothing in terms of actually progressing whether it was feasible, what would need to be in place, what would be required for safety. None of that was done under the Liberal government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:**—but then two years later they decide to play politics, as we have seen with a number of other very important issues: they chose to play politics with people's suffering from cancer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** That is what we have from those opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** What we have from our government is actually making progress—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Sit down. The minister will conclude her remarks and she will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** So what we see from our government is actually steps to progress this, to see whether it's feasible, to see what would be required for it to be an effective and safe service. I look forward to that outcome.

#### **REGIONAL RADIATION TREATMENT SERVICES**

**The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:12):** Supplementary: does the minister still believe that radiotherapy services in the regions are unsafe?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:13):** In my answer I didn't say there were radiation therapy services in the South-East currently that are unsafe.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

#### **REGIONAL RADIATION TREATMENT SERVICES**

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:13):** Supplementary: what advocacy has the minister undertaken for the 20,000-plus constituents who have been calling for these facilities?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:13):** I have had a number of interactions with the Minister for Health, with also the local group that was set up. In fact, there was a meeting here in Parliament House, which I attended with also the Minister for Health. I am very pleased that there are steps being taken to look at how such a service might operate in a regional context in the South-East and that we are doing some work on it, the work that those opposite and their predecessors failed to do.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STOLEN GENERATIONS ABORIGINAL CORPORATION**

**The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:14):** My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister please inform the council about the recent funding boost to the South Australian Stolen Generations Aboriginal Corporation?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:14):** I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. The issue of addressing the wrongs of the past, particularly through the stolen generations, is one of great importance to all of this state and this whole country. The deliberate removal of Aboriginal children in the decades and centuries gone past for no other reason than that they were Aboriginal children is one of the most shameful episodes in this nation's history—in any nation's history.

We have been doing what we can in recent years to try to redress these past wrongs. In 2015, we became the first mainland state to introduce a Stolen Generations Reparation Scheme, but no amount of reparation, no amount of saying sorry, no amount of tributes will make up for the hurt of the past.

The Stolen Generations Aboriginal Corporation provides family tracing, reunion and counselling services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and their families who have been separated by the events of the stolen generations. The Stolen Generations Aboriginal Corporation ensures that survivors have an ability and representation to have input into the decisions that continue to affect their lives. The corporation works closely with organisations like State Records to provide services to Aboriginal people to assist with searching records and coordinating visits to the site and to ensure that these individuals are able to piece together as much of their histories as possible.

Research clearly indicates that stolen generation survivors face poorer health and wellbeing outcomes even than other Aboriginal people, have a higher likelihood of being incarcerated and are more likely to be victims of abuse and violent crimes. Achieving better outcomes for members and survivors of the stolen generations is crucial. As I have said, no action today could remedy the failings of the past, but the hard work of the South Australian Stolen Generations Aboriginal Corporation is so critical to assisting the many hundreds of survivors of the stolen generations who reside in South Australia and providing them with compassionate and culturally appropriate support.

It was with great pleasure that my government was recently able to provide funding of \$100,000 to boost what the corporation does to strengthen their advocacy and support. I want to particularly pass on my very strong admiration and my sincere thanks for what the Stolen Generations Aboriginal Corporation has done for members of their community and what they do for South Australia.

*There being a disturbance in the gallery:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

### **MOUNT GAMBIER MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

**The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:17):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Health, regarding mental health services in Mount Gambier.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.L. GAME:** I have been contacted by residents of Mount Gambier, who have raised concerns about mental health issues affecting the local community. I have been made aware of the lack of adequate mental health support for young people experiencing issues that require early intervention to prevent serious mental health consequences. There are long waiting lists to access mental health services, with reports of some appointments taking up to a year. Unless children and young people are experiencing an acute mental health episode, there is nowhere to access early intervention. This is contributing to long-term mental illness. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Why isn't the government doing more to address mental health issues affecting our young people in regional South Australia, and why is there not a greater emphasis on early intervention?
2. Is the government aware of waiting times taking up to a year for mental health services for young people in Mount Gambier?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:18):** I thank the honourable member for her question. As the minister representing the Minister for Health in this chamber, I will be happy to pass those questions along to my colleague in the other place and bring back a reply.

### **FEDERAL VOICE TO PARLIAMENT REFERENDUM**

**The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:18):** My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding regional South Australia. Is the minister concerned that her local area of Port MacDonnell had a result in the recent referendum of some 81 per cent no vote, indicating that she is out of touch with her own area, or does she think that the vast majority of voters in her area got it wrong?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18):** The reason for having—

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Point of order: the minister does not have ministerial responsibility for her electorate's voting patterns. If the member wishes to ask a question of the minister directly, she needs to cite the correct standing order, which she does not know the number of—and I am not going to tell you.

**The PRESIDENT:** No. The Hon. Ms Franks—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order, the Hon. Ms Franks! That's enough. We have heard from you. The question has been asked. The minister can provide an answer if and how she sees fit, as is per the norm in this place.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Thank you, Mr President. I thank the honourable member for her question because that is the customary thing to do, but for no other reason, I must say. I am very pleased that democracy is part of our nation's make-up. I'm very pleased that we have referenda when there is a significant item to be debated. I am very disappointed with the outcome of the referendum overall, but the fact that we have referenda and that we are a democratic country is something that we should all be very pleased with.

#### FEDERAL VOICE TO PARLIAMENT REFERENDUM

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:20):** Supplementary.

**The PRESIDENT:** I will listen to it but it has to come from the answer.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Does the minister understand the difference between a federal referendum and federal parliament and the state parliament?

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

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:20):** I thank the honourable member for her question, and I think implicit in that question is a suggestion that those opposite do not. It was a federal referendum that we had at the weekend, and we have been talking about a State Voice to Parliament which was legislated—two very different things.

#### OLD MURRAY BRIDGE REOPENING

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:20):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister tell the house about the recent reopening of the Old Murray Bridge two-way traffic?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:21):** I thank the member for his question. It was a pleasure to be in Murray Bridge a few weekends ago now at the community event to celebrate the reopening of two-way traffic to the Old Murray Bridge. It was a great turnout on a beautiful spring day. Many took the opportunity to walk across the bridge, in fact, and to see the work for themselves. The bridge was still closed at that time. The RSL, where festivities continued after the official proceedings and ribbon cutting, was full of families and people enjoying the free activities and a catch-up.

The reopening of two-way traffic on the bridge, which was built in 1879, had been much anticipated by locals, especially those living on the eastern side, and others who use the bridge regularly. Many have patiently waited on numerous occasions while the hardworking traffic controllers ensured safe, one-way passage across the bridge while work was continuing.

I was told how the traffic controllers had become very well-known to passers-by and to local people. There were many chats and waves and offers of coffee, which I must say is not usual perhaps when there are delays to traffic and so on, so that is certainly a tribute to them. Also, the kindness of others was no doubt appreciated on what I am sure must have been very long shifts at times over the past year: hot days, cold days and, of course, very wet days. One of the traffic controllers, Aaron Wilson, told the media that he likened the crossing to a dry ferry, which is quite an apt way I guess of describing the commute across the bridge over the past year and a bit.

Despite the challenges that were caused by the recent floods and the need to revise the timetable for completion because of those events, the bridge was opened to two-way traffic before its revised completion date, and the only remaining works are occurring under the bridge and they will not impact on traffic.

The project was led by South Australian company McMahon Services and has now extended the bridge's life by an estimated 30 years. It included repainting, which is important for long-term corrosion protection as well as heritage amenity, repointing of stonework, upgraded LED lighting, upgrades to footpath and pedestrian access, structural repairs and upgrades, and the installation of interpretive signage to recognise the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal history of the area, amongst other work undertaken.



There are some quite impressive stats in regard to the project: 143,055 working hours; 20 per cent of participation hours were by Aboriginal people; there were nearly 500 apprentice hours; over \$2 million was spent with local small businesses and suppliers; there were 14,537 litres of paint used; 1.2 kilometres of new kerb was installed; and 11,000 vehicles per day crossing while the work was underway. This work has not only ensured the structural integrity of the bridge for another generation but it has also maintained and preserved its rich history as the first bridge to span the Murray in South Australia.

As Rural City of Murray Bridge Mayor Wayne Thorley said on the day, 'This is our bridge.' I think that sentiment highlights the importance of this critical infrastructure to a town that is growing and evolving, not only in the way they see themselves as a community but also in how the rest of the state is recognising the great things that are happening in Murray Bridge and its townships.

I congratulate and thank all the workers on the project, the public servants, McMahon Services and everyone else involved who have done a fantastic job. I also thank those who organised and attended the great community event a few weeks ago.

#### **LOWER RIVER MURRAY LEVEES**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:24):** Supplementary: when is the government going to release funding for levee management along the Lower Murray, particularly around Murray Bridge?

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, you can choose to answer.

*The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** She is choosing not to answer.

#### **OLD MURRAY BRIDGE REOPENING**

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:25):** Supplementary question arising from the original answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter! The honourable leader! Silence!

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Does the minister have responsibility either for the bridge or for the weather conditions in Murray Bridge that day?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

#### **SECOND GENERATION ANTICOAGULANT RODENTICIDES**

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:26):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** There has been an increase in small native animals consuming poisoned rodents, resulting in secondary poisoning. Second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides, also known as SGARs, contain a blood-thinning chemical that can remain active for months and animals that consume it can suffer an excruciating death. It is used for pest animal management. Poisoned rodents effectively become toxic time bombs that spread poison that can kill other animals.

Recent Australian studies have found dangerous and even fatal levels of SGARs in dead birds of prey, including southern boobooks, wedge-tailed eagles and powerful owls. Further local and international studies implicate SGARs in the deaths of native wildlife like birds, reptiles and mammals, as well as beloved pet cats and dogs.

Without realising it, councils themselves are often contributing to this problem by using SGARs to control rodents in council-managed buildings and spaces, particularly in regional areas. These dangerous chemicals are already heavily regulated or banned in the USA, Canada and

Europe, as well as some councils across Australia, which are taking their own action to protect their local areas from the threat of SGARs.

However, in South Australia, SGARs are available for anyone to purchase in supermarkets and hardware stores and it could be argued that these products shouldn't be available to the public or in use at all. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can she provide the council any information about what guidance her department gives for the use of SGARs?
2. Has she had discussions with regard to this at a federal level in the ministerial meetings?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:28):** I thank the honourable member for her question. I am happy to take on notice the first question, which is in regard to whether the department issues any guidance. A number of chemicals—in fact the majority of course—are governed by federal regulations, but other jurisdictions and other bodies can be involved in providing advice and so on.

To my recollection, it hasn't been discussed at the agricultural ministers meetings since I became minister in March last year as a specific in terms of SGARs. Certainly, I will look into that further and bring back any information that I can to the chamber.

#### FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

**The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:29):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON:** Before the referendum the Prime Minister, when speaking with the ABC, ruled out legislating a Voice if the referendum failed when he said, and I quote:

If Australians vote no, I don't believe it would be appropriate to then go and say, 'Oh, well, you've had your say, but we're going to legislate anyway.'

On 28 September, minister, you were asked if you would listen to South Australians if they vote no, and repeal your State First Nations Voice, or if you would reject the results of the referendum on 14 October. You said that regardless of what happens with the vote on 14 October you will be keeping your election commitment to implement the Uluru Statement. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given that 64.7 per cent of South Australians voted no in the referendum, why won't you listen to South Australians?
2. Why are you pushing ahead and disregarding their vote at the referendum?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:30):** I thank the honourable member for her question. In response to question one, it is our policy and it is overwhelmingly supported by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, communities and leaders in South Australia. I can't remember the second question.

#### FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

**The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:30):** Supplementary question: I will remind the minister that the second question was why are you pushing ahead and disregarding the overwhelming vote of South Australians?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:30):** We're not.

#### TARNANTHI FESTIVAL

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:30):** My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about the Tarnanthi Festival for 2023 launching later on this week?

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** On Thursday night.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:31):** I thank the honourable member for his question and his continued interest in this area. The annual Tarnanthi Festival in 2023 will launch, as the Hon. Ian Hunter behind me has suggested, on Thursday 19 October, later this week, and is sure to be—as it always is—one of the highlights on the South Australian cultural and arts calendar.

Tarnanthi, presented by the Art Gallery of South Australia with support from the government of South Australia, provides an opportunity for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander artists from right across Australia to display stories of their culture through art. I have mentioned a number of times in this chamber the importance of art in Aboriginal culture and Aboriginal communities. It does a whole range of things.

It provides valuable income for people, people who often don't get to use their culture in a way that is self-determinative and provides them with an income. It also is a way to keep stories alive, to keep culture going from generation to generation. The institutions that are built up like Tarnanthi and other Aboriginal art institutions provide, on multiple levels, exceptionally important outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

In addition to exhibitions at the Art Gallery, the festival is comprised of an art fair, artist talks, performances, workshops, education programs and activities. There is something for nearly everyone at the festival, and is a generous invitation to the broader community to share in the richness and beauty of the oldest living culture we have on this planet. The program is almost overwhelming in how exciting the events are, but I am happy to outline just a few of them for the council.

This Thursday, the festival will be launched at the Art Gallery with a keynote address by Nayuku Puurka-ku Robert Fielding from the community of Mimili and a musical performance by talented singer-songwriter Dan Sultan. At Light Square in Adelaide, at what is going to be called Light Adelaide, attendees can catch Rising Sun, a multimedia storytelling project that documents and shares the stories of the Adnyamathanha culture. Rising Sun is comprised of four contemporary photographic stories by over a dozen artists, each of which invites the viewer into the beauty of the Flinders Ranges and surrounds and, in doing so, highlights the importance and power of Adnyamathanha land and culture.

At the JamFactory studio, Ernabella Arts are presenting an exhibition of ceramic works by several artists from their centre in a celebration over 20 years of ceramic works. It is a real pleasure that Ernabella Arts is at the JamFactory. I have certainly had members of that community talk to me over the last few months about their excitement at being at the JamFactory studio. Ernabella Arts is the oldest continuing Aboriginal arts centre anywhere in the country, having been established somewhere in either 1948 or 1946, and is an absolute essential hub of that community.

I was very honoured in August of this year when I was on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands to call into Ernabella Arts centre to announce in excess of \$700,000 additional funding for that arts centre to allow a significant increase of the exhibition area, of the waddy room of the men's artists room, and for the first time for proper insulation and air conditioning in the ceramics studio out the back of the Ernabella Arts centre.

I look forward to the Ernabella Arts centre continuing to lead the way in so many areas, as it has in the past with painting and textiles over the past 20 to 30 years and now as a leader in the ceramics movement from around Australia's Aboriginal arts world.

Finally, our regions aren't forgotten. As part of the Tarnanthi Festival, for example, *Saltbush Country* will be on display at the Port Pirie Regional Art Gallery. This exhibition will display the works of Aboriginal artists working independently across regional South Australia. These works have been supported as a result of Tarnanthi's and Country Arts SA community workshops and mentoring for artists across these regions. I highly recommend to members of this chamber and to the South Australian public the excellent displays of culture and talent that will be on as part of the Tarnanthi Festival, celebrating Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts and culture.

*Parliamentary Procedure***STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:36):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move motions without notice concerning the appointment of members to the Legislative Review Committee, the Statutory Authorities Review Committee and the Social Development Committee.

**The PRESIDENT:** I note the absolute majority.

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:36):** I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. R.B. Martin be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos (resigned).

Motion carried.

**STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:36):** I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. T.T. Ngo be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. R.B. Martin (resigned).

Motion carried.

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:36):** I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. M. El Dannawi be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos (resigned).

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Procedure***STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:37):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move motions without notice concerning the substitution of members on the select committees on the Gig Economy, the Return to Work SA Scheme and Budget and Finance.

**The PRESIDENT:** I note the absolute majority.

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Committees***SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE GIG ECONOMY**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:37):** I move:

That the Hon. M. El Dannawi be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos (resigned).

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE RETURN TO WORK SA SCHEME**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:37):** I move:

That the Hon. M. El Dannawi be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos (resigned).

Motion carried.

**BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:38):** I move:

That the Hon. M. El Dannawi be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos (resigned).

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Procedure***STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:38):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

**The PRESIDENT:** I note the absolute majority.

Motion carried.

*Motions***ISRAEL**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:38):** I move:

That this council—

1. Unequivocally condemns the attacks on Israel by Hamas, which are the heinous acts of terrorists, and have encompassed the targeting and murder of civilians, including women and children, the taking of hostages and indiscriminate rocket fire;
2. Stands with Israel and recognises its inherent right to defend itself;
3. Condemns antisemitism and recognises that generations of Jewish people have been subjected to this hateful prejudice;
4. Calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all hostages;
5. Recognises that Hamas does not represent the Palestinian people, nor their legitimate needs and aspirations;
6. Acknowledges the devastating loss of Israeli and Palestinian life and that innocent civilians on all sides are suffering as a result of the attacks by Hamas and the subsequent conflict;
7. Supports justice and freedom for Israelis and Palestinians alike;
8. Supports international efforts to establish and maintain humanitarian access into Gaza, including safe passage for civilians;
9. Reiterates Australia's consistent position in all contexts is to call for the protection of civilian lives and the observance of international law;
10. Acknowledges what has unfolded is deeply distressing for many in the South Australian community, close to the heart of many, and it is important that we maintain respect for each other here at home as people express their views;
11. Condemns all forms of hate speech and violent extremist activity, including antisemitism and Islamophobia;
12. Recognises an attack on any religion is an attack on all religions and that we all share a responsibility to unite, condemn and defeat such an attack on our common values and way of life; and

13. Affirms in the strongest possible terms that hateful prejudice has no place in South Australia.

I move this motion on behalf of the government in this place. It is with a heavy heart that I acknowledge that on Saturday 7 October the terrorist group Hamas launched a series of coordinated attacks upon the people of Israel along the Gaza Strip, killing over a thousand civilians and taking hundreds of hostages in what is a deadly militant assault in the life of the nation.

This was an unambiguous attack, an act of terrorism against the state of Israel and its people, and an act of hate against the Jewish people, with the attacks timed to coincide with a day of Jewish celebration. Since then, the situation in Gaza has become one of blood and terror, with casualties rising by the hour.

I want to say plainly that we condemn Hamas for their acts of indiscriminate violence and murder. To the people of the region, we offer our great sympathy. We share your anger, your sorrow and your outrage. There has been devastating loss of life, Israeli and Palestinian alike, in the war zone that Gaza has become.

We recognise the right of Israel to defend itself from attack, even as we continue to support solutions that would allow the people of the region to live together in peace and mutual recognition. This motion seeks to convey a clear message that the Parliament of South Australia and the people of South Australia wish fervently for peace in the Middle East and the return to a rules-based order.

We support the international humanitarian efforts being made to aid the people of Gaza, and we call for the establishment of corridors to allow safe passage for aid workers, civilians and critical goods alike. We join the international call for the immediate release of all hostages held by Hamas, and we continue to advocate for adherence to the international law and for the protection of civilian lives as a matter of clear and urgent priority.

We also recognise that many South Australians have family, friends and communities in the region, and we know that they are experiencing immense personal distress through this dark and difficult time. Here in South Australia, we must continue to show respect for one another regardless of individual views on the conflict and reiterate that there is no place for hate speech or extremist violence in our peaceful state. With this motion, the South Australian parliament expresses hope for a swift end to this violent conflict and its horrific cost on human lives, and wishes for peace, freedom and justice to prevail for Israelis and Palestinians who call the region home.

The state government, as is the case with the commonwealth, supports the long-term pursuit of a two-state solution being realised as being the only practical means to recognise the deep connection that Palestinian people have with the land in that part of the world and the right of Israel to exist peacefully without the fear of elimination, as is the policy position currently held by other states that it borders, including the leadership of Hamas. We know that Hamas does not represent the Palestinian people.

Israel has the right to exist peacefully and to be a proud liberal democracy that it is, and the Palestinian people deserve a prosperous future with a connection to parts of the land that they naturally call home.

A two-state solution is something that this state endorses but today we make clear that any act of terrorism is not something that this parliament will bear witness to without standing against. I hope this parliament will endorse this motion to send the clearest possible signal that this parliament stands for peace and to extend our very great sympathy to all those affected by this devastating conflict.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:44):** The Israeli-Hamas conflict is a deeply entrenched and complex issue that has spanned decades, rooted in historical, political and religious disputes. It revolves around the struggle for control over land, resources and sovereignty in the region, primarily between the nation of Israel and Hamas, a Palestinian terrorist organisation. While it is important to recognise the profound historical grievances on both sides, fostering respect is crucial to moving towards a more peaceful and equitable resolution.

Hamas, the Palestinian terrorist organisation, has long been a destabilising force in the Middle East, earning widespread condemnation for its actions that have consistently undermined

peace and stability in the region. Hamas is unequivocally condemned for its indiscriminate rocket attacks on the Israeli civilian populations. For years, the organisation has launched thousands of rockets from densely populated areas within the Gaza Strip, using Palestinian civilians as human shields and jeopardising their lives. Such tactics violate fundamental principles of humanity and international law.

It is a sad fact that part of the Israeli building code is that all residences must be built with a bomb shelter. Regardless of religious or ethnic background, Jew or Arab, all who live and work in the nation of Israel do so with that constant fear. Furthermore, Hamas's refusal to recognise the state of Israel's right to exist and its explicit commitment to Israel's destruction demonstrates a dangerous and intransigent stance.

True peace can only be achieved through mutual recognition, negotiation and compromise, yet the obstinacy of Hamas, an internationally condemned terrorist organisation, perpetuates the cycle of violence and distrust. The organisation's use of terror tactics such as suicide bombings and, as earlier mentioned, using vulnerable Palestinian families as human shields, has led to countless deaths and suffering on both sides of the conflict. Many Palestinians are dead. The Israeli body count is not higher only because they have the world's most effective air defence system.

The reprehensible acts of Hamas have left a trail of destruction and misery, further deepening the division in the region. Hamas's government in the Gaza Strip has been marked by authoritarianism, curbing free speech and suppressing dissent. Human rights abuses and political oppression have become all too common under its rule, leaving Palestinian civilians vulnerable to oppression. Moreover, Hamas's diversion of international aid and resources toward military efforts rather than the welfare of its own people has exacerbated the dire humanitarian conditions in Gaza.

The organisation's mismanagement has resulted in a lack of basic services and economic opportunities for the Palestinian population. They are sentencing their own people to poverty and neglect. Hamas's actions have consistently hindered the pursuit of a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. True peace and justice can only be achieved by condemning and holding Hamas accountable for its actions, recognising the organisation's role in perpetuating suffering, instability and violence in the region.

Israelis have a legitimate right to secure borders and self-determination, and we stand with Israel and recognise its inherent right to defend itself. The recent unprovoked attacks by Hamas have undoubtedly been a deeply distressing and painful experience for the Jewish community worldwide. It is with a heavy heart that we acknowledge the profound emotional impact these events have on survivors and descendants of the Holocaust.

The memory of that horrific period in history still looms large. The extermination of six million Jewish people should never be forgotten. The recent violence perpetrated by Hamas undoubtedly brings back painful memories and anguish. Hamas's attack on 7 October, one that was unprovoked and very deliberate in its targeting of civilians, murdering and capturing men, women and children, sent shockwaves around the globe.

We, the Liberal Party of South Australia, today offer our heartfelt sympathy and support during this challenging time. The trauma and scars left by the Holocaust are indelible, and witnessing innocent civilians in Israel facing the ongoing prospect of rocket attacks, machine-gun fire and kidnappings is a stark reminder of the resilience and strength the Jewish people have demonstrated throughout history.

We join with the Jewish community in commemorating the memory of the Holocaust victims and remain committed to promoting tolerance, understanding and peaceful coexistence as a means to prevent such tragedies from recurring. In times like these it is essential to come together, to support one another and to continue advocating for peace and justice.

The world must condemn the unprovoked attacks and work towards a lasting and just solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Our thoughts are with the Jewish community as they navigate these distressing circumstances. We stand in solidarity with you, emphasising the importance of preserving the memory of the Holocaust and preventing any recurrence of such dark chapters in human history.

Respect can pave the way for meaningful dialogue and negotiations, but this cannot happen with Hamas at the helm of Palestine. A lack of respect often leads to intransigence, with each side refusing to engage in meaningful talks due to perceived slights or disrespect. By approaching the conflict with respect, with diplomats and not terrorists leading the way, leaders and negotiators can create an environment conducive to productive dialogue, increasing the chances of finding common ground and sustainable solutions.

I am not beyond the hope that this can and will occur. Respecting the human rights of both Israelis and Palestinians is essential. Recognising the humanity and rights of every individual, regardless of their ethnicity or nationality, is a fundamental aspect of international law and ethical principles. It is also a fundamental Liberal belief. A respect for freedom and human rights, including the right to life, security and dignity, must underpin any resolution to the conflict.

I trust that Hamas can and will be defeated, that Palestinian people can be represented in their homeland not by terrorists but by diplomats, and I trust that they will be accepted by neighbours on all sides, not blocked by Jordan, Egypt or Syria, where the doors are shut hard against them. I trust there will come a day when Israeli people will not need to live with the world's best air defence system, where part of their building code is that each residential house needs to be built with a bomb shelter attached. It is a reality I cannot fathom and it breaks my heart that people live in these situations.

True and lasting peace can only be achieved when there is a willingness to engage in constructive dialogue and a commitment to uphold human rights, something which seems impossible to achieve with Hamas in control. By fostering respect for the legitimate concerns and rights of everyone who lives in Israel, the international community can contribute to a more peaceful and just resolution to this longstanding conflict.

In South Australia we must do our part to call for calm in our migrant populations. We have a wonderful multicultural community here. Many are hurting, and we must ensure that hate speech plays no part in our society, that violent extremist activity does not seep its way into our social fabric. Antisemitism must be condemned. Islamophobia must be unacceptable. I repeat that true peace and justice can only be achieved by condemning and holding Hamas accountable for its actions on both the people of Israel and the Palestinian population they claim to protect.

To finish, I submit a sombre warning: proportionality is a badly overused word in this conflict. Hamas is a terror organisation. The verified reports and eyewitness accounts are shocking. Hamas disguises their attackers in Israeli defence force uniforms and lures Israelis out of safety to be tortured. They are raping women in front of their children. They are going from house to house, smoking people out and shooting them on the street. They use entire apartment blocks of families as the base for firing rockets, turning the building into an active military target.

October 7 was the single worst act against Jewish people since Hitler, and it is shameful that Hamas continues to bring those atrocities upon the Jewish and Palestinian people who live and work in Israel. What proportionality is there when all Hamas wants is to exterminate every Jewish person from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea? I pray for peace for Israel and an end to Hamas's terror.

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

#### *Bills*

### **SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION (COMMENCEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September 2023.)

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:55):** The Social Workers Registration Act 2021, which was passed in 2021, intended to establish and maintain a registration system for social workers and to safeguard the public interest by ensuring that only suitably trained



and qualified persons can practice as social workers. This sector has been advocating for registration for over 20 years now.

This act was a long time coming, and it is a little frustrating to see its enactment delayed once more. Social workers operating in the public departments of health, human services, child protection and education, as well as plenty of private and non-profit operators, are asking for the same security and assurances as other registered professionals.

This amendment bill is being introduced seeking to defer the legislation's commencement date to a time set by proclamation. To certify that an operational registration scheme is in place at the time the act commences, the bill is structured to ensure that the foundations have been properly laid for the scheme prior to the commencement of the act. The amendment bill will make an amendment to section 68 of the act to ensure that the regulation-making power of the principal act is maintained in the act as amended.

The transitional provisions would enable the registration scheme to be introduced using a staged approach. Additionally, it could be argued that the staged implementation approach would prioritise systems and structures to make it consistent with a future national approach. Specifically, this bill we are dealing with today, the Social Workers Registration (Commencement) Amendment Bill 2023, is intended to amend two sections of the Social Workers Registration Act 2021.

The first amendment is to amend 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. The second amendment makes a substantial amendment to the transitional regulation-making power in section 68 of the principal act to reflect the amendment made by this measure.

The Liberal Party supports this bill. It is important to ensure safety and security for both practising social workers and those they serve. We do have some questions for the committee stage, particularly around the need for this bill and the need for the deferring of the legislation's commencement date. Having been advocated for by the industry for approximately 20 years now, and the legislation having been worked on thoroughly from 2018 to 2022, we believe that the former minister, working with current colleagues such as the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Connie Bonaros, got it right.

So, indeed, we will have a question or two in the committee stage, as I am sure my hardworking colleagues will have also, about why the delay in the commencement is required, but with that, I commend the bill to the chamber.

**The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:59):** I rise briefly to support this bill. This bill amends the Social Workers Registration Act 2021. The Social Workers Registration Act 2021 was assented to on 9 December 2021 and 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.

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.

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.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:00):** I begin my remarks by acknowledging the extraordinary and valuable work that the Australian Association of Social Workers and its members do each and every day. It may surprise members of the community but it is no surprise to members of this council that there is currently no form of legal professional registration for social workers in Australia, despite many organisations, parties, reports and individuals calling for this reform for decades.

I introduced my original bill in 2018 to ensure the registration of social workers in this state, and it went to a joint committee that reported at the end of 2020. That joint committee unanimously endorsed the report and presented back to the parliament a draft bill that came out of it. All members in this council across all parties supported that piece of legislation. I would draw this council's attention to these lines from the report of that 2020 joint committee. It states:

In the absence of a federal scheme, submissions to the inquiry overwhelmingly expressed support for a state-based system of registration. The Committee notes that registration will not, in and of itself, automatically ensure safe and effective social work practice. The recent coronial inquests, while calling for social work registration, have been critical of, among other things, the child protection system's lack of understanding of, and compliance with, its statutory obligations. Notwithstanding, the Committee is of the view that legislative reform is urgently needed. It considers that the proposed legislation will provide a solid framework towards improving the accountability and standards of the social work profession.

I repeat: that committee was of the view that legislative reform was urgently needed. We did the groundwork across parties, consulted extensively through the committee process and created through this parliament an act which can lead the nation in this reform.

The Australian Association of Social Workers has been pursuing registration of social workers as a means of enforcing safe and competent practice, and it further protects the public from practitioners who breach those ethical standards. Yet, the scheme has been met with a brick wall when it comes to actually implementing it. It was assented to in December 2021. Our next state election was in March 2022, and here we are in October 2023 still waiting.

The department has only just in September this year—last month—appointed the director. There has been a quite unreasonable delay in getting the scheme in progress. We have a minister who is also Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing juggling with Child Protection. She is juggling two quite conflicting portfolios in terms of workload, and it seems to be here reflected in the ability for her to actually meet her obligations.

While clients of child protection services are some of the most vulnerable in our society, social workers practise in a diverse range of settings, including family violence, disability, mental health, family support, education, drug and alcohol services, and housing, just to name a few. This scheme would be better placed in Human Services or Health, who of course deal with this broader range of issues. Given that the child protection portfolio has delivered us not an announcement, a ministerial statement announcing the commencement of this act, but a request to the parliament for more time to start the act, I think we have to be asking whether or not this act has been placed in the correct portfolio.

The government is pushing the scheme back, not for the first time but, ideally, for the last time. Hopefully, South Australia will lead the way. The Association of Social Workers has been calling for this reform for literally decades. Social workers work with extremely vulnerable clients and, without the registration of social workers, these people could be at risk of poor, unethical practice. That is on our watch if we do not ensure safeguards. It is time that we just got on with it. Certainly, this is a prelude to seeing social workers registered across Australia, and the profession given not only the respect it deserves but the protections that are required.

I will be asking questions of the government as to what work they have done, not just in implementing the scheme here, which clearly they are now asking us for an extension of time to do, but at what levels they have raised this with their federal counterparts at ministerial councils. With that, I do support the bill. As the person who initiated this debate in this parliament through a private member's bill—it was a Greens bill that eventually passed the parliament under the last government, from that report—we then expected the then minister, the previous Minister for Child Protection, the then member for Adelaide, who is no longer in this parliament, to lead the debate.

I again thank the member for Hurtle Vale, now Minister for Human Services, who worked with me to effect this change through the parliament. It was not an easy process, although when it came down to it no-one could really argue against it, but it was delay after delay after delay, and unfortunately we are seeing that here again now. This is incredibly disappointing.

I urge the Malinauskas government to take this issue more seriously and look forward to potentially this act being under the administration of a different minister in the future, and for the

South Australian leadership to be properly and strongly advocated for at a federal level to ensure that other states and territories right across this country follow our lead, reap the harvest of the hard work that that joint committee did here in South Australia, taking submissions not just from South Australia but from right around the country, and that we get on with the job of ensuring that people are protected and that social workers are respected.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:07):** I rise to speak briefly on behalf of SA-Best on the Social Workers Registration (Commencement) Amendment Bill 2023. At the outset, not only do I support and echo the sentiments just expressed by the Hon. Tammy Franks but I thank her on behalf of SA-Best for all her hard work in this area, for bringing this issue to this place and for seeing through the process that we have been through to date.

I can imagine that the honourable member is extraordinarily frustrated that this proposal, which had unanimous support, is now before us for the purposes of extending the time frame for another 18 months. That is bitterly disappointing. We know that without this bill we would end up having a piece of legislation that comes in with none of the framework that is required around it, and so our hands are somewhat tied in that respect because if we do not do this we are going to have a problem on our hands but, by the same respect, as the Hon. Tammy Franks has said, we never should have been in this position in the first instance.

We have had ample time to bring everything that is required around this legislation into place. It beggars belief that the former minister, who indeed insisted on being part of that committee process—as was I, together with the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, who unfortunately has also left us—who said she was so interested in this process and needed to be on that committee to hear everything that was going to be said, and all the justifications for it, lost her seat and we are no closer to getting this scheme up off the ground. That is an extraordinary state of affairs.

Since then, of course, we have a new government which, I think it is probably fair to say, picked up the legislation and saw that, from my understanding, nothing had been done in the intervening period. Nothing had been done other than the passage of this bill through this parliament. It was just left to sit there. They have picked that up, but that does not also dismiss the fact that we are still waiting for a scheme to be implemented, notwithstanding that we have a new minister and notwithstanding that we have a new government.

I have asked those questions of the advisers and I appreciate that there are two things at play here. I appreciate that they have had to find a CE and that they then have to go through the process of appointing an independent board. There are guidelines that have to be implemented and there are fees and registrars that need to be appointed. They also want to provide a reasonable opportunity for the registration of social workers and give them an appropriate lead-in time to be able to do that.

The cynic in me would say we have already had that time available to us, but they have said, 'Look, that process is going to take us a maximum of another 18 months.' My hope is that it will happen well within the 18 months, not another 18 months of waiting. The other issue at play at the same time has been that we have been pushing for a nationally consistent scheme. I really hope that the delays in this bill have not been purely based on seeing that national model get off the ground and that there is not any suggestion that, 'We have this here, we will just see how we go at the national level and if that does not get up off the ground we will buy ourselves some more time.'

I certainly hope that has not been the case. I do understand that those discussions have been taking place at the same time. I certainly understand that there is still an appetite to have a nationally consistent approach. That is something that we have all said from the outset that we all agree with, but in the absence of that, or if that process is to take some time, then what we know is that we have the opportunity to set up a first here and to get it right.

If the government is now telling us, 'Well that's going to take us a maximum of another 18 months,' then that is what we are going to have to support. It does not mean that we have to be happy about that process, because we never should have got to that point in the first place. So my words to the government are to impress upon you the importance of doing this in a very timely manner. We know what the outcome of that review was. We know what the unanimous support of

this legislation was. There have been many calls for the registration of social workers for 20 years now and we urgently need the framework for mandatory registration, binding professional standards and consequences for breaches, amongst other things.

As I have said, the former child protection minister was part of that process. I am just hoping that with the appointment now under this minister of the new chief executive, there is going to be movement. I am comforted by the discussions I had today in terms of saying, 'Well, these are all the things we are looking at doing and at the same time obviously still pursuing the issue of a national scheme.' That CE will be tasked with the establishment, development and implementation of the scheme, including the appointment of the independent board and registrar. There is unanimous support for this. We are giving the government a grace period, without which they would be—

**The Hon. T.A. Franks:** I was told 18 months. I was told much quicker than that, so that is concerning to me.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** I was told a maximum of 18 months. I asked several questions today as to what could possibly take that long. I think it is fair to say that the response I got was, 'We don't anticipate it to take that long, but we don't want to run the risk just in case it takes us that long.' That was concerning to me. I understand what the individuals in front of me were saying, but that does not alleviate my concerns about this scheme coming into place in a timely manner.

I would be urging the government, and I am hoping the Hon. Tammy Franks will ask some questions of this very shortly, to heed the concerns of members in this place who have not only given you the benefit of additional time but also are relying on the government to do what it needs to do in a much more timely time frame than what is being proposed at the moment. Let's just get on with the job of what we should have had finished in two months' time, because that was the original deadline. December of this year was the original deadline. Eighteen months away from now is a far cry from how we thought and how long we thought it would take to get this scheme into place.

I will say that it is one of the things we need to be mindful of when we are passing laws in this place because we know that there is a two-year time frame that applies, and in many cases—and we have seen this before—we do get into the habit, governments do get into the habit, of not doing much until they reach the end of that two-year time frame because they have other competing interests, and then we get to the two-year mark and all of a sudden there is a requirement on them to implement a scheme which they have done bugger all on in terms of work.

I am not suggesting for a moment that that is the case here—and this is no criticism of the CE who has been appointed or anyone who is working on this—but I am bringing this to the government's attention and saying, 'I think 18 months is a stretch for something that should have been implemented by the end of this year.' So those questions will be put to the minister, I am sure, very shortly. We will seek clarification in relation to what the Hon. Tammy Franks has received, and what I have received in terms of feedback, and we will proceed from there.

In closing, I once again want to commend the Hon. Tammy Franks not only for raising this issue in this place and managing to get unanimous support from this parliament for this most important proposal but for seeing it through and insisting and agitating the way that she has on such an important issue. I thank her. I think we all owe her a gratitude of thanks for her work, and I will be seeking some clarification, together I am sure with the member from the minister responsible, shortly.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (16:17):** I would like to thank the Hon. Ms Centofanti, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Connie Bonaros for their contributions. As has been mentioned, this is designed to improve public safety, high 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, and that is why the desire of the government is that we do get this right because it is so important, and that the delay that has been outlined will provide the time for it to be put in place in an appropriate manner. I commend the bill to the chamber.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** I note from the contributions of other members that they had been informed by the government that it was anticipated that 18 months would be the time needed to bring this act to fruition. I also note that the commencement clause does not provide for a date but simply refers to proclamation.

I was not informed by the government that they anticipated this would take 18 months. I also note that we did not appoint Sarah Wendt to the position until last month, and yet Cathy Taylor, the previous chief executive, had informed me at a Budget and Finance Committee earlier this year that the appointment of that position was only weeks away—back in February, I believe.

I am not willing to trust the government on this at this point. I would like to move an amendment. I understand that parties will not have had the opportunity to debate that amendment, but I would seek the assistance of parliamentary counsel to draft an amendment to ensure that 1 January 2025 is the date that would be the latest possible date that this act could come into effect, rather than giving the government yet another blank cheque that they may well never cash.

At this point, unless this parliament ensures that this act has to come into force on a particular day, I cannot trust the government on this. I do note that it is not the minister in the chamber. I was informed by the actual minister over the phone one day that it would not be very long, as she explained that she would not be in the parliament for the debate in the last sitting week on this bill.

I accept that the minister is in somewhat of a difficult position to be able to ensure these things, but I would flag that I will move to adjourn this debate to sort these things out, unless I can get a guarantee that we fix a date of no later than 1 January 2025.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

**ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September 2023.)

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:23):** I rise today to speak in support of the Advance Care Directives (Review) Amendment Bill 2022, a bill that mirrors a bill introduced and passed through the Legislative Council in 2021 by the then Liberal government. This bill, importantly, seeks to amend the Advance Care Directives Act 2013 to support and provide health practitioners and the community with necessary, up-to-date legislative provisions that can assist with advance care directives in South Australia.

Advance care directives are an essential legal document that allow for freedom and choice over one of the most challenging periods a person may have to experience through their lifetime. Allowing individuals to communicate their own arrangements for future health care, living arrangements and other personal matters is important to me as a Liberal and as someone who believes in individual choice and freedom of that choice for all citizens.

This bill to amend the act was introduced in response to a statutory review of the Advance Care Directives Act 2013, which was undertaken by Professor Wendy Lacey in 2019. This review made several key recommendations which are reflected in the amendments of this bill and which were supported either in principle or in full by the then Liberal government. These recommendations included:

- to include references to digital copies of advance care directive documents;
- interactions with other acts and laws;
- giving advance care directives where English is not the first language;

- changing requirements in relation to appointment of substitute decision-makers and their empowerment;
- resolutions of disputes by the Public Advocate; and
- referral of certain matters to the tribunal.

These recommendations we now find before us as amendments are the result of significant consultation with various key stakeholders in the industry. Through this process, the previous government was able to build upon relationships and gain new perspectives from those whom this bill directly affects. I would like to thank them for their contributions, in addition to Professor Lacey, and for their hard work in leading us to this point.

One must ask, given this bill has been brought to both places before, how has the government taken nearly a year to introduce such an important bill into parliament? The government promised South Australians, leading into the 2022 election, that health was a priority of theirs, yet after some questionable priorities and a low number of sitting days to date, the fact that we are only now moving this important bill through the second reading stage is disappointing to say the least.

However, I support this amendment bill. I would like to acknowledge the member for Frome's advocacy for the inclusion of the provision that an advance care directive cannot be used as the basis for withholding life-saving treatment following an attempt to suicide or cause self-harm. I also acknowledge that the government filed an equivalent amendment, which passed in the other place, and I indicate that I am supportive of that amendment.

Back in 2013, the Advance Care Directives Act was originally drafted so as not to allow advance care directives to require the withholding of life-saving medical treatment following an attempted suicide or self-harm. If it had allowed this, this act would have almost certainly not been passed at that time. In spite of the legislative intent, there have been a number of cases which have subsequently highlighted a lack of clarity for clinicians on the ground in regard to this provision.

To provide greater clarity to clinicians, the Chief Psychiatrist recommended that a regulation be promulgated to clarify the requirements on health practitioners consistent with the legislative intent. Regulation 12A was promulgated in 2019. In her review, Professor Lacey considered the matter and recommended that the act should be amended to explicitly state in the operative provisions of the act that an advance care directive cannot be used as the basis for withholding life-saving treatment following an attempt to suicide or cause self-harm. The remainder of an otherwise valid advance care directive would be preserved.

Whilst I recognise that everyone has a right to individual choice and to refuse medical treatment, we must ensure there is clarity for health practitioners in providing life-saving treatments following an attempted suicide. This amendment does not force health practitioners to disregard the binding refusals of health care in an advance care directive in the case of attempted suicide or self-harm but provides health practitioners with the responsibility to make an appropriate clinical judgement decision on a case-by-case basis in line with the relevant professional standards and good clinical practice and all the circumstances of the case. In doing so, they would be protected against civil or criminal liability for refusing to comply with an advance care directive provision in the relevant circumstances envisaged in this section.

I think it is important to note that if a person is conscious following a suicide attempt, they would be able to refuse medical treatment, and that is their choice. But situations are not always black and white, and it is important that our medical practitioners have the confidence to do their job without fear of retribution in these often intense, fast-moving, high-stakes clinical situations.

After heavy consultation with the Law Society, I also add that I will be moving an opposition amendment concerning the protection of the validity of the advance care directive, no matter the order of signature by the signatories. Currently, the Advance Care Directives Regulations 2014 require a substitute decision-maker to complete and sign the relevant part of an advance care directive form prior to an advance care directive being executed by the person making the appointment. The rationale is that this sequence of signing will ensure that the person making the appointment is able to inform the substitute decision-maker about their values.

However, in the opposition's view the rigid order of signing provisions provides little assurance that substitute decision-makers understand their roles and responsibilities. On the other hand, they significantly increase the risk that an advance care directive will not be signed by the principal in time for when it is needed. In what is such a tough period for the substitute decision-maker, it is only appropriate to remove provisions which would only further confuse and lengthen the legal process of finalising an advance care directive.

Advance care directives allow individuals to think about their dying wishes, such as situations they might want to avoid or that they would find unacceptable. It also allows individuals to communicate other end-of-life wishes such as their intentions to be an organ and tissue donor, or considerations such as spiritual, religious or cultural traditions. Advance care directives are an important document that we all should be aware of, consider and promote in our communities. I support this amendment bill, which was developed after the important 2019 review, and look forward to its passage with amendments.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:31):** I rise to speak in support of this bill. The Advance Care Directives (Review) Amendment Bill 2022 focuses on making improvements to the legislation governing advance care directives, to improve accessibility, strengthen safeguards and clarify the original intent of the act. The Advance Care Directives Act 2013 was passed by the South Australian parliament in 2013 and commenced on 1 July 2014.

This amendment bill seeks to enhance the operations of the act in response to the statutory review of the act conducted by Professor Wendy Lacey in 2019. 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.

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 (ACDs) in South Australia. 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 the appointment of substitute decision-makers and their empowerment;
- resolution of disputes by the Public Advocate; and
- referral of certain matters to the tribunal.

The bill seeks to improve accessibility to advance care directives by making it clearer that digital copies of ACDs are legally valid. During consultation by the Lacey review, it was evident that there is a reluctance to rely on digital copies and so this amendment will provide greater confidence for clinicians.

The bill provides additional safeguards for people who require an interpreter when making an ACD, by ensuring that interpreters are subject to eligibility criteria that prevent the potential for undue influence upon the person making the ACD. The bill aims to clarify that there is no limit to the number of substitute decision-makers that can be appointed and that the person making an ACD can empower their substitute decision-maker to make decisions separately and/or together and in order of preference, if they wish to appoint them in that way.

The bill also removes powers from the Office of the Public Advocate that have never been exercised. During consultation, it was found that there was broad agreement, including by the Public Advocate, that these powers should be removed. 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 that the implementation of the review has been overseen by a broad range of stakeholders from the health, age, disability,

legal and community sectors, including the Australian Medical Association, the Council on the Ageing and the Legal Services Commission of South Australia.

In April 2022, the Malinauskas Labor government, through the Department for Health and Wellbeing, commenced a six-week public consultation on the advance care directives redesign project via YourSAy. The consultation process included focus groups with vulnerable communities to understand the enablers and barriers to completing the ACD form.

The redesign of the ACD form will ultimately make it easier for the South Australian public to complete an ACD and therefore increase accessibility and uptake. The redesign project will see a new ACD form, a DIY guide, website and promotional materials developed, and these will be launched following the passing of the amendment bill and the remaking of the regulations to ensure alignment of legislation with these documents in practice.

In August 2022, the Department for Health and Wellbeing hosted an inaugural community forum to bring together key local government partners we are working with to deliver a peer-led ACD training model across local government areas in SA. This partnership consists of four councils in the southern Adelaide metropolitan area, three councils in the western Adelaide metropolitan area, and three councils in the Fleurieu region, as well as the Murray Mallee region.

In September 2022, the Department for Health and Wellbeing launched new branding and a new look and feel for the Plan Ahead Week, the annual awareness-raising campaign that aims to raise community awareness and literacy about the benefits of early planning and the relevant legal tools.

The Malinauskas Labor government supports strengthening advance care directives legislation to support all South Australians to make clear legal arrangements for their future health care. I commend the bill to the chamber.

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

### **APPROPRIATION BILL 2023**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September 2023.)

**The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (16:37):** I rise today to speak on the Appropriation Bill and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill, a relatively benign but important piece of legislation that allows the government of the day to appropriate the funds from which it shapes its future budget. Those details are set out in the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures) Bill.

I note that it has taken some time for this bill to arrive here in this place, more a reflection of the slow pace in the other place than anything else. Sadly, that seems to be becoming the speed with which the government does things. With delays only costing more, as a state we are losing more as a result.

The government has been quick to market their change to stamp duty as an 'abolishment', having mobile billboards in place on budget day, but when you peel it back and take a look at the details they have simply fiddled around the fringes. We wait to see the proof of this change, but I suspect that the people this change will help will be quite few, sadly—especially given the current housing crisis we face.

As an opposition we want to see better support and assistance for first-home owners trying to enter this challenging market. The shadow treasurer spoke in the other place about the severe lack of support for the broader community, who are facing the pinch of unrelenting inflation of costs. The costs of fuel, energy and other essential services are all going up, and avoiding the increases is not possible due to their need—

*The Hon. R.A. Simms interjecting:*



**The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO:** —thank you, Mr Simms—not to mention the cost of housing, with rent also increasing and buying a house getting further out of reach for those aspiring to home ownership.

Small businesses are also feeling the pinch of inflation and the added burden of major staffing shortages right across the state. The shadow treasurer described this budget as buy now, pay later, and I strongly agree. More than that, the spend they put into the economy is inflationary and will not assist with bringing down the highest inflation numbers in a mainland state.

In the June quarter, Adelaide's annual increase was the highest of the eight capital cities. We wait to see what impact the budget has had on the inflation numbers for the September quarter, but if the price of fuel and other essential goods is anything to go by in this state, I do not see any relief anytime soon.

As we have already seen, this government loves a delay, especially when it comes to critical, strategic projects. The only thing they love more than a delay is a cost blowout. Let's take another look at some recent examples. The new Women's and Children's Hospital was intended to be completed by 2027; for that to occur, ground needed to have been broken last year. Initially, the government told us that by changing the location and the plans and the entire commitment they did not believe it would delay the build. We know that it is not going to be opened in 2027. In fact, by their own time lines it will not be achieved until 2031.

Moving on to road infrastructure, the hardest piece of the puzzle that is the north-south corridor was settled by the previous government, but upon their election they took this shovel-ready project and sat on it. They delayed it and therefore increased the price further. The previous time line floated was for it to be completed by 2030, and now they tell us that apparently it will be completed by 2031. That is very hard to believe.

They also have told us it will be only an extra \$5 billion. With that one-year delay they have cost the state another \$5 billion. They will not meet that time line or the cost, and it will continue to blow out, I am sure.

In this time of the housing crisis we need to remember that it is the Labor government that took an extra 130 houses, 130 more houses than was previously required under the plans of the Marshall government for the north-south corridor. The only thing they love more than delays is a cost blowout.

All of this is going on while the government withholds the full details from the Auditor-General while cutting the budget from his office so he is unable to investigate all elements. It consistently uses cabinet-in-confidence as an excuse not to disclose information. We look forward to the Auditor-General attending Budget and Finance next week.

It is simple and laid out in black and white in the budget papers: this government cannot manage money. Almost every single department and government agency failed to meet their budget last financial year. This shows a lack of fiscal discipline from the Treasurer, who projected a \$233 million surplus and delivered a deficit.

The government did not rein in their overspending, ensuring there is no accountability or action required by the chief executives. Instead of acknowledging and working hard to respond to the \$1.3 billion worth of overspending, the government has simply baked it into the budgets across the forward estimates.

We, the opposition, called for action on these major strategic projects that will assist with expanding the economy, but this is a government of delay. We called for broad application of cost-of-living measures to assist people in the community today, but we only received a few slivers of help. As with a lot of things with this government, this budget is very disappointing. I look forward to having the opportunity to speak to the budget measures bill in due course.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:43):** I, too, rise to make a contribution to the Appropriation Bill 2023. There is no doubting that the impact of COVID-19 on our economy and our society is now being brought to bear. We are on the other side of the pandemic crisis, but the priorities have now

come full circle to battling a housing crisis, a cost-of-living crisis, growing levels of poverty and inequality and, of course, the climate crisis.

In that respect this budget is, to say the least, underwhelming. It would be an understatement to say that the Greens are disappointed by the lack of action on climate change in this budget. It is outrageous that in a time of climate crisis, after watching the Northern Hemisphere essentially burn, over the next four years the Department for Environment and Water budget will be cut by \$88 million, and that of course is on top of previous cuts over the past two decades. Yet, this government is willing to spend over \$5 million on establishing an office of AUKUS while gutting Green Industries SA, essentially halving their budget.

We also know that the El Niño weather patterns will hit South Australia very hard. Greg Mullins, who is the founder of Emergency Leaders for Climate Change, has warned us that:

The El Niño event is like adding fuel to the fire—literally. With the warmer and drier conditions it brings, it's likely we're looking at an extended and potentially volatile fire season.

Our climate is changing and it impacts on our lives in many ways. Those who already live with poverty and disadvantage will continue to be the hardest hit. Governments do have an obligation to address climate change, its causes, its impacts on the natural environment and its impact on people, animals and infrastructure. Sadly, the Treasurer did not once mention climate change or the climate crisis in this budget statement. I am not sure where the Malinauskas government has been, but they do have some tough decisions to make.

The Greens are also frustrated to see that preparing for and preventing climate change was largely ignored in this budget. While the government's spending has been focused on emergency capacity—that we, of course, do need—and expensive infrastructure and equipment spending, including an aircraft for increased aerial firefighting capacity, coastal and estuarine risk mitigation and flood barriers, there are many missed opportunities to mitigate and to address the causes of climate change and to grow our climate and disaster resilience, that of the people and communities, beyond investment in just assets.

We do need better funding for our CFS facilities. We are not even talking about gold standard facilities, we are just talking about ensuring a tap, a toilet and no asbestos or mould, and that other work health and safety standards are met. Our CFS volunteers not only generously donate their time and energy but they sometimes put their lives on the line for us. In South Australia, we are lucky to have world-class fire and rescue services, over both career and volunteer.

Through the Greens' questions in this place, we now know that around 90 CFS stations do not even have internal toilet facilities. That is almost one in five of our CFS facilities across the state. As we approach an extended period of hot, dry and dangerous fire conditions, the state government must urgently ensure a proper audit of those CFS facilities across our state.

As I have said before, the importance of a tap, a toilet and a place to change means diversity in our volunteer firefighting service. It means that they are given the respect and dignity they deserve. It means that they do not have to strip off, either before or after doing a shift, in front of their colleagues.

It is a disincentive to diversity, in particular to having more women involved in our Country Fire Service, and it is something that this government could address almost overnight, by not only doing that audit but by identifying where the greatest need is and ensuring things like change facilities, which are important not just for dignity and respect but for the very safety and health of those firefighters.

I note that we do have a cruel summer ahead and the CFS needs are just one part of ensuring that we are best prepared for the climate crisis in South Australia. Those firefighters deserve the best from this government, and I hope that we will see action on that soon.

Another area that I wish to reflect on is that of dog and cat management in this state. In 2018, a joint report published by the RSPCA and the Animal Welfare League stated that the current management systems and implementation of the Dog and Cat Management Act are simply ineffective. South Australia has the second highest ownership of cats in the nation, with 37 per cent of South Australian households owning approximately 397,000 cats. That is no small number;

however, our Dog and Cat Management Act fails to address the issue of the 171,000 unowned or semi-owned cats in our state.

Since 2018, this has led to a 20 per cent increase in shelter intake at the RSPCA alone, and that number is increasing. The resources of rescue charities, both large and small, are struggling to cope, and we get back to that cost-of-living crisis as well. This is resulting in poor welfare outcomes for both the cats and of course those who care for them.

There is no particular statewide figure published, but it is estimated that at least 43 per cent of the annual intake at the AWL and the RSPCA is potentially euthanised, simply as a result of overbreeding. The 2022 announcement of the Dog and Cat Management Board that they were to have a \$100,000 fund for subsidised desexing is, of course, a step in the right direction but is absolutely not enough. It depends on councils being motivated to become involved, and we cannot rely on that particular motivation to avert what is an overbreeding crisis.

The board has said it themselves, not all councils have taken up the offer, and that is because the funding requires them to make a co-payment and councils in the most severe financial distress simply cannot afford this. It is not illogical to observe that those who have the money to put in for the co-funding are the most likely to take up the co-funding option and are best placed, whereas those in the most need will be least able to take up the desexing funding option.

We need dedicated funding in targeted areas of our state to implement free cat desexing programs to get the cat population under control. It is clearly an unsustainable situation for organisations such as the AWL and the RSPCA, and the many rescues—and there are so many rescues—who rely predominantly on community goodwill, volunteer effort and community donations.

Targeted low-cost desexing programs, which have been shown to be effective in increasing desexing rates, also have good, strong community support. Ongoing low-cost desexing programs have helped to achieve what is called zero euthanasia of all healthy and treatable stray and surrendered cats and dogs in places like the Gold Coast. In fact, while that is the second largest council in our country, it is an exemplar of how best to manage this issue of cat overpopulation. It is good for our native flora and fauna, it is good for our pets, and it is good for those volunteers who donate their time in those particular animal shelters.

While I am on cats and dogs, despite our greyhound racing industry currently being the subject of an independent inquiry, I note that in the budget this year Racing SA and Greyhound Racing SA got a funding boost. The government has announced funding to be given to horse and dog racing from its betting operations tax doubling, going from 10 per cent to 20 per cent, or an estimated \$6.5 million in revenue across the racing industry. That is money going to prizes when it could be going to people in need. This is despite all attitudes that have been reflected in national surveys towards greyhound racing, revealing that 69 per cent of Australians oppose the use of taxpayer funds to prop up the greyhound racing industry.

'What is the return on investment of these public funds?' is a reasonable question to ask of this budget. Where could we be using our money to invest better in community programs and looking at, rather than fuelling the epidemic of gambling and gambling harm, the culture of an industry that is defined by animal deaths being acceptable and part of the business model, and where profits are put before welfare?

Further, on the point of sports, we have also seen our major events fund receive an extra \$20.8 million over four years, including the 'hotly contested' LIV Golf tournament. The LIV Golf series is a large-scale effort to sportswash Saudi Arabia, using top-level sports to distract from their human rights violations, and we in South Australia have fallen for it hook, line and sinker.

The Public Investment Fund of Saudi Arabia is the major shareholder of this controversial new tour. Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman is the chairman of the Public Investment Fund, and the Crown Prince now wants to release his Vision 2030 plan of making the country more modern and less dependent on oil money.

Again, we have fallen for it. We have let our state be a puppet of the Saudi regime. I have to say that the fact that this government has so far refused to comply with this council's motion for an order of the production of documents, and the Premier has blatantly refused to reveal just how much

taxpayers have spent on funding this tournament—a tournament that does not need our money, but it does need our credibility—is unacceptable.

The South Australian public deserve better. They deserve not only to know how much money was spent on this but what the conditions are. That motion of this council should be respected by the Malinauskas government and I note that, to date, it has not. Despite that motion passing the parliament earlier this year, my office has yet to receive those documents relating to payments or agreements made to host the LIV Golf tournament. How this government can speak up and talk about responsibility to the state and yet fail to be transparent is something for them to reflect upon.

Sport has received a lot of attention this year, with another \$18 million allocated to the SA Motor Sport Board to support the Adelaide 500. We know that that was a Malinauskas election promise, but we do not know where this funding is going. In an article published in *The Advertiser* on 10 October, the Adelaide City Council Lord Mayor said:

The SA Motor Sport Board...had sought access for an extra 16,000 square metres of Rymill Park to potentially operate as an RV park for this year's event.

Yet, under our South Australian Motor Sport Act, they can potentially do this, not with any decision of the Adelaide City Council but simply that decision is now in the hands of the Motor Sport Board. This is a dangerous precedent that has undermined the integrity of our Parklands and, yet again, is an example of the desires of a few outweighing the needs of many and the cost-of-living crisis going unaddressed and the climate crisis simply being fuelled.

It would be great to see the establishment of a South Australian First Nations Voice to Parliament. However, we are incredibly disheartened by the lack of investment in First Nations issues. I note that earlier today the minister talked about the I believe \$800,000 or \$700,000 given to the Ernabella Arts Centre.

I know that the APY Art Centre Collective—which is an exemplar, a shining example of how art can strengthen communities, can bring wealth into communities living in unacceptable poverty, can empower artists and can use art for absolute purpose—is currently suffering through what I would call a racist campaign by *The Australian*. This is the time that the Malinauskas government should be stepping in to support the APY Art Centre Collective in their time of need and standing against the concerted attack that *The Australian* newspaper has waged against that art centre, possibly because they were involved in the debates and supported the yes campaign in the recent referendum and possibly because they were seen as tall poppies who needed to be cut down.

We have had one particular inquiry find that there was no evidence that the provenance of the work was as *The Australian* had suggested over repeated articles and over many months with a sustained attack on the integrity and credibility and careers of those artists. We have not seen any evidence of *The Australian's* claims borne out and, I note, *The Australian* did not provide the full video footage to that first inquiry that they claimed supported their argument.

I hope that the current inquiry that is ongoing, that the South Australian government is part of with the commonwealth and territories, gets hold of that full video. I certainly would be very pleased to see the artists and the Anangu and the elders given the respect that they deserve by having that full footage released and having their voices actually heard in that debate. But when you stand up for something that the Murdoch empire does not necessarily support, we know that there is a cautionary tale there to those people that they may well find themselves the target of such concerted attack as we have seen in *The Australian* against the APY Art Centre Collective.

So I single them out, that the Malinauskas government should be looking at supporting them, because I note that they have lost both philanthropic and state government support in recent years. They are certainly a shining example of how art can empower Anangu and have been so successful around the world that they deserve a little bit more support than they are currently getting.

The government, of course, has also failed to give additional funding to the Aboriginal Ranger Program despite calls from the community, native title groups and stakeholders. It is good for people, it is good for nature and it is good for culture. More Aboriginal ranger jobs will benefit South Australians and South Australia, as well as our First Nations South Australian community. The

previous commitment of 15 rangers, but for those rangers to only be within national parks, is good, it is a welcome step forward, but it does not go nearly far enough.

South Australia, of course, was also supposed to have a 'globally significant' cultural institution drawing hundreds of thousands of visitors per year to our capital city but, after five years, the Tarrkarri project is currently in limbo. South Australia's dedicated Aboriginal arts centre is quite literally currently just a hole in the ground. The pitch by the previous Premier was 'sharing 60,000 years of stories and songlines with the entire world', and when construction got underway in late 2021 we had hoped for so much more.

A centre bigger than the South Australian Museum and Art Gallery of South Australia combined, Tarrkarri was designed to showcase Aboriginal art, history and culture, but what we have seen is no additional funding allocated here in this budget and, of course, reviews, leaving the future of the centre in doubt and being told by the Malinauskas government that their intention is to make it better. I do not see how not providing money and certainty and security makes it better, and the fact that it is currently still in limbo, with the government now calling for philanthropic funding to offset the costs without putting up any of their own money additionally, does seem counterintuitive, and we will be watching closely what happens next with Tarrkarri.

Aligned with the targets set in the National Agreement on Closing the Gap, the Greens have also called for substantial change in order to reach those targets and, in particular, for concrete action to be taken to reduce the incarceration and criminalisation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and adults. I do acknowledge the work of the minister in this area. There has been much good work.

The fact, however, that much of the year's budget is directed towards capital expenditure and infrastructure, such as the construction of new facilities and accommodation at Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre, suggests that there is insufficient resourcing still for preventative programs to reduce reoffending and support young people to make positive life choices, reduce that over-representation of Aboriginal children and young people in our youth justice system and better support the complex needs of children and their families.

I am, as a Greens member of this place, saddened by the lack of a target to raise the age of criminal responsibility. Raising that age from 10 to 14 years would be a significant step towards reducing the number of children and young people in that youth justice system and enable better supports to be put in places where they are needed. I note that my colleague the Hon. Robert Simms does have a bill to effect that, and I know that he has been having good conversations in South Australia with the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and the Attorney-General in both of those roles. I note that the ACT is currently leading the way—where we do have a Greens-Labor government, I think for the fourth term in a row in that particular jurisdiction—and leading the way not just on that issue but on many other issues.

There has been a lot of praise given to the Malinauskas government for abolishing stamp duty for first-home buyers, something that I do emphasise is not uncommon around this country. While the Greens welcome that as a first step to helping those in our state get into the housing market, does the government actually know what the average cost of a home in metro Adelaide is with their particular scheme? According to an ABC article published in 2023 in July, the average cost of a home in Adelaide is now \$700,000, so I am not sure where exactly the government is expecting these first-home owners to buy, particularly given the new developments in places such as Riverlea and Angle Vale are averaging between \$650,000 and \$700,000.

Again, I commend the work of my colleague the Hon. Robert Simms. We need more, not just affordable housing but more public housing, more housing in general. We need to turn this debate on its head and stop expecting a private market system to provide what is a basic human right.

The demands on our health system in this current climate are costing the government more than \$1.3 billion over the next five years, and yet there seems not much money in the budget for mental health. I note that the state budget does not address the needs of the thousands and thousands of people living with mental ill health in our community, who deserve better and are not getting the supports they need.

I note also that the unmet needs report was shelved and only under public pressure finally released. I find that quite disappointing because the delay of the release of that report meant that it was not out in the context of the framing of this particular budget that we debate now in this parliament. It kicks that can down the road for the next budget, so I do urge the Malinauskas government and look forward to hearing Mid-Year Budget Review announcements to address those unmet needs.

South Australia pays 61 per cent more per person per day for an inpatient bed for mental health than the rest of the nation. We are dealing with tight budgets in the coming years, and this government does need to look at investing in community-based mental health care and support. That will reduce demand for other mental health services, and it is a better outcome for the consumer. It is better, of course, to keep people well and in recovery than to see them enter the acute side of those services.

The government can put money into community-based mental health supports. I know that they are addressing ramping in many ways, but this will cut back ramping and create savings in other areas of the health budget. It would be a much better investment of our money to ensure that people get the support they need to actually stay well in the first place rather than enter acute care. The consequences of not doing so is that people with severe mental illness will continue to churn through emergency departments and acute wards as well as other health, welfare and community services, and indeed places like public libraries.

I note that public libraries are really desperate post-COVID for additional funding. They serve many needs in our community in this digital divided age. People see libraries as a safe place when they are homeless, when they are lonely, when they are in need, when they do not have access in this era to computers or even phones. So I commend the work of public libraries but note, again, that that is sadly missing from this particular budget.

If the government did invest in community-based mental health supports, they would save money. It might not be immediate, but it would be in the short-term and then the longer term, and it would mean better lives for South Australians. It would help the thousands of people who are living with mental illness get the support they need and reduce their need for other health services. It is a missed opportunity. It is disappointing that that unmet needs document was kept under wraps until this budget was already out. It should have been a centrepiece of this budget.

With those words, I do say the Greens certainly have appreciated in many areas working collaboratively with the Malinauskas government, but I would point out that they have some choices to make here. The Greens have outlined what our choices would be. We will put community first. We will fight against inequality, and we will support addressing real climate action. It is now time that we should be talking about that post-COVID, once-in-a-generation opportunity that we were promised by the Premier, of a society that is free of poverty, free of greed, working for the benefit of the many, not the benefit of the few—as COVID did to us, turning the way we see the world on its head, but turning it on its head for the better.

With that, we look forward to working continually with all in this place for those outcomes. Those are the Greens' principles and we will stand by them. We pride ourselves on having policies, having our four pillars of environmental sustainability, social justice, grassroots democracy, and peace and nonviolence. They guide all of our decisions.

We have established and consulted on policy across the board that we take to the election and we will stand by those policies, such as the state Voice to Parliament. We had a policy for Truth, Treaty, Voice, and we will work every day in this place to ensure that that policy comes to fruition. I note the Malinauskas government had a policy for Voice, Treaty, Truth. It may be in a slightly different order, but in fact the Uluru Statement from the Heart needs all three parts of those calls to ensure that we work towards true reconciliation and truth-telling.

On that note, I also have a commitment regarding the state archives that currently are inaccessible to Aboriginal people in relation to their own stories of their own lives, that have been kept from them through bureaucracy and a previous Attorney-General changing the rules on them after a stolen generation member managed to use those documents to ensure a significant and

precedent-making compensation claim. That is part of the truth-telling work that we have ahead of us.

I hope that we will see money allocated again in the Mid-Year Budget Review to ensure that truth-telling can happen, that people have access to their own archives, their own histories, their personal histories, well before they pass, that they are not kept waiting so long that it is their children or their grandchildren who are the ones who finally get to access those archives. It needs to be done in a timely way, and the digitisation and acceleration of making those records accessible for Aboriginal people in this state I think is a priority as we move ahead. With that, I commend the bill.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:11):** I rise also to speak on the Appropriation Bill. In so doing, I echo many of the comments made by my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks. I want to reflect on the failure of this Labor budget to really tackle inequality. In doing so, I want to start with the housing crisis.

We are in the midst of the worst housing crisis we have seen in generations—in generations. We have a record low vacancy rate for rental properties. We have a waitlist for public housing of almost 20,000 people. As a result, we have people sleeping in cars, people sleeping in the street, people sleeping in tents. There are people who have employment who are not able to afford to find a place to live.

I do want to recognise the leadership of the Malinauskas government in attempting to tackle the crisis. They have taken some welcome steps. I know that Minister Hon. Nat Cook is passionate about wanting to address the homelessness crisis, and I know that Minister Hon. Nick Champion is equally passionate about wanting to see more land released for housing. We welcome that, but the government needs to do better. They need to do much, much better and we need to see a more radical approach being taken to housing policy here in this state.

This approach of simply saying, 'Let's let the free market decide,' is not working. It is turbocharging this crisis. Let's look at the rental crisis, where we have a record low vacancy rate and where we see rent prices climbing up and up and up. Rent in the city over the last two years has gone up by 20 per cent. In some regional areas it has gone up by 70 per cent.

What action has the government taken on rent prices? They introduced a bill that prevented people from being able to advertise properties in a range, which they said was banning rent-bidding, which we know did not actually ban rent-bidding. It does not prevent somebody from offering a bid above the asking price and clinching the property. It was a step but, quite frankly, far too little to have a meaningful impact on this crisis. They need to take action on rent prices.

I introduced a bill in this place that would have capped rent increases in line with inflation, a simple proposition, one in line with the model that has been in operation in the ACT over many years. I could not get one other political party in this place to support that bill, not one—not the Labor Party, not the Liberal Party, not the SA-Best independents, and not the One Nation party.

It is outrageous that not one party would step up and support renters in this place, not one party. Instead, they kowtow to the likes of the Property Council, they kowtow to the big end of town who are advocating for the interests of landlords at the expense of those South Australians who are feeling the pinch of this housing crisis. The Greens will continue to hold this Labor government to account on that. They need to do better.

I am not just here to complain about the lack of leadership in this regard. The Greens have also put some concrete ideas on the table. I am a proud South Australian but sometimes Victoria comes up with some good ideas. Recently, they suggested a levy on the Airbnb sector, the short stay accommodation sector. That would have a really positive impact in terms of incentivising more housing back onto the long-term rental market.

Mr President, I ask you to consider whether it is fair, whether it is equitable, that in the middle of the worst housing crisis we have seen for generations we have perfectly good properties sitting there vacant for six months of the year while people sleep on the street. That is not right in our society. At least the Andrews government in Victoria, in introducing a levy, are trying to address that, and the money raised could be put into social housing. So the Greens support that and we urge the Malinauskas government to take some lessons from what their counterparts are doing in Victoria.

We also urge them to look at applying a tax on vacant property and vacant land. In Victoria, they apply a tax of 1 per cent on property that is vacant without good reason for six months, and on land that is vacant without good reason for five years—1 per cent on the value of the property or the land, with the money again going to boost social housing. We need that investment in housing in our state and we need to crack down on land banking. That is what the Labor Party is doing in Victoria—they should be doing it here.

We also need to ensure that there are better concessions available for renters and that is why, in the lead-up to the recent state budget, the Greens called for an increase in the Cost of Living Concession for renters so that it was at the same level as home owners. We have called for that over the last two budgets, the first two budgets of the Malinauskas Labor government, and they still have not delivered it.

We also want to lift the eligibility for the Cost of Living Concession so that it is in line with the threshold for the Low Income Health Care Card and introduce a partial concession for low income earners who live in share housing. That would really help give a helping hand to those renters who are doing it tough. And, of course, we need to build a lot more public housing. We have been calling for 10,000 public homes over the next 12 months—that is 10 times what the Malinauskas government has put on the table—because we know that whilst what they are doing is a start it is just not enough.

It is not just in the area of housing where the Malinauskas government have failed to take action on the inequality crisis that is engulfing our state. They also need to invest more in our public schools and in providing support to parents. We have been calling to increase the South Australian government's share of the Schooling Resource Standard funding from 75 per cent to 80 per cent for public schools. We have also been calling for the government to abolish materials and services charges and other fees for parents at public schools so that public schools are actually free.

We want a universal free, healthy breakfast and lunch program in every public primary and secondary school in South Australia, and I do want to acknowledge the leadership of the minister, the Hon. Blair Boyer, in that regard. The government has put more money on the table for free breakfast programs in some schools, and we welcome that. That is going to help a lot of kids, but they need to go further and make it available in every school.

We also want more money to upgrade infrastructure in our public schools. By way of example, I recently went to my old stomping ground, Aberfoyle Park High School. I think I am one of the few people in this parliament who went to a public school. I am proud of that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** There are a few in this chamber, but not many in the other place. I am proud of that, but I might say that it was very disappointing to go to that school and see that it still has not seen the investment in infrastructure that is needed, 20 years after I graduated. There needs to be more money for maintenance of our public schools.

The other area where the Malinauskas government needs to step up, I would suggest, is in public transport policy. We conducted a major inquiry into public transport here in this chamber, and six months on I could not get the Minister for Regional Development to actually read the report for some time. I understand she may have done so recently—I certainly welcome that; that is a real move in the right direction—but we have not seen action in terms of the recommendations in the report.

That is, what is the government doing about rail for the regions? What is it doing to ensure that people living in regional areas have access to public transport? Where is the money for cycling infrastructure, when South Australia falls so embarrassingly behind other jurisdictions? There is lots of work to do, and the Greens will continue to push the government to go further.

In respect of transport, we saw recently that there had been a decline in the use of public transport over the last few years. We have been calling for free public transport to try to get people back onto the network and, in the context of a cost-of-living crisis, to try to provide relief to families who might be struggling with the rising cost of petrol.



There are lots of things the government could do, and the Greens will continue to put forward positive ideas here in this chamber. With that, I conclude my remarks.

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

### **SUCCESSION BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of message No. 93 from the House of Assembly.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

### **SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION (COMMENCEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** What consultation was undertaken with regard to the preparation of this bill, in particular with the Australian Association of Social Workers?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised there was a large amount of consultation on the original bill, which of course passed and was assented to, and there has been discussion since, but I would have to take on notice what specific consultation on this particular bill has been undertaken.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** I just got off the phone to the CEO of the Australian Association of Social Workers and this is the first time she has heard that apparently this government will need 18 months additional. She was also in agreeance with my concern that there was no start date other than by proclamation in this bill and that it could, indeed, leave it unaddressed in terms of any start date at all, as we have seen already.

So I would like the minister to provide when she communicated with the Australian Association of Social Workers that this government and this minister was requesting an additional 18 months. I would have thought the least that this minister could have done was talk to the body that in fact will be crucial to the success of this bill and let them know that apparently an additional 18 months was required, and also to have at least done them the courtesy of correspondence with regard to that issue.

I look forward to seeing evidence of when the minister alerted the Australian Association of Social Workers about the contents of this bill. I am happy for the minister representing the minister to take that on notice, but I do expect to see that correspondence, unlike some debates where we see things taken on notice and then we never see them again. I really think it is way too important that the key stakeholder did not even know about the contents of this bill, other than we knew that you needed a little bit more time, in terms of myself as the original mover of the original bill that became the act and the AASW (Australian Association of Social Workers) as the key proponents calling for this act.

Following that, I would like the government to explain what it is they need to do with the next 18 months, what tasks have been done and what is yet to be done.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that since the original act was assented to in December 2021 the Department for Child Protection has worked with key stakeholders to finalise the scheme's implementation plan and this has included determining the staffing and financial needs for both the implementation phase and the ongoing delivery phase.

DCP and the Department of Treasury and Finance worked closely on the budget for the scheme and funding was approved in November 2022 as part of the 2022-23 Mid-Year Budget Review. I am advised that at that time \$4.7 million was committed to the scheme over the following financial years. Additionally, DCP has worked with key stakeholders to build the foundations for the scheme, both within the South Australian government and the broader sector.

It is critical that the scheme is set up properly and that all due diligence is undertaken prior to it becoming fully operational. The reasons of course, I am sure, are clear, that we want to make sure that this works as intended and that no social worker suddenly finds themselves unable to work in their profession because in some way there has been a lack of preparation in the phases that we have been referring to.

DCP also undertook an extensive recruitment process, which resulted in the appointment of Professor Sarah Wendt to the position of director of social work registration. Professor Wendt is a social work expert with a strong national and international reputation, and as director of the scheme will be responsible for its development and implementation. That will include appointing a registrar and registration board.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Under the recruitment process, when was Professor Wendt first identified as the candidate that the offer would be made to?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I do not have that date to hand, but I am happy to take that question on notice.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** When did the recruitment process close?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am happy to take that question on notice.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Did the recruitment process close under the CEO stewardship of Cathy Taylor?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** That will form part of the response to the question I will take on notice around the entire process. Obviously, once we find that date that will indicate whether it was under that CEO or not.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** I note that the former CEO did media saying that the recruitment process was about to close. That was very early this year, so I would really appreciate responses to those particular questions. I understand that you have to take them on notice. With that, in incredible frustration, I do have an amendment. I will briefly outline that my amendment would allow the government their now made known extension of approximately 18 months, but would enable them to enact this piece of legislation earlier should they choose.

I note that the government has now circulated an amendment that simply says that the act would come into operation on 1 July 2025, thus locking in the longest possible time rather than a more timely framework, should that be possible, and I look forward to speaking to that amendment as we get to that clause.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** I have a question for the minister. Why is it that the government appointed Professor Sarah Wendt—I think there was a media release about it—on 18 September, yet there seems to be no progression with this registration scheme? My understanding is that in the media release they said that they have progressed, yet we are here with the bill asking for a delay.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that Professor Wendt was appointed on 18 September and so these first weeks would have involved looking at the implementation plan, getting ready to establish staffing and the other items that we have indicated that are necessary to establish this scheme and make it operational.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

**The CHAIR:** We have a couple of amendments at clause 2. The first one is filed by the Hon. Ms Franks. Would you like to speak to your amendment or move it, please?

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** I move amendment No. 1 [Franks-1] standing in my name, in an amended form, as follows:

Clause 2, page 2, line 10 [clause 2, inserted section 2(1)]—

Delete inserted subsection(1) and substitute:

- (1) This Act comes into operation—
- (a) if a day falling before 1 July 2025 is fixed by proclamation—on the day fixed by the proclamation; or
  - (b) in any other case—on 1 July 2025.

**The CHAIR:** In any other case on 1 July 2025?

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Yes, I have changed January to July in my amended form. I think that my amendment is superior to the government's because it ensures a start date that is the earliest possible start date rather than continuing to see this issue not given the due urgency that I believe it deserves. Should the work be done, we would not want to be waiting unnecessarily, I would image, Chair, particularly as then you would need to get on with a whole range of other delegated legislation and so on.

With that, I do urge members. I understand that the government and I have come to an agreement about a start date being inserted into this potential act, into this bill, and ensuring that it is not left without a start date, and that 1 July 2025 is an agreed across all parties in this chamber start date, but I think my amendment is actually superior because it ensures that that is the latest possible start date.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am happy not to move the amendment filed in my name and instead indicate that the government will be supporting the amendment as moved in its amended form by the Hon. Tammy Franks, the reason being that the intention is to have this scheme up and running as soon as is possible. In discussions, 1 July 2025 was agreed to; if it can be operational prior to that then I think there is widespread agreement that that would be preferable. Therefore, on this occasion I agree that the amendment is superior to the one that was filed by the government and the government is happy to support the amendment moved by the Hon. Tammy Franks.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** The opposition will be supporting the Hon. Tammy Franks' amendment in its amended form.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clause (3) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:42):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Parliamentary Committees*

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The House of Assembly informed the Legislative Council that it had appointed Mr Brown to the committee in place of the Hon. A. Piccolo (resigned).

At 17:43 the council adjourned until Wednesday 18 October 2023 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***MENTAL HEALTH**

**298 The Hon. S.L. GAME** (13 September 2023).

1. Does the minister believe it is appropriate for psychologists providing mental health counselling for veterans in South Australia to receive \$61 less per session under the federal rebate system than they would treating NDIS clients?
2. What support is the state government providing to veterans in South Australia to make up for this shortfall, which is seeing some providers dropping veteran clients in favour of NDIS clients?

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

1. The Medicare Benefits Schedule is a federal rebate system over which the state government has limited influence. I have written to the federal Minister for Veterans' Affairs, the Hon. Matt Keogh MP, to request that the disparity between the Medicare Benefits Schedule fee between NDIS and federal Department of Veterans' Affairs (DVA) clients is investigated.
2. The Australian government is responsible for funding health services for eligible DVA clients. The state government has limited influence over private service providers in relation to which clients they accept.

Mental health and suicide prevention is a focus at national and state levels, for both the general population and for veterans. South Australian veterans have free access to high quality mental health services delivered by a range of organisations. It is critical that veterans are enabled to connect with all of the services available to them.

The Jamie Larcombe Centre (JLC) opened in November 2017. The primary role of the JLC is to provide acute, subacute and rehabilitative mental health care to men and women aged over 18 years who are current or former serving members of the Australian Defence Force.

The JLC includes an ambulatory service incorporating outpatient treatment and a post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) service, 24 single rooms with ensuites (inpatient unit), outpatient rooms, a gymnasium, research spaces, gardens, and a children's playground for families.

Service delivery and development is underpinned by the Specialist Mental Health Services for Veterans Model of Care (the model of care). The purpose of the model of care is to guide service delivery and improvement through the identification of key components that inform evidence-based treatment for veterans' mental health.

The Veteran Mental Health Rehabilitation Unit for outpatients provides an accredited PTSD group program, veterans and seniors group programs, individual and couple counselling, and a Transition to Care service. Referrals may be received from health and community organisations, self/family, ESOs and the inpatient unit.

**MINISTER'S YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**299 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO** (14 September 2023).

1. What training and support have members of the Minister's Youth Advisory Council received to participate in this council?
2. How many members are part of the Minister's Youth Advisory Council, and what are their functions?
3. What have been the key priorities for the Minister's Youth Advisory Council since it has been established?
4. What are the key priorities for the next 12 months for the Minister's Youth Advisory Council?
5. To which policies, and what contribution has the Minister's Youth Advisory Council contributed?
6. How many meetings of the Minister's Youth Advisory Council have there been?
7. How many of the meetings of the Minister's Youth Advisory Council has the minister attended?
8. How many of the meetings of the Minister's Youth Advisory Council has the minister's staff attended?

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

1. Members have received no formal training to be on the council. The Department of Human Services provides administrative support for the council.
2. Twelve members, including an appointed chair, are on the Youth Minister's Advisory Council. They have been appointed to the Youth Minister's Advisory Council to represent the views of young people and to help shape strategies and youth policies in SA based on their lived experiences.

3. Since establishment, the key priorities for the Youth Minister's Advisory Council have been to provide advice to the Minister for Human Services and to help shape strategies and policies relevant to young people by drawing on their lived experiences.

4. The key priorities of the Youth Minister's Advisory Council over the next 12 months include, but are not limited to:

- Strategic advice on the development and implementation of multiple strategies relevant to young people including, South Australia's Youth Action Plan and the State Disability Inclusion Plan.
- Discussion of measures to improve cost of living for young people.

5. To date, the Youth Minister's Advisory Council provided advice and feedback about:

- South Australia's Youth Action Plan
- Keeping Our Promises report (Commissioner of Children and Young People)
- State Autism Strategy
- State Disability Inclusion Plan
- Review of the Residential Tenancies Act 1995
- Creation of the Adelaide University
- Issues of youth homelessness and affordable housing
- Australian government's Youth Engagement Strategy (to the federal Office for Youth).

6. To date, there have been three meetings of the Youth Minister's Advisory Council. The council meets four times a year.

7. The minister has attended all three meetings.

8. A member of the minister's staff has attended all three meetings.

#### **STRONGER TOGETHER PROGRAM**

**300 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO** (14 September 2023).

1. What are the key achievements of the Stronger Together program since it began in January this year?

2. How much funding is provided to the Stronger Together program in 2022-23 and 2023-24?

3. How many families have been referred to the Stronger Together program?

4. How many families have been part of the program since it's started?

5. How many families have had successful outcomes since the program has started?

6. How many families have not been successful in this program?

7. What supports or services are being provided to the families that have been unsuccessful in this program?

8. What supports or services are being provided to families with successful outcomes from this program?

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

The Department of Human Services funded Anglicare SA Ltd \$686,914 (GST exclusive) in 2022-23 and for the 2023-24 financial year, will provide \$1,391,000 (GST exclusive) for the Stronger Together program.

Stronger Together is an intensive family service for families whose children are at imminent risk of placement in out of home care. The service aims to keep children safe and well in their family, community and culture, and where possible, prevent the need for children to go into care. The service works with families to improve safety and wellbeing, family functioning and address risk factors that put pressure on families (domestic violence, homelessness, parental mental health, and drug and alcohol issues).

Since the commencement of the program in 2023, 25 families have been referred to the program. The service has helped families create meaningful and sustainable change by giving families the tools they need to succeed in the future. For many of the families, the intergenerational cycle of dysfunction and trauma has been disrupted, creating a brighter future for the next generations.

Stronger Together assists families to achieve successful outcomes by providing practical and therapeutic support in the home including:

- Provision of practical assistance in times of need, financial support and budgeting.
- Coaching and mentoring skills in caregiver coping, positive parenting, behaviour management, communication, problem solving and household functioning.
- Building an understanding of child development and attachment.
- Supporting social and emotional competence of children and young people.
- Building understanding of safe, healthy family relationships.
- Building positive social and community networks.

As the program commenced in 2023 outcome data is only available to date. Of the 25 families, eight (8) families have been supported with outcomes achieved. These families are now connected with ongoing support.

A number of other families are currently engaged and supported within the service.

Since commencement there have been a small number of families disengaged from the service or were escalated back to Department for Child Protection or children were removed (due to parents not able to maintain safety for their children despite additional support).

When considering unsuccessful outcomes, it is important to acknowledge that the families in this program present with imminent high level complex risks.

The program often connects families with key supports such as education, health services (including mental health services), childcare, substance use support, DV support, etc.

Some families are not at a point in their life journey where they are motivated or willing, or able to address the underlying issues behind the child protection concerns. For families who are not ultimately able to keep their children safe at home they will still experience a therapeutic service and engagement with support in a trauma-informed way to help overcome difficulties.

#### **DISABILITY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**301 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO** (14 September 2023).

1. What training and support have members of the Minister's Disability Advisory Council received to participate in this council?
2. How many members are part of the Minister's Disability Advisory Council, and what are their functions?
3. What have been the key priorities for the Minister's Disability Advisory Council since it has been established?
4. What are the key priorities for the next 12 months for the Minister's Disability Advisory Council?
5. To which policies, and what contribution has the Minister's Disability Advisory Council contributed?
6. How many meetings of the Minister's Disability Advisory Council have there been?
7. How many of the meetings of the Minister's Disability Advisory Council has the minister attended?
8. How many of the meetings of the Minister's Disability Advisory Council has the minister's staff attended?

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

1. Members have received no formal training to be on the council. The Department of Human Services provides administrative support for the council.
2. Twelve members, including an appointed chair, are on the Disability Minister's Advisory Council. They have been appointed to the Disability Minister's Advisory Council to represent the views of people with disability and to help shape strategies and policies in SA based on their lived experiences.
3. Since establishment, the key priorities for the Disability Minister's Advisory Council have been to provide advice to the Minister for Human Services and to help shape strategies and policies relevant to people with disability by drawing on their lived experiences.
4. The key priorities of the Disability Minister's Advisory Council over the next 12 months include, but are not limited to:
  - Providing strategic advice on the implementation of State Disability Inclusion Plan.

- Providing strategic advice on the State Autism Strategy and the Autism Inclusion Charter.
  - Participate in the Review of Disability Inclusion Act 2018.
  - Provide advice to any areas that will promote accessibility and inclusion for people with disability.
5. To date, the Disability Minister's Advisory Council provided advice and feedback about:
- State Disability Inclusion Plan
  - State Autism Strategy
  - Review of Disability Inclusion Act 2018
  - Review of Carers Recognition Act 2005
  - South Australia's Youth Action Plan.
6. To date, there have been three meetings of the Disability Minister's Advisory Council. The council meets four times a year.
7. The minister has attended all three meetings.
8. A member of the minister's staff has attended all three meetings.

#### REGIONAL RADIATION TREATMENT SERVICES

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (4 May 2023).

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Yes, the feasibility study will be released publicly. The time line for its completion will be determined through the tender process currently underway.

#### REGIONAL RAIL

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (14 June 2023).

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

1. The state government is aware of the recommendations outlined in the February 2023 report of the Public and Active Transport Select Committee (the committee).

The Malinauskas government has been in discussions with Viterra and Aurizon since April 2022 on their proposal for regional rail in Eyre Peninsula. Recently, Minister Koutsantonis wrote a letter to the Hon. Catherine King MP, federal Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government asking that the Australian government considers this proposal in light of the national benefits it will provide.

2. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport has been provided a copy of the committee's report and recommendations for its consideration.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND COUNTRY CABINET

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (27 June 2023).

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

Immediately following the forum where these concerns were raised, the chief executive of SA Health, Dr Robyn Lawrence, the acting chief executive of the local health network and the minister sat down with the resident to discuss her concerns at length.

The Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network conducted a rapid incident review and remain in contact with the resident.

The Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network have also instigated an Interagency review with the Women's and Childrens Health Network to gain further insight and learnings into the case.

#### FERAL DOGS

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (12 September 2023).

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

The government of South Australia works within the scope of nationally endorsed Codes of Practice and standard operating procedures for all pest management programs, using best-practice methods to ensure the highest possible welfare outcomes and cost-effectiveness.

Nationally endorsed codes of practice and standard operating procedures undergo extensive consultation with all jurisdictions, the Australian Government and animal welfare agencies before being endorsed by the Environment and Invasives Committee, which is a subcommittee of the National Biosecurity Committee, and subsequent publication on the PestSmart website.

The requirements outlined in the nationally endorsed codes of practice need to be followed in all jurisdictions, unless a particular jurisdiction has its own code of practice for a particular pest species.

#### **COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE VOLUNTEERS**

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (13 September 2023).

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries):** The Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services has advised:

1. Approximately 90 CFS stations do not have internal toilet facilities. Several brigades have access to toilets in adjacent community facilities. Most of the stations now operated by the CFS were first built by councils before transferring to state government ownership in the 1990s.

2. The vast majority of the 425 CFS stations across the state have private spaces within the facilities that can be accessed by members. In addition, several brigades have access to adjacent community facilities with private spaces. All new station designs and builds are done in consultation with brigades and seek to reflect their input and needs.

3. CFS has embedded programs, both capital and facility renew, that provide an ability to effectively plan and invest in CFS facilities and is forecast to invest \$12 million on these measures over the next four years. CFS has a risk approach to the planning of those programs, safety being the number one focus. CFS is committed to providing a safe and fit for purpose environment for all members, and aligns its decision-making to legislative requirements, industry standards and service provision needs.