

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 20 February 2024**

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

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

*Bills***ELECTORAL (CONTROL OF CORFLUTES) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Aboriginal Lands Trust—Report, 2022-23

Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 18 of 2023-23 Review of Remuneration for Official Visitors of Correctional Institutions

Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 18 of 2023-23 Review of Remuneration for Official Visitors of Correctional Institutions

Response to the Findings of Coronial Inquest into the death of Lucas Latouche Mazzei—Findings released 26 May 2023

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

Regulations under Acts—

Electoral Act 1985—Control of Corflutes

Dangerous Area Declarations Section 83B of the Summary Offences Act 1953 Road Blocks Section 74B of the Summary of Offences Act 1953

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

Inquest into the Death-in-Custody of Mr Joshua Marek Stachor, pursuant to the Coroners Act 2003

Report on the Early Commencement of the Local Heritage Places Code Amendment 2024
Review of the 2023 Community Engagement Charter 2023

*Ministerial Statement***O'DONOGHUE, DR LOWITJA**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:20): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement in relation to the state funeral for Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can today announce that the family of the late Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue AC CBE DSG has accepted the South Australian government's offer of a state funeral to honour her life and legacy. Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue passed away peacefully, aged 91, on

4 February 2024 on Kurna country in North Adelaide, South Australia, with her immediate family by her side.

It is with great sadness that we mourn the passing of Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue, a proud Yankunytjatjara woman and highly respected Aboriginal leader. Australia is better off because of Dr O'Donoghue's selfless service. Through her lifelong work, Dr O'Donoghue has made an incredible contribution to the betterment of our country and people.

From South Australia's first Aboriginal trainee nurse to one of Australia's most regarded Aboriginal leaders of our time, the state funeral will be an opportunity for everyone in our community to pay tribute to her incredible legacy and reflect on her work and advocacy to improve the rights, health and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

The state funeral will be held on Friday 8 March 2024 commencing at 1pm at St Peter's Cathedral, Kurna country, North Adelaide. Registration to attend is essential, with further details available at dpc.sa.gov.au. The funeral will be live streamed for free for those unable to attend. In lieu of flowers, the family has requested people and organisations please consider a donation to the Lowitja O'Donoghue Foundation via lowitja.org.au.

O'DONOGHUE, DR LOWITJA

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:21): I table a ministerial statement made by the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, the Premier, on the same matter in the other place.

LATOUCHE MAZZEI, LUCAS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:21): I table a ministerial statement made by the Hon. Blair Boyer, Minister for Education, about a response to a coronial inquiry.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Parliamentary Committees

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:35): By leave, I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. T.A. Franks be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. F. Pangallo (resigned).

Motion carried.

Question Time

BEE DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of bee deaths in the Riverland. Has the minister investigated the complaints which I raised in this chamber last sitting week made to the PIRSA hotline in regard to claims that PIRSA personnel were spraying directly on, or close to, beehives? Will she now commit to an independent review into bee deaths in the Riverland?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her question. I do feel like we have a little bit of *deja vu* in this place, not just occasionally but repeatedly.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Those opposite hopefully were listening to the answer in previous question times.

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: I don't think we can call it an answer.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Hopefully they have the ability to read *Hansard*.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: And hopefully, when a question is taken on notice, they are aware—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —that an answer will come back in due course. One thing I think is worth considering is some of the key points around the issues to do with bee deaths. My first question would actually be to the shadow minister: does she not accept the science that Naturalure, which is used by PIRSA in the fruit fly eradication effort, does not contain Fipronil? Does she not accept that? It is really difficult to be any clearer to the shadow minister. Fipronil is not used as part of the fruit fly eradication program, so she continues to undermine the efforts in the fruit fly eradication program—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —by implying that PIRSA is to blame for the extremely unfortunate bee deaths in the region.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I have said previously, a number of times, there are a number of things within the environment that can result in bee deaths. That is unfortunate, but they are not being caused by PIRSA's fruit fly eradication program.

BEE DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Supplementary: why won't the minister meet with affected beekeepers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:38): This is an operational matter in regard to—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —what is occurring in the Riverland. I am not sure that I have had a direct request to meet, but I am happy to check my records and see if that is the case.

BEE DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Supplementary: is the minister concerned that her lack of commitment to an independent review takes away from the work of the fruit fly committee and industry and undermines confidence in the process of eradication?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that it's a supplementary, but if you want to answer it you can.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:39): I am happy to answer it. What is it that the shadow minister—

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —wants to be reviewed? Does she want the science around Naturalure to be reviewed? Does she want the science around Fipronil to be reviewed? What is it that she actually wants reviewed? What she seems to be after is not about actions, is not about supporting fruit fly eradication in the Riverland; what she seems to be after is headlines.

BEE DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): Further supplementary: will the minister confirm to the chamber that Naturalure is dangerous to bees?

The PRESIDENT: We have talked about that in the original answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Well, I thought you did.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:39): I refer the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like to be able to hear.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —back to my previous answer and suggest that she reads *Hansard*.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on varroa mite.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In an answer to multiple questions asked in this chamber on 31 October last year, more than four months ago, in which I asked the minister what she and her government were doing to prepare apiarists here in South Australia, given the national change from eradication to management strategy for varroa mite, which occurred back on 24 June, some eight months ago, the minister said, and I quote:

Here in South Australia, in consultation with industry, we have established a consultative committee to look at the best ways forward in terms of management, and once there is more to say from that committee, I will be happy to update the chamber.

Eight months ago. My questions to the minister are:

1. Who is on the consultative committee?
2. How many times has the consultative committee met over the last four months?
3. Given we are now eight months post the change in strategy, what information, communication and documentation has been released to prepare apiarists for the change in management strategy regarding varroa mite here in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for her question. Some of those are very detailed in terms of times of meetings and dates of meetings and so on, so I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a response.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Supplementary: can the minister please answer my final question, which was what information, communication or documentation has been released to prepare apiarists for the change in management strategy regarding varroa mite here in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Enough! It is not a supplementary question. You know well that it is not a supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Girolamo, you will be getting an early minute. Order!

VIRTUAL FENCING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding virtual fencing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The Malinauskas government is undergoing animal welfare reforms. As the legislation currently stands, the commercial use of virtual fencing for livestock is prohibited under South Australian animal welfare legislation. My question to the minister is: will her government be introducing legislation as part of the animal welfare reforms to allow the legal use of virtual fencing for commercial use, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for her question. Again, I know that I have answered a similar question previously, certainly in terms of the basis, which is around the research that is underway in regard to virtual fencing for use by the South Australian livestock industry. The Struan Research Centre is doing that work. I certainly feel that virtual fencing provides an opportunity to better manage grazing pressure on pastures, improve natural resource management on farms and reduce labour costs associated with installing and maintaining traditional internal farm fences.

Virtual fencing, for those who are unaware, is an agtech solution that manages animal movement via GPS-enabled virtual boundaries. The boundaries are enforced by neck bands worn by each animal. The neck bands administer audio tones and electric pulses in response to the animal's location and behaviour and, over time, the animals learn to avoid the pulse by responding to the audio tone alone.

I am advised that there are five research trials that have been completed to date at Struan Research Centre in the Far North and on Eyre Peninsula. There was some delay with the Struan Research Centre project because of the building fire that occurred, but a number of research activities have taken place since the beginning of 2023.

The aims of this research really come to the basis of the question from the member opposite. The aims of the research are to assess any animal wellbeing impacts of virtual fencing, to investigate the commercial applications, to quantify the demand for virtual fencing and the barriers to adoption and to inform options to allow the use of virtual fencing in sheep and cattle in South Australia.

That first one, in regard to assessing the animal wellbeing impacts, is absolutely key. Once we have had full completion of that research, that project, and I have been briefed on it, we will have the opportunity to say more.

VIRTUAL FENCING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): Supplementary: can the minister provide a time frame as to when that research will be completed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I don't have that in front of me.

VIRTUAL FENCING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): Supplementary: will the minister please take that question on notice and bring back a reply to the chamber?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): Sure.

REVIEW OF HARASSMENT IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LEGAL PROFESSION

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:45): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney inform the council about the review recently commissioned to evaluate the progress made by South Australia's legal profession in tackling bullying and harassment?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:46): I thank the honourable member for the question. I would be most happy to provide an update to the chamber.

In 2021, a review was undertaken by then Acting Commissioner for Equal Opportunity Ms Steph Halliday, which found that, sadly, discrimination, sexual harassment and bullying were all too prevalent in South Australia's legal profession. The review made 16 recommendations to improve both organisational and workplace culture within the profession. The progress made in those 16 recommendations is what will be evaluated in this review, with a focus on the effectiveness of the laws, policies, structures and complaint mechanisms for harassment and bullying.

Commissioner for Equal Opportunity Jodeen Carney and Assistant Commissioner Colin Marsh have been commissioned to undertake the review work, with Assistant Commissioner Marsh having previously worked on the 2021 review. As part of this review, feedback is being sought from both people who practise the law and people who work, or who have worked, in a workplace that provides legal services over the past three years.

I encourage all those eligible to take part in this review, either through an online survey that can be found through the Equal Opportunity SA website or by providing a written submission to LegalReview@sa.gov.au by Sunday 31 March 2024. Participants are reassured that all responses will be kept confidential.

I would like to thank all those who were instrumental in the 2021 review, including those who worked in the profession and told their stories as well as the people who are about to undertake important work and participate in the current review process. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for her work in first kicking off the 2021 review several years ago, and give her acknowledgement. As I was recently quoted on social media on the matter:

I would be remiss of me not to thank Connie Bonaros for kicking off the 2021 review of harassment within the legal profession. It wouldn't have been done without you Connie! You are a star!

Again, I thank both the commissioner and the assistant commissioner in advance for undertaking this important work and look forward to seeing the outcome of the progress made in the safety of the legal profession. I strongly encourage those eligible to take part in this review to ensure that our state's legal profession is a safe and fair place to be employed.

COST RECOVERY REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about cost recovery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: As luck would have it—the Leader of the Opposition may not have heard the news—I understand that today we have had a cost-recovery review report published publicly on the PIRSA website, one for aquaculture and one for commercial fishing. I am going with the information on the website here, but it does say:

Following a review process, the state government has embraced the majority of the recommendations presented by the Independent Cost Recovery Review Panel. Out of 33 recommendations, 28 have been fully [implemented], two have been partially accepted, two requiring further consideration by industry and one deemed not to be in scope.

My questions to the minister are:

1. When were stakeholders advised of the report's release, if at all, and which groups were notified ahead of today's public release?
2. Which of the 28 recommendations have been fully accepted, which have been partially accepted, and was recommendation 7 deemed not to be within the scope of the review?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for her questions. Our state's commercial fisheries and aquaculture sectors play an enormous role as producers of some of the finest sustainably sourced seafood to all parts of our country and, indeed, all over the world. Even more than that, the \$508 million South Australian seafood sector is a provider of jobs and opportunities, especially in regional areas, and is a huge part of regional and coastal economies.

The current PIRSA cost-recovery policy has been in place for approximately 20 years and is based on the premise that the state owns South Australia's aquatic resources; that is, the South Australian communities own those aquatic resources, and they are managed by PIRSA on behalf of the community. In managing the resources, the costs that are incurred are partly recovered from commercial licence holders and leaseholders. It is a complex but hugely important part of managing our state's marine resources.

Cost recovery has been reviewed several times in South Australia in the past decade or more, with reviews of varying scopes undertaken in 2009, 2015, 2016, 2018 and 2021. Each of those has had a role in shaping the processes to where they are today. Prior to the last election, we made a commitment to review the cost-recovery process again, noting that many within the seafood sectors told us that they could see opportunities to further improve the policy. I am pleased that in releasing the reports we have now met that election commitment, but it will be clear in reading the government response to the panel's reports that work will continue alongside industry in implementing the accepted recommendations.

The panel's key findings included strong overall support and goodwill from stakeholders for the cost-recovery concept in the state's fisheries and aquaculture sectors along with a desire to improve the current cost-recovery system. Significantly, the review did not identify alternative models that would deliver better outcomes for South Australia, and this was highlighted by the panel's finding on a gross value of production (GVP) based model, which the panel found had:

...no support from industry for the %GVP model, even among those fisheries where the total cost recovered currently comprises a high percentage of GVP...

The panel also raised other issues perceived by industry in jurisdictions where a GVP model is in place, stating in the report that some industry members:

...argue a uniform percentage of fishery GVP approach entails cross subsidisation and has disincentivised investment in industry.

In all, 33 recommendations were made, as the honourable member alluded to, 17 for fisheries and 16 for aquaculture; 28 of the 33 have been accepted, two have been partially accepted and two are for further consideration by industry. The one recommendation that was not accepted—which may be No. 7; I do not have the report in front of me to know the actual number—may have been that relating to a recommendation for a recreational fishing licence. We did not accept that given that it was not part of the scope of the review and also on the basis of comments and commitments already made in regard to a recreational fishing licence.

The report did find that a range of areas could be improved, primarily focused on the need for transparency in determining cost attribution for services and activities undertaken in managing the fisheries and aquaculture sectors. To that end, the panel recommended regular benchmarking and review of PIRSA's compliance and research programs and a more comprehensive performance

framework, each of which will be progressed by PIRSA, working with industry, in the coming months and years.

The reports are now published online on the PIRSA website, and communication to the sectors will be occurring this afternoon if it has not already. I look forward to seeing the accepted recommendations implemented and further strengthening the relationship between the seafood sectors and government as we realise the enormous potential for this industry and our state moving forward.

Regarding a couple of the other specific questions about who was advised in advance, no-one was advised prior to today. Regarding the recommendations that were not accepted, I have already referred to recreational fishing. Also, there were two recommendations that I consider are for further consideration by industry. They related to the creation of a GVP-based self-insurance fund across fisheries and aquaculture sectors. If that idea has support, it is the government's view that that should be driven by the sector, given that the panel found that a GVP model in general did not have widespread support.

Two of the recommendations were accepted in part and relate to reviewing compliance risk models and assessing opportunities for further use of technology. Those parts are accepted. However, one aspect of the recommendation related to further use of external contractors for some aspects of compliance. That is not supported by government, given the acknowledgement of the unique skills and attributes of our dedicated fisheries officers in carrying out compliance tasks.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question, the Hon. Ms Bonaros.

COST RECOVERY REVIEW

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:55): Thank you to the minister for her very thorough answer. Will the minister be consulting with stakeholders regarding those recommendations that have been partially accepted or described as requiring further consideration?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:55): I will be, I am sure, receiving feedback from the industry on all matters that are canvassed within the reports and also on the government's response to them.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about regional health care.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: As reported by an article from InDaily on 16 February, titled 'Calls for regional healthcare funding as life expectancy gap remains', the National Rural Health Alliance has called for more funding for regional health care in South Australia. NRHA Chief Executive, Susi Tegen, said funding from the government is 'still very much often city-centric' and, 'The funding models of the government do not match what is needed at a local level.'

This followed an announcement of the recipients of the Innovative Models of Care Program by Minister for Health and Aged Care, Mark Butler, on 7 February, where none—none—of the recipients were from South Australia. Regional communities are very concerned about the lack of focus by the state government on addressing health issues in regional South Australia. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the Minister for Regional Development support calls to increase funding for regional health care? If so, what actions has the minister personally undertaken to advocate for the South Australian regional communities?

2. As we learnt from the announcement that there are currently no SA recipients from the Innovative Models of Care Program so far—this is very concerning—will the minister commit to lobbying her colleagues to ensure there is necessary funding for health care in South Australian regions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for her question. Whilst some aspects of the question should be referred directly to the Minister for Health, there are certainly some that I am able to answer in a general sense. I think it is positive that that report—I think the one that was referred to—showed that South Australia has the second best life expectancy of any regional area in the country. While that is positive, clearly there is still far more to do.

We have increased the budget for regional health services by \$165 million over the past two years. This is across a range of services and programs to ensure that people living in regional and rural South Australia have access to quality health care. This includes recruiting more than 150 additional ambulance officers in regional South Australia during our term of government, out of 350 statewide.

Also, of course, the Malinauskas Labor government doubled the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme fuel subsidy from 16¢ to 32¢ per kilometre for specialist services that are not currently available in regional South Australia. That was the first major increase to PATS in more than 20 years. Those are some of the things we are doing to address regional health, but we are well aware there is still more to do.

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:58): Will the minister inform the council about the recent milestone anniversary—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, which minister?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: —the Attorney-General—for voluntary assisted dying in South Australia?

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 his question. I am pleased to inform the member that the voluntary assisted dying scheme in South Australia recently marked one year since its introduction. That was on 31 January. It was one year since the introduction of voluntary assisted dying in this state.

It has been pleasing to hear many stories over the past year of how this reform has provided relief and what many have described as a beautiful death. For those who have suffered through an incurable, advanced, progressive illness, such as cancer, to describe something as a beautiful death in those circumstances is quite a remarkable thing.

In its first year of operation, 195 people were issued with a voluntary assisted dying permit; of those, 140 have passed away, with 110 of those being from administration of the VAD substance. This is roughly in line with international and interstate experience, where not all of those who are granted a permit pass away from using the substance, but have the substance, which many report has a palliative effect just knowing it is there, should they need or wish to take it.

One hundred and twenty-one doctors have registered to undertake the relevant training to approve voluntary assisted dying permits, with 73 having completed the training. The service has been accessible across the state, and it is pleasing to see that 27 per cent of practitioners are located across regional South Australia and 32 per cent of those who have applied for the training are from the regions.

Throughout the process of the voluntary assisted dying being formulated in South Australia, and for many years of advocacy, Dr Arnold Gillespie played a pivotal role in its formulation. Since the time Dr Gillespie worked tirelessly to see voluntary assisted dying legislation pass in this place, providing many members of parliament with the benefit of his professional medical wisdom, he became unwell through an illness from which he was unable to recover. Dr Gillespie endured ongoing pain and, after some time, he himself ended up making an application for voluntary assisted dying.

I have had the benefit of spending time talking to his wonderful wife Deb, who has described the peace of mind it brought Dr Gillespie being granted a VAD permit and how he passed away peacefully at home. In Deb's words, 'If you can have a beautiful death, he certainly had one of those.' Dr Arnold Gillespie's story epitomises why dying with dignity, through schemes such as voluntary

assisted dying, is such an important part of what we now have, not just in South Australia but in every single state around the country.

I thank all those who have been involved: the administrators in the health department, the Voluntary Assisted Dying Review Board, the practitioners who have registered or are undergoing training, and those who have supported these reforms.

COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICES

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:01): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Attorney-General on the topic of community legal services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: On 8 February this year, Community Legal Centres Australia wrote to federal Attorney-General Mark Dreyfus KC seeking urgent additional investment of at least \$125 million nationally to prevent the current funding crisis for 164 local legal services from worsening further. Their analysis reveals that Community Legal Centres are being forced to turn away over 200,000 people nationally each year. Community Legal Centres provide free assistance to people who need legal services information or education. My question to the Attorney-General is:

1. What is the government doing to ensure that people who need legal services in South Australia are able to access them?
2. Will the Attorney-General be advocating for more funding for the Legal Services Commission in the next state budget?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his important question. The provision of legal services to those in our community who need them is a very important issue. It is certainly something I have been very interested in since coming to government. I regularly meet with the body that provides an overarching voice for Community Legal Centres, as well as individual Community Legal Centres.

Very regularly, when I am on visits in regional South Australia, it is a great pleasure—and I have talked about this a number times in this chamber—to meet with Community Legal Centres. Only in the last week I met with a community service that provides legal advice and services to Aboriginal people in relation to family violence and other matters in the regions. When I was recently in the Riverland I had the benefit of dropping into the Community Legal Centre in Berri.

A very substantial review has been conducted by Dr Warren Mundy, the NLAP Review, which is looking at the provision of funding to community legal services right across Australia, including to ATSILS (Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander Legal Services) as well. That review, if not published, is due to be published soon, and I look forward to working with my federal colleagues, particularly the federal Attorney-General, in relation to recommendations made in that review.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE ELECTIONS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:04): I seek leave to make a very brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on Voice nominations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Premier was on radio yesterday, and as part of the news summaries it was reported—I am not sure if they were his words or not—that there were 'plenty of candidates running' for the Voice elections. My questions for the minister are:

1. Can he provide details to the chamber: of the 11 positions in region 1, Central, how many eligible nominations have been received?
2. Similarly, for region 2, Far North, of those seven positions how many eligible nominations have been received?
3. For region 3, Flinders and Upper North, of those seven how many have been received?

4. Region 4, Riverland and South-East, of the seven how many nominations have been received?

5. For region 5, West and West Coast, of those seven positions how many nominations have been received?

6. For region 6, Yorke and Mid North, of those seven positions how many nominations have been received?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:05): I thank the honourable member very much for her question and for her very genuine interest in this area. I note the interest she has shown and the way she—both as a minister and in opposition—involves herself with Aboriginal people and communities is very much appreciated.

In short, I can't provide her with an answer on the eligible nominations received, but that will be made public on 26 February. Nominations closed on Monday of last week—5pm Monday just over a week ago. There are still checks for exactly that eligibility for people who have nominated to make sure they are eligible and they are in the right region and their nomination is in order. February 26 is the date the Electoral Commissioner will release the details of all eligible nominations.

What I can inform the honourable member is that I have had an update from the Electoral Commissioner once nominations closed to let me know that nominations were very strong and healthy and that there were at least enough nominations for both the male and female positions that are required in every single area of the six regions. From memory, I think it was more than double the number of nominations for all the positions across South Australia that were made for the positions that are to be filled.

The first step is the nominations, and then there is the election. With that first step, it seems a very pleasing result that there was strong interest for those positions. That's reflected when I have been, over the last few weeks, in different areas around South Australia, from the very Far West Coast to the Riverland, where I think all or, if not, almost all of the Aboriginal community organisations that I visited have had displays of the First Nations Voice in their offices, encouraging people to get involved and to nominate. So it is pleasing to see how much this is being taken up by the Aboriginal community in South Australia.

Having said that, I might note that, almost as a word of caution, I am not sure what we will see as the turnout for the elections. It is a voluntary voting election. We know in voluntary voting elections, even where huge amounts are spent on awareness and where they have been around for a very long time, such as local council elections, there is often very low turnout for those. For ATSIC elections, which were conducted four times over the 1990s and which became very well known, I think turnout varied between, at the first ATSIC election in 1990, about 2,000 up to 2,600 or so for the fourth election in the late 1990s.

So while the nominations have been a very positive start, when you do something for the first time like these elections, I suspect there will be, starting out, as people get used to it, a smaller turnout that will grow over time.

PURRKANAITYA HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister please inform the chamber about the joint initiative of the state and commonwealth Labor governments to construct a new social housing development for Aboriginal elders?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am very pleased to be able to inform the chamber of an exciting recent development that involves both the South Australian and Australian governments to create Purrkanaitya on Kurna country at Bedford Park, which will provide a place to call home for Aboriginal elders. Purrkanaitya is Kurna, meaning 'for all elders'.

The project will see 40 modern and culturally appropriate homes built on land donated by the Indigenous Land and Sea Corporation, designed to serve Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander

tenants aged over 50 and empower them to live independently on country in affordable, safe and secure housing.

The South Australian government is proudly contributing \$4 million towards this initiative, assisted by a \$3 million federal government contribution. The development will be fit for purpose by way of accessible design features including stepless access and bathroom grab rails, as well as a number of communal areas and culturally significant outdoor fire pits.

The SA Housing Authority's Aboriginal Housing Strategy has a number of aims that will be advanced by this development, including to reduce homelessness amongst Aboriginal people, increasing housing supply and supporting innovative housing solutions. Elders at risk of homelessness will be targeted for inclusion in this project as well as those already living in social housing.

Importantly, the SA homes vacated by tenants who move into Purrkanaitya will be offered to Aboriginal clients currently placed in category 1 on the housing wait list. Aboriginal organisations will lead both the building and ongoing management of the village, with Aboriginal Community Housing to manage the tenancies. This is a very welcome initiative from the feedback that the government has received, and I certainly look forward to construction commencing in August of this year and the first residents moving in, it is anticipated, by the end of 2025.

PURRKANAITYA HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:10): Supplementary question: can the minister advise in what financial year the South Australian Housing Authority allocated \$4 million?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I refer her to the publicly available budget papers.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:11): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about domestic violence.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: For the past year I have been advocating for a brave and determined young mother, and her equally committed family, after she was violently stabbed close to death by her then husband in an horrendous act of domestic violence almost three years ago, and in front of their petrified children.

The gutless thug was initially charged with attempted murder, but later pleaded guilty to the lesser charge of aggravated recklessly causing harm, and sentenced to a jail term of five years and two months, with a non-parole period of three years. In his sentencing remarks in July 2022, Supreme Court judge Justice Stein said:

Given the seriousness of offending, the need to maintain adequate standards of punishment for serious crimes of domestic violence and the need for general and personal deterrence, I decline to partially suspend your sentence.

He continued:

Given the non-parole I have fixed, you are precluded from serving any sentence on home detention.

The thug was due for release in April this year. To the young mother's horror, and that of her concerned family, she was informed that he was going to be released seven months early in October last year, against those specific orders of Judge Stein.

Within hours of being released, he allegedly breached the condition of his release and an intervention violence order by allegedly posting photos of the children he had with his former wife on social media. The family notified SAPOL and he was charged but, again, to the woman and the family's disgust, he was not returned to prison but given bail to continue his home detention.

It gets worse. On the weekend, this long-suffering woman's and her family's psychological trauma hit rock bottom when she was notified that police had decided to drop those charges because

it cannot be proved the thug personally uploaded the photographs. It appears this person may be receiving preferential treatment and you wonder whether this government is serious about domestic violence and its weekly law and order announcements. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. How can a violent criminal be released from prison prior to his non-parole period expiring, specifically after such strong comments from the sentencing judge?
2. What is the point of a judge making such orders if they are ignored and overridden?

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. I don't recall the matter the honourable member is talking about but I am happy, if he wants to supply details, to look at the specifics of the individual case further. Of course, we abhor any sort of violence, and the scourge of domestic and family violence that is perpetrated very largely against women by men is something we take very seriously. We have had various pieces of legislation that we have moved, and we will do more over the next couple of years.

In relation to decisions police make about prosecuting authority or, if it finds its way to the DPP, major indictable offences, those are matters for those prosecuting authorities. I think most people would agree that you wouldn't want a government of the day or politicians stepping in to make prosecution decisions about what should or shouldn't be prosecuted.

Similarly, as I have said before in this chamber, I am not going to pass commentary on specific sentencing decisions when the court has had before it all of the information that has been presented in a case and determined the most appropriate sentence. I am happy for, perhaps later on, a member of the honourable member's office to look at the individual case if the honourable member wants to provide some details privately about the matter he is talking about.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:15): Supplementary: I will just point out to the Attorney-General that I have actually written to the police minister about this case some time ago. Can I ask the Attorney-General: who makes the determination for the early release—the Parole Board or the Department for Correctional Services?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:16): Again, without knowing the nature of the release it is difficult to say without individual circumstances, but the honourable member is probably correct that the police minister, who also has responsibility for correctional services, will probably be able to provide better information about a specific matter.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:16): Supplementary: is the Attorney satisfied with a three-year head sentence, three years actually time served, for stabbing a woman multiple times and nearly killing her?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:16): Again, I thank the honourable member for his invitation to comment on what the court has decided within the bounds of the range of penalties that we set down as a parliament. Firstly, I am not aware of the individual case, and even if I was I have resisted the invitations previously to pass commentary on matters where judges have heard all of the evidence that has been presented and the arguments that have been put forward by the prosecution and defence. I know the honourable member has, as we all do and as I particularly do, an interest in keeping the community as safe as possible. I am not going to start a habit of commenting on an individual case and the sentence.

IMMIGRANT DETENTION

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:17): My questions are to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney now update the chamber on the number of detainees currently in South Australia as a result of the *NZYQ v Minister for Immigration, Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs* case? Could the Attorney confirm if any government housing was provided, as he committed last sitting week?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): As I have previously said, I am happy to get updates if there are any available. I have previously informed the chamber that the federal authorities are working with SAPOL on this matter, that SAPOL is very well equipped, as they diligently show very much of the time, to keep the community safe. I am happy to restart the process of finding an update from last sitting week and find figures that might be two weeks' more up to date. That will of course delay the honourable member in getting an answer, but I am happy that other ministers—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to give instructions that other ministers' departments that have started the work on answering the member's previous questions put that all on hold and restart the process to find out more up-to-date information.

IMMIGRANT DETENTION

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:19): Supplementary: will the Attorney come back with a response by the next sitting week? When was the Attorney last briefed on this serious matter?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for her question. I don't have further figures than those that I have provided previously but, as I said, I am happy for any work in relation to providing answers to previous questions to be scrapped and stopped to restart the process to find out answers in relation to this week's question.

IMMIGRANT DETENTION

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:19): Supplementary question: can the Attorney-General please advise when he or other ministers were first advised to make first preparations to protect South Australians from these hardcore criminals?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order: how could that come from the original answer?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter, I will rule on the supplementary questions. That has been going on for 100-plus years.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is not a supplementary question, the Hon. Mrs Henderson, and really you should know better. The Hon. Mr Pangallo, I will listen to your attempt at a supplementary question arising from the answer.

IMMIGRANT DETENTION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:20): Do the government, the Attorney-General and SAPOL know where these criminals are, and what is the type of monitoring that is taking place?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. I don't know the operational details of what SAPOL are working jointly with the commonwealth officials on but, as I have said before, SAPOL have said that they are well equipped—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —in their joint operation—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter and the Hon. Ms Girolamo, I can't hear the answer.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I would apologise on behalf of this chamber to the Hon. Frank Pangallo for the disrespect he is being shown by members opposite when I am trying to answer his question.

The PRESIDENT: And the member behind you, if you are going to go down that path.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Not quite that far, sir.

The PRESIDENT: No, of course not.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I have previously informed the chamber, and as the police minister pointed out last year, there is a joint operation between SA Police, the Australian Federal Police and the Australian Border Force to monitor these released detainees. I don't have exact operational information of how that is being conducted, and even if I had that information I would be pretty sure it would be something that wouldn't be discussed publicly in how an operation that involves Border Force, the Australian Federal Police and the SA Police were doing that.

AGRIFUTURES RURAL WOMEN'S AWARD

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the progress of the 2024 South Australian AgriFutures Rural Women's Award?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest. The AgriFutures Rural Women's Award was established in 2000 to raise the profile of talented and passionate women involved in primary industries and rural Australia. Over the past 24 years, the award has both highlighted and supported the contributions of more than 250 women who lead the development and implementation of diverse and innovative projects, businesses and programs in regional Australia.

On 9 February, I had the pleasure to announce the three finalists for this year's South Australian award. In no particular order, they are:

- Nikki Atkinson from Wilmington in the Flinders Ranges, a designer of luxury, sustainable wedding dresses and occasion wear made from merino wool;
- Suzi Evans from Mantung, a mental health first aid trainer and founder of the resilience-building program "Workbench for the Mind"; and
- Susie Williams, an entrepreneur from Willunga and developer of the Fleurieu App, an online platform that provides free local news and celebrates local businesses, events, places and achievements that define the region.

Each is in the running to receive a \$15,000 grant from Westpac, which can be used to enhance their endeavours through a number of ways: formal training in leadership and business management, overseas study tours, establishing business plans or pilot programs, developing educational or promotional campaigns, networking at forums and conferences, developing training programs, testing information technology initiatives, developing or testing a new business concept or innovation, and publishing books.

In addition, the South Australian winner will also attend a three-day workshop with other state and territory winners to focus on further professional development and to refine their winning project, business or program initiative. The South Australian winner will also go on to represent the state at a gala dinner in Canberra and be in the running for the national AgriFutures Rural Women's Award.

The AgriFutures Rural Women's Award provides a focal point to celebrate the achievements and contributions of some exceptional female role models, which in many ways represents so many other regional women who perform critical functions at the heart of rural communities. I congratulate all of the finalists and look forward to the announcement of the South Australian winner on 26 March.

APY ART CENTRE COLLECTIVE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, representing the Minister for Arts, on the subject of the APY Art Centre Collective.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: In the previous sitting week, I asked several questions of the Minister for Arts via the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. I received an answer today and, with regard to my questions about the opposition art dealer who was potentially behind the video that launched the so-called scandal into the APY Art Centre Collective, they were not answered by the minister. Certainly, the role that Yanda studio played has not been addressed by the Minister for Arts in her answer.

In my question to the Minister for Arts about whether or not Greg Bearup, *The Australian* reporter who has made assertions and published about the findings of the tri-government review, whether he was provided with any information about the findings of the review, the Minister for Arts has advised that the terms of reference for the panel was a publicly available document. I did not ask for the terms of reference of the review, I asked whether the findings of the review—which are not publicly available—have been made available to *The Australian* journalist. That question remains unanswered.

I note that the potential role that Yanda studio played, which it has now been exposed that they played a role in a hit piece—both through the media and elsewhere—on APY Art Centre Collective, was also not addressed by the Minister for Arts in her answer to this question. I do note, however, that at the end of the minister's answer it says that the review is now concluded, that governance and management issues have been referred to ORIC and that consumer protection issues have been referred to the ACCC. It states that:

We are committed to supporting Aboriginal artists across South Australia to share their art with the world and ensuring their cultural heritage is respected and that culturally safe workplace practices are in place.

So my question to the Minister for Arts, via the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, is: will she now unfreeze the \$40,000 that she froze during the tri-government review that was earmarked for the Port Augusta operations of the APY Art Centre Collective, and will she ensure also that the Coober Pedy APY Art Centre Collective operations can open, so that they are no longer painting in the heat, in the weather, on a basketball court, but are able to have a not just culturally safe but an appropriate workplace for their artwork?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. I will refer those on to the Minister for Arts in another place. Some of that I have knowledge of and can offer some answers, but the remainder I will undertake to refer to the minister in another place. I am not aware of the \$40,000 commitment to arts in Port Augusta, but I am sure that the minister in another place will be able to provide an answer in relation to that.

I am aware of the arts centre in Umoona, the Aboriginal community located at Coober Pedy. I know that very well because I have spent time sitting on the basketball court, which I know has been used for change rooms for films that have been up there in the past. I have attended funerals at that basketball centre in the past as well. It is a big structure, but it is not appropriate for a modern facility for an arts centre.

I spent time with a number of artists from that community, who are doing exceptionally well. They have been finalists and, I think, even winners of the Telstra art prize, the most regarded national art prize in Australia, and I understand, but I will check with the minister in another place, that the facility—I think it was about half a million dollars from a state government grant to build a purpose-built art facility in Umoona—is, if not now, due for completion very soon, on my understanding, but I am happy to check on that.

CRIME RATES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:29): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding rising crime rates in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Over the past 12 months, South Australia has experienced a very significant spike in crime, with police statistics revealing the following: robbery and theft-related offences have increased by 23 per cent; shop theft has increased by 31 per cent; assaults on police also a 31 per cent increase; homicides a 17 per cent increase; serious assaults resulting in injury a 16 per cent increase; abduction, harassment and other offences an 18 per cent increase; family and domestic violence and abuse related offences an 11 per cent increase; aggravated sexual assault an 8 per cent increase; and sexual assault itself a 6 per cent increase.

In light of these figures, late last year—before these figures were publicly available—Minister Tom Koutsantonis told the media that the state government would be reviewing the penalty thresholds for criminal behaviour, stating:

If there's any changes that need to be made I know that the Attorney-General and police minister will work day and night to make sure [they] do this.

My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Why has crime across so many categories risen so much in South Australia in the last 12 months?
2. Does the Attorney agree with the prevailing sentiment that perceived weak sentencing is somehow contributing and preventing deterrence to crime?

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 his question and, as I mentioned earlier, his very strong interest in making sure that South Australia is kept as safe as it possibly can be. It is true, as he has mentioned from the member for West Torrens, the Minister for Transport in another place, that it is and should be one of the top priorities of government to make sure we keep South Australia as safe as it possibly can be.

We have seen an increase in a whole range of different offences pass by this parliament over the last two years. Things that have been top of mind are to do with the driving without due care offences, after the Sophia Naismith tragic death, and we have seen very significant increases for child sex offences that this parliament has passed in the last two years. We always stand ready to look at what needs to be done to keep the community safe. In fact, there will be legislation we debate this week that aims to do exactly that in relation to keeping the community as safe as possible.

I note some of the categories of offending that the member has pointed out. My information is that the 2022-23 Australian Bureau of Statistics figures released on 8 February this year showed an increase of 1.91 per cent in the offending rate recorded by police from the year before. So yes, there will be some categories that will go up and there will be some categories that go down as well; however, I am informed that just under 2 per cent was the overall increase in offences recorded by police.

A Report on Government Services, I think, recently pointed out, and as the police minister in the other place and the member for Cheltenham, the Hon. Joe Szakacs, has pointed out, that per head of population we have more police officers than any other state in Australia. It is that dual commitment to making sure there is the legislative response in place, as the honourable member said, to create the deterrent, but also that we have police numbers and police with the resources necessary to combat those.

The honourable member makes a very correct observation. Much of the idea of what we have as criminal sanctions are aimed not only at making sure people are behind bars and the community safe because they are not within the community with a chance to reoffend, but to create that deterrent effect so that people think more carefully about the behaviour they might engage in because there are those significant penalties if they engage in the behaviour.

APOLOGY DAY 2024

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:33): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister tell the chamber about last week's Apology Day 2024 community event at Veale Park?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:34): I thank the honourable member for his question and note his very keen interest in the area of Aboriginal affairs, demonstrated, of course, by his long-time stewardship as the Chair of the former Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee.

On 13 February 2008, the then Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, delivered a well overdue apology to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders who were removed as children in what we have come to know in Australia as the stolen generations. This was something that most state parliaments had done many years before.

Back in 1997, when the Bringing Them Home report was laid on the table in the federal parliament, South Australia, two days after that happened, had an apology by I think then Aboriginal affairs minister, Dean Brown, on behalf of the South Australian people for the forced removal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children who were members of the stolen generations.

It was some time, more than a decade, after that, despite very long and loud calls from members of the Aboriginal community, that on 13 February, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd delivered that apology on behalf of the Australian people in the federal parliament. Each year since then, right across Australia, there are events held to remember that anniversary and the poignancy of that day when the apology took place.

Like years before, remembering the day that the apology occurred in South Australia was a very significant day for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community. There is a walk from the centre of the city to Veale Park in the South Parklands, ending with a community event organised to commemorate the apology and create a space for community to come together to heal and reflect.

Once again, I will acknowledge it was good to see bipartisan support for this. Again this year, the member for Heysen, Josh Teague, the shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs, was in attendance at the event. It was an honour once more to be able to speak at the event and provide my personal reflections on how important that apology was to Aboriginal people in South Australia, particularly having been at Elder Park on 13 February 2008 amongst so many members of the stolen generations when the apology was originally delivered.

Of course, it was a good opportunity to talk about the next steps we are taking in South Australia, South Australia being the first mainland state to provide a reparations scheme for members of the stolen generations back in 2015. I thank those who were involved in the event held in the South Parklands on 13 February, and I certainly intend to attend future anniversaries when this day is remembered in South Australia.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS PORTFOLIO) BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 February 2024.)

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:37): We find ourselves here today because of two things, one called common sense and the other called media pressure. One thing the Labor Party lacks, and the other thing is the only thing the Labor Party responds to. We are here today due to the sheer ideological arrogance of this government.

The government have been brought here with their tails between their legs, ordered by the Premier. The Attorney-General has been sent back here full of contrition and, I hope, apologies for his poor behaviour during the last week of sitting, all of which could have been avoided if not for the sheer arrogance against our community, against our veterans, against their families and against the vast majority of Australians who support Australia Day.

To refresh the memories of those opposite, this side of the chamber did the work. We spoke to the community, got the sense of what the community wanted and brought sensible amendments to this place—sensible amendments that would have protected days like Australia Day, ANZAC Day and Christmas Day but, in their arrogance, this government rejected them all.

Those amendments would have achieved what we are tackling here today. In contrast, the other side chose to play politics with this. Worse than that, they chose to ignore, denigrate and dismiss those South Australians who care about the naming of days such as Australia Day, Christmas Day and, most importantly, ANZAC Day. We are here to put them back in the right place. We need to make sure that common sense prevails.

We know that the Premier was put under significant pressure by the media and hundreds of veterans, who were appalled by the changes that were made. At the time of the absence of the Premier, he declared this to be a storm in a teacup, as described. The Premier was dragged back from yet another sporting announcement somewhere else to address this serious issue.

If anything, this issue shows a severe lack of depth in the government benches, in that no-one, not even the Minister for Veterans Affairs, thought that the erasure of ANZAC Day was an issue to the community. The veterans minister has been completely absent on this issue too, which is very disappointing.

The Attorney-General, the first law official in this state, abdicated his role as the lawmaker in charge and allowed what he called a stylistic drafting choice to reign instead. If it is to be believed that the Attorney consulted with hundreds of individuals, hundreds of organisations and hundreds of companies over many weeks, it is strange that no-one, not one person, raised an objection to the major name changes, possibly because they were not told about them.

I wonder if this is yet another sneaky ploy by a sneaky government. I hope to receive an apology but, with the arrogance of those opposite, I will not be holding my breath. Names matter, and it is telling that the Premier was on leave and the B-team were in charge. Look at the chaos that occurred. I do not think the Premier will be taking a break anytime soon.

At every ANZAC ceremony I have ever attended, before or since becoming a member of parliament, the Ode of Remembrance was recited and, as the audience, we repeated the refrain:

We will remember them

Lest we forget.

The government have lost their way, blinded by their arrogance and control of the numbers in the chambers, and cheered on by the Greens and their 'SA-Besties', who set to dismantle our great institutions at every step. Names matter to our community, but all that matters to Labor is spin. Still today we are continuing to hear the spin from this sneaky government. Instead of naming this bill as simply an amendment to the Public Holidays Act, it is being referred to as the Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024, making use of the one last time they can spin their great mistake.

Today is a day of reckoning, another day of backflips, and I look forward to the backflips that are still coming. I am disappointed it took so long for the government to see sense. I would like to say thank you to our community of veterans and thank you to the thousands of South Australians who rallied for these amendments to finally be addressed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:42): I rise with elation to speak in absolute favour of this bill. We do not want to say I told you so to those opposite, but we told you so. How depressing it must be for the Leader of the Government in this place to have to skulk back into this chamber, no doubt feeling defeated and possibly ashamed, and bring this amendment bill forward after having voted against it and having belittled the opposition whilst doing so.

It pays never to be too overconfident and arrogant in this place because, on occasion, it will absolutely come back to bite you. Can I just remind the chamber and those on the government benches that during the debate, when the opposition moved an identical set of amendments in this

place prior to the Christmas break, the arrogance that was displayed by the government around those amendments was absolutely extraordinary.

Comments such as 'you have no clue' and general grandstanding were what we heard from those opposite. However, today they seem somewhat subdued. Some might say they even appear somewhat sheepish. If it is not too forward, I would perhaps even suggest that the Leader of the Government and those opposite owe the Hon. Heidi Girolamo an apology for not supporting her sound amendments to begin with.

I am sure we all know the old saying, 'When the cat's away, the mice will play.' Well, that is exactly what we saw in the final sitting week of last year. The Premier, rightfully, took some time off—I think it was just a week, from memory—after the birth of his son, and the government fell into a rabble, so much so that the Premier then had to come back, like a schoolteacher, reprimand his children and fix the nightmare of a mess they had created in his short one-week absence. Imagine if he had had two weeks!

It goes to show that the mob opposite are the still the same old Labor with their bickering and infighting, and when the leader of the right is away the left will play, and what a joy it is to watch. Not only that, this is a clear display of the ineptitude of Labor's ministers and of how out of touch they are with community sentiment. While their boss was away they were entirely unable to recognise what South Australians truly want and showed their complete lack of connection to the real world.

Enough of me pointing out the failings of Labor, although I do enjoy doing so. This is actually a very serious matter for many South Australians, and that is why the Hon. Heidi Girolamo brought these amendments to the chamber in the first place. These amendments protect the sanctity of these days, and every one of these public holidays should be referred to by its rightful name. I certainly saw no logical reason for removing those names in the first place.

Australia Day is a significant day for many Australians. Changing it to a date radically reduces the significance of that holiday. It is entirely appropriate that we continue to refer to the official national day of Australia by its proper name and not 26 January. Similarly, ANZAC Day is a day that commemorates those who have fallen. It is absolutely offensive and outrageous to those who have sacrificed their all, and to their loved ones, for this public holiday to be reduced to a date and not referred to by its proper name—we do our wonderful ANZACs a grave disservice if we agree to anything less.

This is not merely a matter of semantics. The government bill, as it currently stands without this amendment bill, denigrates what that holiday commemorates—and 25 December is Christmas Day. No fair-minded person would believe that it is appropriate to label this public holiday as 25 December. Christmas is celebrated by the great majority of South Australians, and none of them would want that public holiday described as 25 December. Christians, and even those without faith, treat this day as one of the most important days of the year.

I reiterate that this is not just a matter of semantics. Our amendments are a way of recognising the value of this day and not reducing it to a date, like those opposite want. For these reasons, I indicate to this chamber that I will support this amendment bill in its entirety. It is lovely to see that the government has finally woken up, has seen the light, has done a backflip and has found a small sense of humility to recognise that they were absolutely and utterly wrong.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:48): I rise to also support these amendments. I remember late last year coming into this chamber and thinking to myself: I think what the Hon. Heidi Girolamo is doing is assisting the government because they have forgotten to pop these names in. But, then, to see the arrogance of the government on that side—the jeering, the nastiness directed to towards my friend the Hon. Heidi Girolamo—I was quite incensed. I was like, 'What is going on here?'

The glee with which those barbs came across this chamber, the glee with which the government was sitting there patting itself on the back for omitting these names, thinking what a wonderful job they had done, was extremely disappointing, but then only a few days later having to scramble. I can only imagine the conversation over the phone from the Premier to those opposite: 'What are you doing? Social engineering should be done in a clandestine way. You guys are doing

it in such a huge and open way. We are going to have to roll this back. I'm going to look very silly.' I can just imagine what the Premier was saying.

Indeed, you are rolling these things back, and you can sit there and trade barbs, again from the other side of the house, but you are rolling these back. You are inserting the names, as you should have last year and saved a lot of heartache, because I can tell you there are hundreds if not thousands—indeed, thousands—of South Australians who did weigh in on this and did say that it was a travesty to omit those names, that they wanted them back in. I am certainly glad that the government has come to its senses, although still with this air of arrogance towards us opposite for doing the right thing.

I could go on about the government's display. I could go on about the Attorney-General framing this issue as a political football and a fear campaign drummed up by the Liberal Party, but in the interests of brevity and humility I will end my contribution. I commend the return of common sense that we are witnessing with the passage of this bill, and I hope we do not see another repeat of the arrogance coming from this government, although I will not hold my breath.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:50): I think we can say it in one single sentence: the government got it wrong. It is pretty straightforward, I think, to all observers that the government got it wrong. When this bill was originally introduced and the Hon. Heidi Girolamo attempted to amend it there was almost disdain from the government, almost a sense of, 'You're making something of this that's not really there.'

I will tell you who does believe there is something there, and that is, for instance, our veterans, of which my father is one. When I informed him what the government was doing he was genuinely surprised and disappointed. He is quite a balanced man. He does not overreact. I can imagine there would be some who felt much more strongly about it—not that he did not feel strongly, because he did, but he controlled himself, if you like. But there were many people who would be very upset, particularly at renaming ANZAC Day, or deleting the name of ANZAC Day I should say. It was wrong at the time, and I am pleased to see the government has finally come to its senses.

I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition made a good point. I think the Hon. Ms Girolamo was treated very poorly during the debate and is owed an apology. She was right. The fact that we have this bill before us today proves that she was right, and I think if the government was humble about this and wanted to make amends to some extent, as this bill seeks to do, then part of that should be an apology to the Hon. Ms Girolamo.

It goes further than that, of course, to Christmas Day. Christmas Day is a sacred day to many people in Australia. Even those without religious faith celebrate Christmas Day—most people do anyway—exchanging gifts and the like, and to delete the word 'Christmas' from that holy, sacred day is just wrong at every level. What happens to people, when they agree on something like that, that makes them think that is actually fair and reasonable?

The overwhelming majority of people do not see it that way. In fact, Ray Morgan polls have consistently revealed that approximately two-thirds of Australians believe that 26 January should be known as Australia Day, and the numbers for Christmas Day are even higher than that. So why on earth would any government seek to remove what everyone knows those days as from what they are?

There is a risk with governments, and I am seeing it with this one. The truth is, governments can become arrogant. To some extent all governments are arrogant, but there is a risk of governments becoming increasingly and overly arrogant during the course of their term. I think that is a risk for this government. When their leader was away, as one of my colleagues put it, the mice came out to play, or perhaps the left came out to play—I am not sure which way is better to put it—but whoever it was, someone came out to play and made a complete mess of this, a complete mess of it.

Finally, this will be righted today. I am pleased it will be righted. These are only words on paper in one sense, but those words matter a lot to a lot of people. This was wrong from the outset, it is finally being corrected and I am so glad to see it.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:54): I rise today to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024, or perhaps it should have been called the 'statutes amendment fixing Labor's mistakes bill'. We are in Labor's backflip era. Labor truly seemed to be on a roll, backflipping last sitting week to support the Liberals' initiative to ban the corflute on Stobie poles at election time, and this week they are backflipping and walking back their misstep in dealing with our state's public holidays.

You may recall last year a very arrogant Labor government ramming through their public holidays bill, a bill where they decided to not refer to multiple fixed-date public holidays by their traditional names but, instead, by their dates, a bill the Liberal Party sought to amend to add the traditional names for these public holidays—amendments the Labor government opposed.

In fact, *The Advertiser* asked the Premier why the government had not accepted the changes in the first place, to which he said that he was not in the parliament at the time as he was on paternity leave. This is no criticism of the Premier for taking paternity leave, but I think it speaks volumes that he cannot trust his cabinet to take a commonsense view—that when the Premier is away, the children will come to play.

South Australia has a Labor government that is so far in over their heads that they cannot be trusted to even amend a bill, let alone be able to handle the big issues like ramping or the cost-of-living crisis. When the Hon. Mr Ben Hood gave his speech on Labor's 12 days of Christmas, I do not think we were expecting Labor to take on the mantra to become the grinch who stole Christmas.

On 30 November 2023, the government issued a statement titled, 'Legislation to make Christmas Day a public holiday every year has passed parliament.' This is quite unusual considering that the word 'Christmas' was not used in the legislation once—not once. Despite the statement from the government about making Christmas Day a public holiday, my speech has already referenced the word 'Christmas' more times than the public holiday bill put forward by Labor.

Some would say that, over the Christmas break, Labor have had a 'Come to Jesus moment'. It appears that over the Christmas break the Labor government has had time to listen—imagine that, actually listening—to the South Australian community about the Labor government's plan to badge these days with a mere date in the legislation. To quote an article following Labor's mess-up, it was stated:

In the world of politics, some things are sacred.

So important are they within the community that no government would dare to even toy with the idea of a change...

It goes on to say that:

...the backlash faced by the South Australian government over the past week seemed somewhat inevitable.

It would seem that Labor well and truly missed that memo. One news article said that the South Australian government has been labelled 'unAustralian'. Another article reported that:

RSL state president Dave Petersen said that some veterans had been bewildered and upset by a Public Holiday bill, which passed parliament last week, that does not describe public holidays by their traditional names but instead by their dates...

And that:

...the RSL is urging Anzac Day be reinstated into wording of public holiday laws, saying that this would be a simple measure to stop confusion.

This, ultimately, is why we see Labor's backflip here today.

Why should ANZAC Day be reduced to a mere date in our legislation? Why should Australia Day be reduced to a mere date in our legislation? Why should Christmas Day be reduced to a mere date in our legislation? Why do we not proudly refer to those days by their traditional names, to give them their meaning? We in the Liberal Party believe in the importance of referring to those significant dates by their names in legislation. We in the Liberal Party believe in the importance of protecting our nation's values and traditions.

South Australians deserve to know that Australia Day, ANZAC Day and Christmas Day will remain key dates to be commemorated by our community going into the future. That is why the Liberal Party pushed for these changes last year. It is nice to see that the Labor Party have finally decided to come to the table and make the necessary changes to align with the expectations of our community, but I think the damage for Labor is already done and they might be a little bit too late to this party today.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:59): I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024. What is this government bill about? The title of the bill is not exactly clear. If you look closely, is it not another public holidays bill? It is about amending the names of public holidays or, should we say, inserting names of public holidays. To save themselves from embarrassment, the Labor government gave the bill the title: Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024.

Backflip after backflip seems to be the new process that the Malinauskas Labor government has adopted. It is incredibly shortsighted. The Labor government has wasted valuable time in parliament to fix up their initial legislation because they did not get it right in the first place. I highly commend the Hon. Heidi Girolamo for her great work in standing up to move sensible amendments in the council about public holidays.

The honourable member was poorly treated by those on the Labor benches. She was bullied, she was harassed and she was called names by members of the Labor Party. I believe they owe her an apology. The Malinauskas Labor government also owes an apology—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): Order!

The Hon. J.S. LEE: —to the people of South Australia. Why?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): The Hon. Ms Lee, if you could please take a seat. The Hon. Tammy Franks with a point of order.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The honourable member has made accusations of bullying and harassment. If she wishes to make those, she should refer those matters to a Privileges Committee and we can adjudicate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): Do you wish to refer those to a Privileges Committee, the Hon. Ms Lee?

The Hon. J.S. LEE: No.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): I am happy to just move on from that for now.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Thank you, Mr Acting President, for letting me continue my speech. The Malinauskas Labor government also owes an apology to the people of South Australia. Why? Because they have the wrong priorities. As we start the parliamentary year, we should be focusing on important issues confronting South Australians, such as the cost of living, the housing crisis and the ramping crisis.

Instead, we are using parliamentary time to fix up legislation because the Labor government was too arrogant to listen, to consult properly and to care about how South Australians truly feel about the meaning that is attached to the names that identify those public holidays in this state's legislation.

Let us step back. We used to have the Holidays Act, until it was repealed by the government's bill dealing with these naming conventions. Labor's government ministers argued that the names allocated to public holidays were unnecessary. They further argued that those names, such as Christmas and ANZAC Day, did not mean anything to anybody so we did not need to have them in the legislation.

To the amazement of many, government ministers also argued that they had not been in the act previously. But our hardworking shadow treasurer, the member for Colton, Matt Cowdrey, in the other place highlighted some key facts in his contribution. He pointed out that in the Holidays Act 1910, which was in force between 2012 and 2023, under section 3A 'ANZAC Day' was printed and under section 3B you will find 'Christmas Eve'. If you turn the page in the act, you will find 'Good Friday' and on the next page 'Christmas Day' is mentioned.

Government ministers are trying to rewrite history by denying the names associated with those public holidays. The names of these public holidays hold special value in the hearts and minds of our community and they resonate with the South Australian public. We on this side of the chamber know full well how important those names are. Names of public holidays matter because they hold significant legacy.

We do not have public holidays for the sake of long weekends. We do not have public holidays so that we can party with our friends and family. ANZAC Day is an important day for all Australians to honour those who made the ultimate sacrifice. ANZAC Day is on 25 April. It has been recognised in this country since 1916. It is an important part of Australian history. As honourable members know, ANZAC Day is a commemoration of the anniversary of the landing of Australian and New Zealand troops at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915.

As the longest continuous serving member of parliament in the portfolio of multicultural affairs (since 2010) I know there are many new arrivals and migrants who do not understand the significance of the public holiday on 25 April. I have, over the years, taken the liberty at every opportunity to share information about ANZAC Day with our migrant communities. It is important that all Australians know about 25 April as a national day of commemoration for brave soldiers, for victims of war and for recognition of the role of the armed forces.

The Liberal Party strongly opposed the deletion of the names of those public holidays from Labor's legislation for good reason: we believe that certain names carry a legacy that cannot and should not be erased. Language matters. A title matters. A name carries with it a specific commitment and intent to make us pay attention and pay respect. These names should never be erased and should never be replaced by just a date.

We wonder: was it a complete lack of political judgement by the Labor government? Or was it a complete lack of understanding of the sentiments of the South Australian public? Or was it just a complete lack of empathy towards how South Australians feel about such a matter? Regardless of what it was, we welcome the backflip.

The RSL welcomes the government introducing the bill. I take this opportunity to join other members on this bench to recognise and thank those committed members of RSL sub-brigades throughout South Australia who shared with the Liberal opposition their views of retaining ANZAC Day in the legislation.

We are fortunate to be living in a multicultural country where all faiths are respected. Christmas is celebrated around the world on the same date every year: 25 December. Many honourable members know that I was born in Malaysia. The Malays, the Chinese and the Indians are the three largest populations of people in Malaysia. They belong to different faiths—Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu and Christian are the four largest faith groups. In Malaysia, Christmas Day is declared as a national public holiday. All Malaysians, regardless of whether or not they are Christian or of other faith, recognise Christmas Day on 25 December.

The Advertiser quite rightly pointed out that all of this could have been avoided, as other honourable members already mentioned. I want to say thank you to the veterans community, thank you to the South Australian community, thank you to the media for putting the pressure on, and I note the consistent calls by the Liberal Party to make those changes and fix this legislation. I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:08): I, too, rise to support this piece of legislation, which has been comprehensively canvassed by my honourable colleagues in many ways. I am not going to repeat a number of the very good and sound comments they have made, except in a couple of instances, and that is to say that the Liberal Party certainly understands the depth and importance

and observance of the names and titles of Australia Day, ANZAC Day and Christmas Day. If those amendments that were moved on behalf of the Liberal Party by the Hon. Ms Girolamo were accepted, this would have been avoided.

Honourable members have spoken about the hurt this has caused a range of communities, in that the Labor Party and others thought it fit to delete those titles from legislation, so it is pleasing that the government realised that it got it wrong and has reversed it. Symbols are important, titles are important, and we certainly stand up for those important things that are a part of our heritage.

The Hon. Ms Girolamo did a sterling job on the day, and I would like to reflect on some of that debate, which has already been reflected on. There was a lot of jeering that afternoon, particularly from Labor members, but I also think it was disappointing that there was a mean girl pile-on from members in this chamber. I think that is not a way for us to behave ourselves. I think if that had come from a conservative male toward any member broadly of the left or centre left that would have been something of subject commentary. I hope it is not something that we see again.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:10): I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024. I note that the title of this bill is determined by parliamentary counsel. There are rules around titles of bills, so for the opposition's education that is where the title of this bill came from, not from the government, not from the Greens and not from the crossbench.

Parliamentary counsel, who are the official drafters of legislation, are the ones who also follow drafting rules for bills, including the titles of bills. It should come as no surprise to the Liberal opposition that an amendment to the statutes will start with 'Statutes Amendment'. So many of the bills that we discuss in this place do.

I rise to echo my support for ensuring that in the future, unlike under the Marshall government, when a Christmas holiday falls on a Sunday workers shall get their rightful entitlements to enjoy the benefits of that being a public holiday. That is why this debate was brought to this chamber before Christmas.

To the Liberal Party I say, I know what you did last summer: you lied to the South Australian people about legislation that this parliament passed. You lied to the RSL. You lied to the community. The Liberal opposition went out there over their Christmas holiday—they were not in their offices because I did make a phone call on one of those days to a Liberal member of this place who was not in her office. Funny that. But you went out and you lied. You lied and you said Australia Day was under attack and ANZAC Day was under attack. You created fear, and you created a situation of post-truth politics. So here we are fixing your lies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: If they are lies why do they need fixing is the interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. They need fixing because unfortunately people believe politicians when they tell lies, and so the government has brought a piece of legislation in to give assurance to the South Australian community that those lies were not true. If they were true the government would not have this bill here today that we are now debating.

We are in post-truth politics, unfortunately, and indeed the Fringe comedy act seems to have come to this particular council. We have not one, not two, not three, not four, not five, not six, but seven members of the Liberal opposition speaking to this bill today. Do we ever get seven people from the Liberal opposition talking about the cost-of-living crisis? Do we ever get seven members of the opposition talking about child protection or education or actual health, rather than just their rhetoric on health?

The names were not deleted by the previous bill. Indeed, had they really been concerned, the Liberal opposition, in those four years of the Marshall government, could have changed the legislation then but they chose not to, and they also chose not to make Christmas Day a public holiday when it fell on a Sunday. Deliberately, they chose to have Christmas Day not enjoyed as a public holiday by those workers who worked under the Marshall government's regime.

Where was their virtue signalling then? Where was their care for the importance of Christmas to families then? It was absent. I have to say, though, it is virtue signalling from the Liberal opposition

when they do not support it, but symbolism and words are very important when they do. It just seems to be whether or not they agree with the concept that is before the debate.

I note that one of the members of the opposition discussed the bewildered and upset members of the RSL, and I expressed my concern that members of the RSL were bewildered and upset because there was no reason for them to fear that ANZAC Day was under attack. There was no reason for that fear campaign to have been promulgated by the Liberal opposition—but here we are. Members of this crossbench will have long memories about the way this Liberal Party operates.

There has also been a lot of talk about mean girls and pile-ons, and the Labor Party apparently piling on the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, and talk in the lower house of how she was bullied. Well, I am going to refresh members about what the Hon. Heidi Girolamo had to say when she put up her amendments around the insertion of the name 'Australia Day'. I asked the honourable member to tell us what happened on 26 January not once but several times during the debate. I even gave her about 20 to 30 minutes to, I don't know, google it, during the last debate.

At the time, when I asked the Hon. Heidi Girolamo what happened on 26 January, she stated, 'I just cannot be bothered.' Hardly an appropriate response for somebody putting up an amendment. She then went on to say, 'Would you like a history lesson?', to which I responded, 'Yes, a history lesson, Heidi. Tell us more about it.' The Hon. Heidi Girolamo then said:

In regard to this bill, we feel that this is an opportune time, given the changes that are coming through for the Public Holidays Bill, to ensure that Australia Day remains on 26 January to recognise when Captain Cook first came through—

I replied, 'Captain Cook!'—pretty much like that.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): Order!

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Then there were members interjecting, and I know that my interjection was, 'Wrong captain, wrong cove.' The Hon. Heidi Girolamo then finally corrected herself, but I note that the member had at least half an hour to have looked up what happened on 26 January before she finally deigned to answer the question.

So the honourable member came in having no concept of what had happened on 26 January and getting an answer wrong: a commonly held misconception amongst many that apparently when Lieutenant Cook, in 1770, came to Port Botany, that was on 26 January. We know that is a common error in our historical understanding, but it is not an error I would have thought the lead Liberal opposition Legislative Councillor moving an amendment around Australia Day would have made.

The reflection of the response of this council to the Hon. Heidi Girolamo was more on her lack of preparedness, her arrogance, her refusal to acknowledge that she did not know what she was talking about, to amendments that were filed and circulated literally hours before we had the debate, without due consultation with members of this council whatsoever, reflects more on her performance that day. Certainly, the words 'shame' have been used in this debate. They have been attributed to the Attorney-General. I would suggest that the Liberal opposition hold up a mirror to themselves.

The Hon. L.A. Henderson: Actually, the use of 'shame' hasn't been to the Attorney-General, it has been against the conduct towards the Hon. Heidi Girolamo.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Say it a little louder, the Hon. Laura Henderson, and then I will be able to respond to your interjection and get it on *Hansard*.

The Hon. L.A. Henderson: I said: the use of 'shame'—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: Leave it. It's not worth it. They are just repeating the same thing over and over.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Apparently, it is not worth it.

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: I don't want to engage with this sort of behaviour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): Order!

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The use of 'shame' apparently goes only one way in this chamber, according to the Liberal opposition interjections to me. That was word-for-word *Hansard*.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: Point of order.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: That is what happened that day. The Hon. Heidi Girolamo—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): We have a point of order, the Hon. Ms Franks, if you could please take your seat.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: Acting Chair, the honourable member is verballing the opposition.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order, Acting President: you are not Acting Chair.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: The use of 'shame' has not been against the Attorney-General, it has been in relation to conduct towards the Hon. Heidi Girolamo.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): I am happy to move on and dismiss that. There is no point of order. Please continue.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Greens will be supporting this bill before us today. It was not necessary. It has been the subject of a concerted Liberal opposition campaign that has put fear and confusion into the community unnecessarily.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: Then why are you supporting it?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: 'Why are you supporting it?' the Leader of the Opposition interjects. Because common sense actually is in the crossbench today, not in the Liberal opposition.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): Order!

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Common sense dictates that where the Liberal opposition goes out and creates a scare campaign, the other members of this parliament will give the South Australian community the reassurance that the Liberals' lies are not true.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. R.B. Martin): Order!

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Thank you, Acting President, for your protection. We have spent a lot of time today debating something that need not have been debated, but the Greens are very happy to come here and give the South Australian community the reassurance that they need that ANZAC Day and Australia Day are not under attack.

We do have some concerns about the Liberal opposition's arguments that 'the sovereign' rather than 'the king or queen' needs to be inserted and enshrined in legislation. We find it hilarious that suddenly it is all non-binary language, with beautifully binary-out-the-window inclusive language of 'the sovereign', be they male, female or transgender into the future, to be incorporated in the legislation. It is not lost on us that you are able to be inclusive with your language when it comes to making a political point, but you are not able to accept that transgender people exist when you are making a different political point.

This bill is a waste of parliament's time, but it is important to give the South Australian people the reassurance that they need not to believe the Liberal lies. With that, we commend it, and we hope that this is the last time Liberal lies see us back in this chamber having to re-go over something that should have been a celebration of ensuring that Christmas Day remained a public holiday even when it fell on a Sunday.

Regarding the Hon. Heidi Girolamo's attempts to remove Easter Saturday as a public holiday, which she raised in the previous debate, saying, and I paraphrase, 'Four days of holidays in a row was too long', I do hope that the Liberal opposition will be allowing the Saturday that comes after Good Friday to be seen and continued as the Easter Saturday public holiday.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:23): First things first: the Leader of the Opposition spoke of matters being referred to as and by their rightful names. The Hon. Ms Lee spoke to language mattering and titles mattering. The Hon. Ms Lensink spoke to symbols being important and titles being important. Given that we are here seeking apologies, I, too, would like the Hon. Ms Girolamo to reflect on her choice of words when she uses phrases like 'SA-Besties' in this place. That is not in line with anything any of your members have said today.

You do not get to come in here and call another political party by the name 'SA-Besties' and, by extension, suggest to other members—and I am sorry to the Hon. Ms Game, but I will pull her into this—regardless of who it is, that somehow people who vote in a certain way can be denigrated in their titles. That is in line with everything you have just said, but the Hon. Ms Girolamo opened up today by referring to the 'SA-Besties' in this place.

That is what she did, and it was completely inconsistent with every other statement she made, so I ask her to reflect on her words in here today and ensure that when she addresses people in this place, regardless of who they are and what she thinks of them, she does so with the titles that they carry, just like her and everyone else sitting on her side of the chamber.

We all get called up in this place by the President himself for using anything less than proper titles. If we are going to go about asking for apologies, then I think, today, that is a good starting point from the Hon. Ms Girolamo. Use this opportunity to apologise for your own use of words that do not meet the standards of this place. Last I checked, those titles and words applied to me just as much as they did to the member opposite.

It does take a brave member to stand in this place and speak of disappointment, dishonesty, politicking and misinformation after what we have seen with this campaign. While the opposition, we know during this campaign—and I cannot believe we are spending so much time speaking about this—has been consumed with what can only be described as its own arrogance and self-importance, the rest of us, last year, were here trying to fix two critical issues which, I would hasten to say, the opposition missed in their entirety.

We sought to fix the issue that the Hon. Tammy Franks referred to in relation to Christmas Day falling on a Saturday, and we also sought to fix another critical issue, which I would have thought the opposition, who comes in here and talks to us about business each and every day of the week, would not have overlooked, namely that the Public Holidays Act declared every Sunday a public holiday. It is something that we knew the business community, more than anyone else, wanted addressed.

Those are the two issues that we came here to address in a relatively straightforward and simple bill. Those are the issues I got my briefings on from the government. Those are the issues that we came in here to address. But, as it transpired last year, those two critical points of this debate were completely overlooked—completely and utterly overlooked—by the opposition. Instead, what we saw was indeed a misguided fear campaign, one which we all got dragged into whether we wanted to be or not.

I do not appreciate being accused of cancelling ANZAC Day, I do not appreciate being accused of cancelling Good Friday and I will not be dragged into the mudslinging of the Liberal Party and the misinformation of the Liberal Party. That is precisely what you drummed up: a fear campaign that had nothing to do with the core issues that we were debating in this bill and everything to do with your own self-righteousness. That is what it had to do with.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Everything to do with your own self-righteousness—everything. You speak of the sanctity and sacredness of those days—

The Hon. J.S. Lee interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: —and in so doing, Ms Lee—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In so doing, the Hon. Ms Lee—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, you direct your comments through the Chair.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In so doing, Mr President, they suggest that the rest of us are some godless creatures who lack any social, moral or ethical compass or principles or practices. That is offensive to the rest of us. You are not the only people in here who get to come and espouse these things and treat the rest of us like some godless creatures because we are not the Liberal Party, that only you stand up for those things, that the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, who did not support Easter Saturday being a declared public holiday, is somehow more righteous because she wants to insert these words back into the bill.

Well, good on you! If that makes you go home and feel good at night, good on you, but do not pull the sanctity and sacredness of those dates into question, and certainly do not pull our positions in relation to those dates into question. I do not appreciate it, it is offensive and your campaign was absolutely and utterly misguided and misinformed the public.

I agree with every word that was echoed by the Hon. Tammy Franks in relation to that. If only, to go back to the first point, we did not see the tactics that were pulled in this place time and again, you would not get reactions like this and you certainly would not get allegations of mean girl pile-ons by the rest of us, who are supposed to sit here and accept your criticisms, accept being referred to as 'SA-Besties', and take it sitting down. Well, guess what? That is never going to happen—not from this seat and I am sure it will never happen from the Hon. Tammy Franks' seat. So keep trying and this is the response you will get each and every time. I do expect an apology from the Hon. Ms Girolamo. I am not your SA-Bestie.

Back to the merits of the bill—I am some people's SA-Bestie—the bill we debated last year dealt with two issues: it dealt with Sundays being declared as public holidays and with Christmas Days that fall on Saturdays being declared public holidays. That is what we came in here to debate, that is what we all agreed to, and anything beyond that that called into question the importance or significance of those dates referenced in this bill is an absolute pile of rubbish and propaganda by the Liberal Party.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:32): For such a simple bill there has certainly been a lot of mudslinging going on today, but it is fortunate that we have a lot of speakers up here today because, so light is the government's agenda, we may well have had to rise before 6 o'clock, and we would have been the butt of jokes from the House of Assembly.

I rise to speak in support of these amendments in the guise of a new bill, but the cynicism of the government's actions is overwhelming. Again, it is Popular Pete coming to the rescue of a piece of legislation that was bound to cause a backlash—and it did. The Premier does not like bad news. He does not like talkback radio being flooded with calls condemning the government for its simple, yet obviously deliberate, oversight of not designating the names of the public holidays to the dates on which they fall.

All of this was pointed out to the Attorney-General by the Liberals and me during the last debate, but the Attorney-General was flippant and simply laughed it all off, along with those who supported the bill. The government also seems to think that people are ignorant mugs, at the time accusing the opposition of spreading misinformation about ANZAC Day and other public holidays. Note that the Attorney-General makes no specific mention of Australia Day in his second reading of this reworked bill, in which I am sure he would like to see the end of 26 January, along with other leftie cancel culture ideologues in the Australian Labor Party.

As for ANZAC Day, people were offended and, yes, they were confused by what was happening, because the government simply failed to articulate its intent. I know that I am speaking for my other colleagues in here when I say that we were all aware that the ANZAC Day holiday was not going to be cancelled. It would be political suicide for any government or politician to suggest as much for a start, so revered is this event's commemoration in our nation's history.

What the fuss was all about was that the Attorney-General, the government, did not want to accept the Liberal amendments to clarify the dates to the occasions. It really was not a big deal to do so. It was intended to be an accurate reflection of what those dates stand for, so not to mention

ANZAC Day next to 25 April was insulting to the broader population of this state and this country. Just do not assume everyone in this country will know that anyway.

The backlash against the Malinauskas government was predictably fierce. People were offended by the omission of the names. To his credit, Popular Pete stepped in and promised to fix the avoidable mess and negativity his government suffered as a result.

Also lost in this debate was the fact that Australia Day was an obvious omission to the 26 January holiday. We know that if Labor and the Greens have their way this date will eventually be scrubbed from our history. What a tragedy that would be. It underlines the antagonism some Australians have towards this great and prosperous country that has delivered a high standard of living for its small population and that has devoted countless billions of dollars to close the gap for Aborigines.

Australia continues to be a positive beacon for democracy and free speech, being respectful of our Indigenous people and of multiculturalism in our region and in the world, yet we have a section of our society that hates Australia and what it stands for today. They want to bring it down for some sins of the past. This country has grown and learned from those experiences some still find painful today. There is nothing wrong with feeling that way, but why destroy the spirit of this country by creating and preaching hatred and division based on race and events that happened more than 200 years ago?

All this hate-Australia speech is being fuelled by a bunch of noisy entitled activists whose minority voices are greatly amplified by left-leaning media like the ABC, The Guardian, Nine newspapers—*The Age* and *The Sydney Morning Herald*—and others. However, I do not think any date put up for Australia Day would ever satisfy these hardliners.

I cannot recall the last time I heard a Prime Minister or a Labor politician give an emotional speech about how much they loved Australia and why. One of my late mother Maria's most prized possessions was not a piece of jewellery or a family heirloom, it was a simple framed colour photo of the young Queen Elizabeth given to her and my late father when they became proud Australian citizens in 1958. That photograph remained in a prominent place on her mantelpiece for the rest of her life.

After surviving the Great Depression, poverty and fascism in southern Italy, they appreciated the new life and enormous opportunities and a welcoming country that was open to them, their children and other migrants, who have since helped build this nation. That photo now sits on my desk at home, a constant reminder of how lucky I am to be here and what a great and lucky country we all live in.

It was extremely disappointing to see a corporate giant like Woolworths, run by a woke chief executive and a board stacked with wokes, effectively rip apart the image of Australia by announcing they would not be selling merchandise celebrating Australia in their stores to coincide with 26 January. They made a point of it being a political decision rather than one supposedly based on sales. They knew it would upset many Australians.

Aldi, surprisingly, followed them. To their credit, Woolworths do have an admirable vision for reconciliation and should be congratulated on that. However, they do not seem to share the same vision for the other 97 per cent of the population. They got a deserved backhander from many Australians, who heeded Coalition leader Peter Dutton's call to boycott them. I have boycotted them as well and the German family-owned Aldi, whose profits go straight back to Germany.

I have not been anywhere near one of their stores since they made that decision, nor will I ever shop there again until they reverse their decision. I now gladly spend my money with the mighty South Aussies—Foodland—Drakes, IGAs and, occasionally, Coles, which did not follow Woolworths. Guess what? My shopping experience has never been more enjoyable. The Australia Day merchandise flew off the shelves at Foodland stores, Drakes and elsewhere that it was for sale.

Many of these hugely successful independent retailers are run by the families of postwar immigrants, like the Romeos and the Chapleys. They love what Australia stands for and what it can do for people who are prepared to work hard. That is why I find the attitude of Woolworths and its executive so reprehensible. They do not want to highlight Australia's national day, yet they fall over

themselves heralding the national celebrations or festivals of other cultures—Chinese New Year, for instance, and Diwali for the Indian community. They will do it for Ramadan as well. Great, I welcome that. But they shamelessly also commercialise Halloween, Easter and Christmas, which are all Christian events, yet the very meaning of those events is lost in the grab for customers' cash.

Today, they have copped a hammering after *Four Corners* lifted the lid on their price gouging and the anticompetitive behaviour by the duopoly supermarket giants at the expense of consumers and suppliers drowning in cost-of-living pressures. Chief executive, Brad Banducci, now says their customers want them to focus more on delivering value than broader conversations. In other words, they do not want to be lectured on what to do when they are shopping for their groceries.

Woke-led councils across the country are opting to move their citizenship ceremonies away from 26 January. Australia has moved on. Let's make Australia Day a day we all celebrate for the good that has happened. Why is Australia not proud of its national heritage like other countries, where national days are sacrosanct?

I have been to countries on their national days, and people are emotional and motivated, such as in the United States on 4 July. Like Australia it, too, has a notorious past from slavery to civil rights, yet Americans of every colour and race are proud of their country. They fly the Stars and Stripes everywhere. They know the words of their national anthem and sing it with gusto at any public event. But here, do you see Australians singing *Advance Australia Fair* with similar fervour? No, although I will acknowledge football and soccer fans are a loud exception when the Socceroos or the Matildas play anywhere around the world.

Our kids in our schools should be taught the words or sing it daily, as we once sang *God Save the Queen* or *God Save the King* before school started. Our children are not being taught to be proud of their country or the achievements of our pioneers. They are being indoctrinated by a curriculum that deliberately airbrushes some parts of our history.

Just recently, federal Labor's clumsy Aboriginal affairs minister, Linda Burney, flagged the idea of changes to the curriculum to include so-called truth-telling about Aborigines. All well and good, I say, but what about some positive truth-telling about white Australians, too? I will wager that few students today would even know the stories behind some of our greatest Australian and South Australian pioneers because they have been slowly vaporised from the curriculum by a politically motivated generation of educators.

I am alarmed at what is happening on our university campuses today. The politics of race and division are becoming contagious. Antisemitic behaviour is rife since the war in Gaza. Jewish students are fearing for their safety and not attending campus for lectures and study. It is happening here in Adelaide.

Furthermore, Jewish academics have been forced to quit their jobs. What are our university leaders or political leaders doing about it? Little, I am ashamed to say. Our universities are again becoming a breeding ground for hate-fuelled racial politics. I was disgusted to hear yesterday that one university wants to ban the Australian flag from being flown. What on earth is happening to our country?

In closing, can I point out that in this bill 'Anzac' is not fully capitalised and even that obvious mistake insults our friends across the ditch by reducing and belittling them to lower case. ANZAC is an acronym for Australian and New Zealand Army Corps. I hope the Attorney-General seeks to correct this error in the debate. In style books when I was a cadet journalist, it was always capitalised, and I hope we change that today.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:45): I rise briefly to put on the record that I support the Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024. Late last year, the Malinauskas government vehemently attacked the members in this place who stood up for Australian values by pushing back against the cancelling of our most nationally significant days of commemoration, and here we are, less than three months later, amending the Public Holidays Act 2023 to insert names next to dates of public holidays.

Importantly for the men and women who have fought for our freedom and paid the ultimate sacrifice in World War I and World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan and peacekeeping

operations around the world, ANZAC Day, previously erased by this government, is reinstated. Also essential is the reinstatement of Australia Day and Christmas Day.

I want to put on the record as well that I share the sentiment shown by the Liberal opposition about what I perceive also was the appalling and inappropriate behaviour towards the Hon. Heidi Girolamo. We do need to be able to have robust debate, but for me that is different from relentless aggression towards a single human being. That debate did not sit well with me. On that note, I am pleased to support the bill.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:47): I stand up today to support the Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024. Part 3 of the bill amends the Public Holidays Act 2023 to insert names next to dates of public holidays. I will not go through the actual dates and the titles that are next to them, but I would like to say this: I am sure these amendments will dispel the fear campaign that the Liberal Party has run through our veterans community, spreading misinformation about the status of ANZAC Day and other public holidays.

I think it indicates that we have an opposition that are so totally bereft of any policies, any vision for this state or any new ideas that they have to sit there and resort to going out and spreading fear amongst the most cherished members of our community: our veterans. These are people who actually put their lives on the line. These are people who hold ANZAC as sacrosanct, just as we do on this side of the chamber and as do most Australians.

ANZAC Day has a very special place in our calendar, and the very thought that you were out there putting misinformation out to our veterans that ANZAC Day was going to be dispelled I find quite appalling. I find the behaviour of the Liberal Party during this whole issue absolutely appalling. It will come back to haunt you, because the veterans understand that what you did was misinformation, misleading and just basically lies.

I have heard during this debate the word 'bullying' come to light. I was at that debate—we all were—and I must say I am astounded. I did not see any bullying going on during that debate. What actually happened was accountability. Many members on this side of the chamber, and I know a number on the opposition benches, have suffered much, much worse than that in the name of accountability. If somebody comes into this chamber seeking to amend legislation, they have to know what they are talking about. When it is drawn to their attention that they have not done their research, that is not bullying. It is accountability.

If anyone in the opposition hopes in the future—way, way in the future—to become a minister, they had better be prepared for much more robust debate and accountability than what occurred in that particular debate. I support the legislation and, as I said, I think it will dispel the misinformation and lies that have been spread throughout our veterans community by our bereft Liberal opposition.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:50): I am going to support the amendment, but to mangle a quote from Yogi Berra, 'It's the Liberal party factions at war all over again.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Some in the opposition, they scoff now. They are very concerned about the perception of themselves on the opposition.

The PRESIDENT: Will the opposition benches stop laughing.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: And they should be concerned.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Stop it!

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: They should be deeply concerned. Some of the opposition have decided they are going to sit there today—and I notice the comments of Ms Franks in this regard.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Franks.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: She said it is very rare to get seven members of this opposition to comment on anything. It is very rare to get them all standing up here today and having a chat

about anything. All their concern about all these issues, where has that been? Where was that when they were in government? Where were their amendments to public holidays when they were in government for four years? Not once did they come in here, drape themselves in the flag and say, 'You know what? We're going to make a change.' No, they did not do that.

What they have adopted here is the tedious catchcry that the Malinauskas Labor government somehow is woke. They have decided they should use a pretty cheap and remarkably undignified angle to Trojan horse their way into scoring some sort of substantive political victory. It would be a banner day for this mob if they did, but all we have here is just another day ending in 'y'.

'Why?' is no doubt the question that some in the Liberal Party might be asking—not just the rank and file but some elected members here too. Why have some elements in the party decided that Trump-style dog whistling is the way to go? It is such an honourable style of politic and political rhetoric, is it not? It is a tactic that ends with chaos. We know it and they know it too. Great choice, team. It is a very good look for your mob, this Trump politics.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Trump?

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: And are they saying it? You bet they are. Trump, that is right, the Hon. Ms Lensink, Trump. Here is something that Mr Trump would have said: the Attorney clearly wants to cancel Christmas. That is what Mr Trump might have said. Did you say that? Yes, you did. Will this Trump-style Liberal Party tell you that the government will cancel Australia Day? The Liberals said it. Yes, you said it. No denying it now. They are all sitting there mum. They said it, just like Donald Trump would have. Well, Mr Trump has done it and now, it seems, the Liberals will too.

They are not just seeking cheap hits on Labor, they are cherrypicking the dog whistles that some of them believe will get them preselected, instead of actually seeking a serious alternative government to get elected. It is particularly disappointing to see that these behaviours from some opposite—

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Point of order: the honourable member keeps pointing in the chamber, which is unparliamentary.

The PRESIDENT: That is correct. The Hon. Mr Hanson—

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Thank you for dismissing that farcical point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: No, the Hon. Mr Hanson, I have not dismissed it. It is actually correct. Do not point. It is not parliamentary.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: It is a gesture, Mr President, but I take your counsel.

The PRESIDENT: You would want to.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: It is particularly disappointing to see these behaviours, because while many things in the political cut and thrust are all good fun—and many of them are, from time to time, the subject of political jousting—you would think that some things in this place could be above that. We should hold some things in place above that. One of those things in particular is the soberness and the solemn significance of ANZAC Day and the very genuine feelings that South Australian veterans hold in relation to its importance.

Everyone here, as members of this parliament, know full well there is a specific piece of extant legislation that enshrines in law ANZAC Day commemoration, and they were still willing to go out and tell the RSL, to tell veterans of our community, that the government is trying to erase ANZAC Day from the calendar. That is vile behaviour. That is deceiving veterans on purpose. Would the Liberal Party do it? How low can you go?

There is an act in this parliament enshrining ANZAC Day in law, particularly because ANZAC Day carries a particular meaning, a particular importance to our community, because all sides of politics, regardless of who you are, have a deep respect for our veterans—until now. The Liberal Party of South Australia have cheapened and degraded their relationship with veterans by manipulating and deceiving them. It is dumbfounding and, frankly, it is absolutely disgraceful.

What is worse, they did not even arm themselves with the basic foundational knowledge that would be necessary to make their vile gambit even credible. This extraordinary disingenuity with which they are conducting themselves, and the desperation of this opposition to find something, anything, to make it stick, are honestly pretty incredible to behold. The extraordinary, gobsmacking ignorance on display from members opposite is all the evidence we need to understand what they are actually doing here.

They are prepared to go as low as they possibly can because they cannot go high. They do not know how to go high. They are not capable of competing with the government on actual substance. They have to scrape the bottom of the barrel. They have no choice. The talent has left the building. One honourable member could not even tell us what event 26 January commemorates and when pushed on the issue, to quote that member, she said, 'Maybe this is an indication that there should be more education on this within South Australian schools.'

That is what the honourable member said. Well, that remark was issued by a person who attended St Andrew's School, and who attended Loreto College. I do not imagine those two very reputable institutions were proud to hear how poor the honourable member apparently thinks the education that she received in those schools was.

They are not just imitating Trump's rhetorical tactics; they are actually imitating him in all regards. There is no need to have the requisite knowledge, the requisite substance to back up your rhetoric. There is no need to know anything. Just lie to people. Say whatever. The truth does not matter. That is Trumpism distilled to its very essence, and the South Australian Liberal factions are sucking at that lemon with unbridled enthusiasm. They are leaning right into it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Even here today they are denying the existence of factions in the hope that South Australians will not notice. Mate, it is so tacky it is embarrassing. It is unbecoming of members who are sent to this place in good faith to represent the South Australian community. I tell those on the opposition benches who are good people, who are genuine people—and several of you definitely are—do not let the identity and the values of your party disappear into the frightening and frankly depraved miasma that is Trumpian-style politics. Do not go down that path. Fight against your party going down that path because that path leads to a very nasty place and, what is more, they know it. You know what?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Even now in screeching about it instead of addressing it as the serious matter it is, they again debase their party, much like Mr Trump would. You know what? Those of you who are actually promoting and practising this style of politics, you know it too, and that, frankly, is the most frightening thing of all. Unlike the suggestion of Mr Pangallo, I do not need to come in here and give speeches about how much I love Australia. I do not have to do that. I do love this place, and if they love this state, if those in the opposition love this state—as I love this state—then do not go down the path of shrinking it down to base politics.

You were sent to this place with a responsibility to the South Australian people. You can afford them the courtesy of acting with integrity or you can continue to debase yourself like you have been doing. You should consider that choice very carefully. This bill seeks to fix that thing you complained about. Congrats.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the Attorney to conclude the debate, I want to point out that we are well aware that there was basically a drafting error with the word 'Anzac'. It should be printed in uppercase, and I can advise that a clerical amendment will be made to the bill pursuant to standing order 326.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:00): I want to thank all members for their very strong support for the government bill before us today.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I was saying, I would like to thank all members in this chamber for the very strong support of the government bill that is before us today. It is disappointing the way some of this debate has been conducted, and I am sure people will take their time to reflect on how they have conducted themselves not just in this chamber but during the course of this debate publicly.

People have spoken about needing to do what we can for our veterans, something all of us, myself in particular, agree with. I might just read out a quote from the head of the RSL in South Australia, Mr Dave Petersen. During the time this was a public debate at the end of last year, and in relation to legislation previously, he said:

I'm not offended by this piece of legislation but I am offended by perhaps the misreporting of what is happening here and the outrage that some veterans are feeling thinking that their date has been cancelled but it has not.

I am sure people will reflect on this in the cool light of day, on what they have done, and their role in causing this distress to veterans.

On a very small level, I think some of those opposite will probably reflect on how they conducted themselves in this chamber. We need to be here day in day out, and we have seen how some of the members of the crossbench have reacted to the way members of the opposition, in particular, have treated them today. It will be up to them how they continue to behave, but one day they will want the support of members of the crossbench in something they do, and I think the way they treat them will make it very difficult for them to find that.

People can yell and interrupt me, and if that is how they want to carry on and conduct themselves that is their business. However, credit where it is due: one thing I will congratulate the opposition on is that this bill does not include their sneaky attempt to remove Easter Saturday as a public holiday. They tried to sneak that through last time.

They think four days of public holidays is outrageous for hardworking South Australians to have. We will stick up for hardworking South Australians. We think Easter Saturday should remain a public holiday, and credit to the opposition that they have declined to show their true colours again and tried to remove these sorts of public holidays.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

The CHAIR: I have already advised the council of the drafting error with regard to 'Anzac Day', obviously ANZAC to be in capitals.

Remaining clauses (2 to 9) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (DESTRUCTION OF SEIZED PROPERTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 February 2024.)

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:06): I am glad to have the opportunity to speak to the Controlled Substances (Destruction of Seized Property) Amendment Bill 2024. This bill proposes amendments to the Controlled Substances Act that aim to enable the Commissioner of Police to authorise the destruction of prescribed hydroponic equipment, that is, equipment that is able to be used, or may have been able to be used at some stage, for hydroponic cannabis cultivation that has been seized by police.

Where a police officer suspects on reasonable grounds that an offence against the act has been committed, officers may seize and remove from the premises any equipment that they have reasonable cause to suspect affords evidence of the offence. Once equipment has been seized by police under such circumstances, the current provisions of the Controlled Substances Act require any prescribed hydroponic equipment to be held pending the outcome of court proceedings in relation to the relevant offence. Equipment may then be destroyed only upon an order of the court for forfeiture of the items to the Crown.

This bill provides for the Commissioner of Police to be empowered to authorise the destruction of seized equipment prior to the finalisation of proceedings and without the requirement for a court order to that effect. Court proceedings do not require prescribed hydroponic equipment to be brought to the court and tendered as evidence. It is a typical practice that secondary evidence, such as photographic and video evidence of a hydroponic set-up, is relied upon and is considered sufficient.

This bill intends that once photo and video evidence of the seized equipment has been captured, there will be no further need for the equipment to be retained. Such equipment is generally not returned to the person from whom it was seized in any event given that, without reasonable excuse, it is an offence to be in possession of prescribed equipment. This bill also establishes a mechanism for the Commissioner of Police to seek a court order to recover reasonable destruction costs from a person who is convicted of an offence in relation to the equipment.

The current retention scheme is burdensome for SAPOL in the areas of cost, storage space and labour. The Malinauskas Labor government are committed to availing themselves of every possible avenue to ensure that our police force is enabled to operate as efficiently as it can. This bill will support the improvement and the streamlining of processes in relation to dealing with seized equipment. It puts forward sensible and straightforward reforms that are in the public interest. The more police resources that are not dedicated to babysitting seized hydroponic equipment, the more resources can be dedicated to the core tasks of policing that keep our community safe.

The Malinauskas Labor government knows how crucial good policing is to our community, and we know that something our police service wants and needs is more personnel on the frontline. We are acting to advance that priority by committing \$81 million to recruit an additional 189 sworn police security officers in the 2023 budget; funding a \$12.2 million accelerated police recruitment package to enable 300 recruits to train at the Police Academy each year for the next three years; restarting overseas recruitment to recruit up to 200 experienced officers, targeting New Zealand, the UK and Ireland; and creating the Pathway to Policing Program to inspire year 11 and 12 students to consider policing as a career.

We are proud that South Australia has the most police officers per capita of all Australian states and we aim to further improve on that figure. We recognise how important it is for government to advance reforms that lead to improved operational outcomes for our police service, because that leads to better outcomes for our community.

Our intention is that the measures contained in this bill will lead to welcome improvements towards facilitating more efficient processes and lower resource demands in relation to seized prescribed hydroponic equipment. I am pleased to commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:10): I rise to indicate the Liberal Party's support for this legislation, which has been introduced to provide for greater efficiency in relation to authorising the destruction of seized prescribed hydroponics equipment before the conclusion of court proceedings—so quite specifically contained to that particular class of equipment—which will alleviate the significant storage burden on police resources, particularly given that some court cases

can take some time to proceed through to a conviction. This clearly assists in reallocating those resources towards more frontline policing and community safety.

This bill introduces a provision for the recovery of reasonable costs associated with the destruction of prescribed hydroponics equipment (PHE) from convicted individuals, which will assist in offsetting the financial impact, and also introduces a punitive measure which potentially could serve as a deterrent against the cultivation and trafficking of controlled substances.

The inclusion of measures for cost recovery without a court order align with existing legal frameworks that prioritise public safety. I understand there have been concerns raised about the transparency of the cost-recovery process, and there are amendments before the house that will be considered in due course. We will put our position on those particular amendments in due course.

This legislation supports SAPOL's continued efficiency in terms of improving logistics. I note that the Law Society has written to the Attorney-General in relation to this. It is broadly supportive of the bill but, I quote from the letter, 'notes some concern as to a convicted person being required to meet these costs given the difficulty in ascertaining whether the costs incurred are indeed reasonable'. I look forward to the Attorney responding to those particular concerns expressed by the Law Society.

In terms of the technicalities of the clauses, the bill extends the powers of the Commissioner of Police to destroy seized property, which will now include PHE capable of being used for hydroponic cannabis cultivation. Clause 2(2) exempts PHE from being subject to the ordinary evidentiary provisions, which require that samples are taken of any seized property to be destroyed and the defendant be given an opportunity to have a portion of the sample analysed by an analyst.

As I have already mentioned, the Commissioner of Police, or a delegated person within SAPOL, would have power to collect reasonable costs from a convicted person. With those comments, I indicate support for the bill and look forward to the committee stage of the debate.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:14): I rise on behalf of the government to speak in support of this bill. We have spoken in this chamber before on legislation that is burdensome and in need of amendment. This is the case with the Controlled Substances Act.

Currently, the act requires that the hydroponic equipment that has been seized by police in circumstances where they have reasonable grounds to suspect an offence has been committed is stored by SAPOL. Police hold the goods pending court proceedings for the relevant offence, such as the equipment being used for hydroponic cannabis cultivation. It can then only be destroyed upon an order of the court for forfeiture.

It is pertinent to note that in reality these court proceedings do not require the confiscated hydroponic equipment to be tendered as evidence. The common practice involves presenting secondary evidence, such as photo and video evidence of a hydroponic set-up, which is relied upon in court proceedings. The bill before the chamber will enable the Commissioner of Police to authorise the destruction of seized equipment prior to the finalisation of proceedings and without the need for a court order. This is about efficiency—the current retention scheme puts an unnecessary burden on SAPOL.

The fact that video and photo evidence is what is presented in the court, the storage space, labour and cost clearly indicate that retaining the seized equipment is grossly inefficient. Importantly, this bill also establishes a mechanism for the Commissioner of Police to seek a court order to recover the reasonable destruction costs from the person who is convicted of the offence in relation to the equipment.

The Malinauskas Labor government knows that an efficient police force enhances public safety and fosters community trust through effective response measures, and I commend the bill to the house.

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

ELECTORAL (CONTROL OF CORFLUTES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

**CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (ADDITIONAL HIGH RISK OFFENDERS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

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

**ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TREATMENT (POSTHUMOUS USE OF MATERIAL AND DONOR
CONCEPTION REGISTER) AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 17:20 the council adjourned until Wednesday 21 February 2024 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***DRIVING OFFENCES**

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (30 November 2023).

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

The motor vehicle accident in question occurred on 7 March 2023. I understand that the driver pled guilty on 28 September 2023 to aggravated driving without due care cause death pursuant to section 45 of the Road Traffic Act 1961. In November 2023, the driver was sentenced in the Magistrates Court to imprisonment for three months, suspended upon entering a bond to be of good behaviour for 12 months. Taking into account the seven-month licence disqualification that had already been served, the driver was disqualified from driving for a further two months.

The maximum penalty for a first offence of driving while disqualified under section 91(5a) of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 is 12 months imprisonment. For subsequent offences the maximum penalty is three years imprisonment. South Australia currently has the highest maximum penalty of all states and territories for a subsequent offence of driving while disqualified.

The conduct which occurred in March 2023 would now fall within section 19ABA of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. The offence of causing death or serious harm by careless driving under section 19ABA was inserted by the Statutes Amendment (Serious Vehicle and Vessel Offences) Act 2023 and came into operation on 1 January 2024. Under this provision, a basic offence of causing death or serious harm by careless driving carries a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment and a mandatory minimum licence disqualification of one year. For an aggravated offence, which includes committed the offence while disqualified from driving, the maximum penalty is now seven years imprisonment and a mandatory minimum licence disqualification of three years.

In addition to the increase in penalty, the mandatory licence disqualification under section 19ABA of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 operates to cancel any driver's licence held by the convicted person. This is not the case for an offence under section 45 of the Road Traffic Act 1961.

APY ART CENTRE COLLECTIVE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (6 February 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Arts has advised:

The APYACC Review Panel (the panel) comprising Megan Krakouer, Cameron Costello and Anne Sibree examined current and historical allegations made against the APYACC including that:

- staff intervened in the artwork of Indigenous artists connected to the APYACC;
- efforts were made to conceal this activity;
- APYACC was not supporting culturally safe work practices; and
- sought to assess management practices and terms of engagement for artists.

The terms of reference for the APYACC Review Panel was a publicly available document.

The terms of reference directed that the panel review the allegations and operations of the APYACC and determine whether any matters should be the subject of investigation or regulatory action by another body.

The panel assessed the allegations made against the APYACC and found that matters of governance and management practice should be referred to Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations (ORIC) and has also referred consumer protection and contracting matters to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC).

We are committed to supporting Aboriginal artists across South Australia to share their art with the world and ensuring their cultural heritage is respected and that culturally safe workplace practices are in place.

It's been a very tough time for the industry and it's important to remember that there was no suggestion that artists are at fault. As the review has been completed and referrals have been made, I trust that the industry can move forward. It has a very bright future and our government will continue to support First Nations artists to share their art with their world.