

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 6 March 2024

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

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:18): I bring up the 39th report of the committee.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Response prepared by SA Health dated January 2024 to the Coroner's Findings into the death of Bodhi Leo Searle.

Response to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee—Inquiry into the Urban Forest Interim Report.

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

Report by the Chief Executive, Department for Trade and Investment on the Early Commencement of the Ancillary Accommodation and Student Accommodation Code Amendment

Ministerial Statement

KANGAROO ISLAND KOALAS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:19): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to Kangaroo Island koalas made in another place by the Hon. Susan Close.

Question Time

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding fruit fly.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Yesterday, the minister updated the chamber through a ministerial statement on the recent Queensland fruit fly outbreak in the northern suburbs of Adelaide. The sterile insect technology program, or SIT program as it is commonly known, is one of the very important tools for the eradication of fruit fly here in South Australia. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the current SIT facility at Port Augusta have the capacity to expand for the necessary increase in SIT production that is likely to be required in eight to 10 weeks' time when the department has indicated its intention to drop sterile fruit fly into the northern metropolitan area?

2. If not, what is the minister's plan around expansion in the short term to ensure that the SIT program in the Riverland can continue to operate at capacity whilst this new outbreak is dealt with?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is certainly the case that once the initial baiting program has been completed we will be able to utilise sterile insect technology. Members will be aware from previous contributions I have made in this place that we were able to double the production of sterile insects at the Port Augusta facility due to investment in this current term of government and that is now 40 million sterile insects that are produced per week.

I look forward to being able to further update the house in the future. I have already had discussions around the options that might be available to us and, of course, the most important part in the short term is that we do get everyone involved who is affected in terms of preventing the further spread of fruit fly. On the PIRSA website, there is the information in regard to the outbreak zone and suspension zone, as well as the requirements and obligations that people are under.

I am sure that everyone will join together in saying that we are very keen that people do look at what those obligations are and do cooperate in this. It is important for our pest-free status as a state, it is important for the growers on the Northern Plains, and it is also important for those of us backyard growers who like to grow fruit and vegetables so that we are able to overcome this Qfly outbreak and move forward into the future.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: will those options that the minister has indicated she will bring back to the chamber be available to increase production of SITs in 10 weeks' time?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:22): I think I have already addressed that question in my original answer.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding sterile fruit flies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The mating of released sterile male fruit flies with wild female fruit flies leads to a decrease in the female's reproductive potential and, ultimately, if SITs are released in sufficient numbers over a sufficient period of time, leads to the local elimination or suppression of the pest population. The release of tens of millions of sterile fruit flies into the Riverland has indeed been productive in the fight against fruit fly and horticultural productivity in the region. However, the opposition understands that the communication from the department to individual growers in industry regarding these releases or locations of these releases has either been not forthcoming or has not been effective.

One grower has reported that he was not informed at all of the sterile fruit fly drop and continued with his bait spraying program. He reports that PIRSA staff discovered a very substantial spike in the number of dead fruit flies found and that these are suspected to be the same dropped sterile fruit flies. My questions to the minister are:

1. What is the normal procedure for advising growers and, indeed, the community of the release of sterile fruit flies in a district or area?

2. Can the minister confirm if a lack of communication has resulted in substantial deaths of their own sterile fruit flies?

3. Given the importance of having live sterile fruit flies to break the cycle of reproduction of Queensland fruit fly, does the minister believe her department is currently delivering good practice and communication?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:24): I thank the honourable member for her question. Whenever there are any kinds of perceived breakdowns in communication, I would always urge those who are aware of it to actually bring that to the attention of the department. The department is very keen to improve their communications at all times. We know that cooperation of the community, cooperation of growers and cooperation, indeed, across the board is very important. If there are any gaps in what would be best practice in terms of communications, the sooner that is brought to the attention of the department the better. I know they are very keen to continually improve.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Supplementary: can the minister outline for the chamber the normal procedure for advising growers and, indeed, advising the community of the release of sterile insect technology within an area or district?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): I am happy to provide that operational detail on notice. Certainly, we have had a lot of general media around how we are releasing the sterile fruit fly and the increase in production. In the Riverland there has certainly been multiple media coverage of it; I have been involved in a great deal of that myself. When we had the release of sterile insects here in Adelaide just a couple of weeks ago, again we talked about that operation and had quite good coverage through the media. In terms of the more operational matters, I can take that on notice and bring back a response.

BEE DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of bee deaths in the Riverland. Given the fact that investigations into the incidents to date have been internal in that the department have investigated themselves, and given the minister believes that the department has nothing to hide, my questions to the minister are:

1. Why won't the minister commit to an independent review in order to ensure confidence in the fruit fly eradication program?
2. Has the minister now met with affected apiarists in the Riverland on this important issue?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): If the honourable member has any additional evidence that could be investigated, she is welcome to provide that. I think it is unfortunate that she continues to undermine the fruit fly eradication program in the Riverland, despite the answers that have been given repeatedly in this place—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —in addition to those that have been given repeatedly in writing, which outline what has occurred.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I certainly think those opposite should reflect on the impact of their constant raising of this issue without any additional evidence.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: No additional evidence; the same question week after week. If she has any additional evidence—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —she is welcome to provide that. She hasn't done so.

BEE DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary: I ask my question again. Has the minister now met with affected apiarists in the Riverland?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:28): I have had repeated correspondence on this matter.

EUROVISION SONG CONTEST

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about Australia's recently announced representatives at this year's Eurovision Song Contest?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for her question. I have lived my parliamentary life waiting for a question about Eurovision and I am glad our side has provided it. I hope to get more about Eurovision in the future. I think it is safe to say that Eurovision is a highlight on just about everyone's social calendar, particularly since Australia was invited to join the fold in recent years. The contest puts artists from all corners of the artistic spectrum on the international stage, in front of some 180 million viewers worldwide each year.

Australia has been represented by a number of extraordinary artists at Eurovision in the past, household names like Guy Sebastian and Jessica Mauboy. I have been beaming with pride to learn just in the last 24 hours that at the 2024 song contest, to be held in May of this year, Australia will be represented by none other than South Australia's own Electric Fields.

Electric Fields are an electronic music duo comprised of vocalist Zaachariaha Fielding—who hails from Mimili in the APY lands—and keyboardist Michael Ross. The pair have gone from strength to strength over the past decade, winning best New Talent of the Year at the National Indigenous Music Awards in 2017, being nominated for Artist of the Year in the same awards the following year and performing at things such as the 2020 AFL Grand Final and having their song, *We the People*, be the official song of Sydney's WorldPride in 2023.

The incorporation of Yankunytjatjara language into Electric Fields' songwriting has become a defining feature of their music, and I was delighted to hear they will take to Eurovision a song called *One Milkali*, which translates loosely to 'one blood', with the song centred on the message of all people being united together as one. Having Aboriginal language up in lights on the world stage will be such a special moment and highlights the importance of valuing and preserving languages.

I have been pleased to inform the chamber in the past about some of the achievements of other Anangu artists such as the hip hop group Dem Mob, who I ran into walking down the street today on the way to parliament, and who are thought to be the first rap group in Pitjantjatjara to have their sound and language taken to music festivals both in the US and Europe. Young and innovative artists like Dem Mob and Electric Fields give us much to be excited about and are extraordinary representatives of not only their local communities but the state and this country. Their efforts to preserve and showcase language are worthy of recognition and praise.

I wish Electric Fields the very best of luck at Eurovision in a couple of months' time. In particular, I wish to say how proud I am of Zaachariaha doing extraordinary things, showcasing culture and language in so many ways—a Wynne art prize awarded visual artist, a vocalist who is going to be capturing the attention of the world. The regular catch-ups with Zaachariaha are an absolute joy to me. I must say, palya wiru from one very proud kamuru (uncle).

RENTAL VACANCY RATES

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:31): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the minister representing the Minister for Planning on the topic of rental vacancy rates.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Figures that were published earlier this week in Domain's February vacancy rates report showed that Adelaide continues to have a vacancy rate of just 0.3 per cent, the lowest in the country. The data shows that in 2020, at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, Adelaide's rental vacancy rates were much higher, at 1.2 per cent. On Monday, Architecture Australia published an article that suggested that Australia has enough unoccupied homes to cater for the shortage of housing. Also on Monday, SACOSS released its budget submission calling for a vacancy tax to free up more rental properties in our state.

My question to the minister representing the Minister for Planning therefore is: will the government consider a vacancy tax to free up more supply for rentals here in our state and if not, why not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer it to the Minister for Planning in the other place and bring back a response.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about Aboriginal affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: It has been brought to the Liberal opposition's attention by concerned members of our community that some of the nominees for the Local and State Voice are individuals who already hold significant positions within agencies that provide advice directly to either state or federal governments. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why do the criteria allow for these individuals to advise the government on multiple platforms?
2. Will they, if elected, be remunerated on top of their current agency remuneration?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. In relation to people who hold positions either in the public sector or in specific roles, I know that's something the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment will help manage and will advise on for any individuals who may be elected.

We have some extraordinary Aboriginal people in South Australia working in federal government departments, in state government departments, in other areas in non-government positions and other positions, and I am very, very pleased at the quality of the 113 nominees for the 46 positions that have been put forward.

In relation to remuneration, there are some circumstances where state public sector employees are not remunerated if they are on a state government appointed board or committee. I will double-check, but my guess is that for elected bodies, like local government bodies, if you are a public sector employee you probably are remunerated, recognising the extensive amount of time that is involved in liaising with your community and local government. I expect that is the same with the Voice, but if that is not correct I am happy to bring back a reply and correct that.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:35): Supplementary: will the OCPSE also be advising on potential or actual or perceived conflicts of interest?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her question. I know that, in discussions I have had with the secretariat being set up to support the Voice, that is certainly something that will be addressed, and I expect the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment will be involved in that as well.

WOOD FIBRE AND TIMBER INDUSTRY MASTER PLAN

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Forest Industries. Will the minister update the council about the recent release of the South Australian Wood Fibre and Timber Industry Master Plan?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for his question. As members on this side at least would be aware, the Malinauskas Labor government took to the election a suite of forestry election commitments for the Limestone Coast, which is in stark contrast to members opposite, who failed to take pretty much any election commitments relating to forestry to the last election.

I was pleased to join both the Premier and the hardworking local MP, the member for Mount Gambier, last week in announcing the release of the South Australian Wood Fibre and Timber Industry Master Plan. While those opposite get involved in having little giggles at the expense of the forestry industry, our government is actually keen to progress initiatives. The master plan provides a vision to grow further and develop South Australia's \$1.4 billion forest and timber industry, and has been developed by the Forest Industries Advisory Council of South Australia (FIACSA)—which has a broad membership from different sectors within the forest industry—in consultation with myself as the Minister for Forest Industries.

It was critical that this master plan had significant input from the forest industry and I am delighted at the significant work put into this document by the industry in the South-East. I would like to thank all members of FIACSA for their ongoing hard work and commitment to the development of this important plan. Three goals have been identified through the master plan to strengthen the state's forest and timber industry: the right resource and capability, a future-focused workforce, and a clean and green circular economy.

The master plan will be reviewed annually to keep pace with socio-economic and environmental changes influencing the industry, particularly in such areas as international trade, climate change and technological developments. Again, I think it is important to emphasise that the forest industry will have a key seat at the table and will be directly involved in shaping any changes required for the master plan into the future.

The impact and benefit of the master plan will be immediate. While releasing the document last week, I was joined by Wendy Fennell from Fennell Forestry, and Tammy Auld from the South Australian Forest Products Association, to announce several projects to be funded through the master plan. We announced a \$200,000 investment for Fennell Forestry to commence stage 2 of an electric log truck trial. Fennell Forestry has shown a commitment to reach net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 by decarbonising their fleet.

Back in February 2023, Fennell Forestry announced stage 1 of their trial, while stage 2 will see further collaboration between industry and government using evidence-based data to further understand the costs, benefits and barriers of electric log truck adoption. In addition to the electric log truck trial, I was also pleased to announce \$70,000 in funding for the South Australian Forest Products Association to develop a state of the industry report for the forest sector.

Other projects identified as priorities through the master plan will be developed and implemented over the next two years as part of the state government's \$2 million commitment. Our forest industry in South Australia is a significant contributor to our state's economy and I am confident that we will continue to see a future-focused circular economy sustainably driving the state's economic prosperity with globally recognised skills and innovation.

Of course, this is not the only election commitment we are rolling out in the forest industry: there is a total of close to \$20 million of investment in this industry. I look forward to being able to

update this place once again soon on the ongoing work being undertaken by the state government to support our forest industry.

WOOD FIBRE AND TIMBER INDUSTRY MASTER PLAN

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:39): Supplementary: does the master plan also focus on local sawmillers, and why does ForestrySA prioritise exporting logs to China rather than give first option to local sawmills crying out for logs to meet the demands of the housing and construction industry in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:40): The association for small growers is part of FIACSA, so in answer to the first question it certainly does include that sector. In answer to the second question, ForestrySA does not directly export any logs to China, or at least they have not done over the last 12 to 24 months at the very least.

OVERSEAS TRAVEL

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries, representing the Minister for Child Protection, regarding overseas travel.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: Having supported my Public Sector (Ministerial Travel Reports) Amendment Bill last year, it was disappointing to every South Australian taxpayer that the child protection minister would attempt to hide an extravagant and wasteful \$62,000 overseas trip, as reported in *The Advertiser* today. It is galling to find out a legitimate FOI request for the very details the bill ensures are made public was blocked because access to the final itinerary was denied due to it referencing cabinet documents.

As though this is not absurd enough, a government representative made the statement that 'Ms Hildyard had been transparent'. *The Advertiser* details that her department chief executive, Jackie Bray, told parliament's Budget and Finance Committee last week that she was not aware of the FOI request or indeed any such action after that request. We have a child protection crisis in this state and a cost-of-living crisis. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister believe taxpayers will think this is good and proper use of taxpayer money in a cost-of-living crisis where families are without homes?
2. What is the evidence that the children in neglect are best benefitting from the minister taking staff on a \$62,000 overseas trip?
3. Is it time the minister gave up her recreation, sport and racing portfolio and is it time to consider Zoom or Teams meetings, which allow free and effective communication with international colleagues?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for her questions. Firstly, I am advised that the minister has provided all relevant documents relating to this trip and the opposition was comprehensively briefed on the minister's meetings and engagements on the trip in January. In terms of any further information that might be appropriate, I will refer it to the minister in the other place.

EMERGENCY PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding emergency public housing. Can the minister advise of the ring-fenced properties set aside for domestic and family violence households? How many have been designated specifically for Aboriginal women escaping domestic violence?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for her question, a question that I think goes over quite a number of portfolios, particularly housing. I will be happy to

refer that to Minister Nat Cook in the other place for a reply, but I will also see if there is any contribution that can be made from Minister Katrina Hildyard.

THE YELLOW GATE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:43): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney please inform the council about the open day for the new government-funded domestic violence recovery and prevention hub, The Yellow Gate?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:43): I would be most happy to, and I thank the honourable member for his question. At the end of last week, it was a privilege to attend the open day of The Yellow Gate, along with many colleagues from the other place as well, and federal member the Hon. Amanda Rishworth, as well as the Mayor of Onkaparinga, Moira Were. The Hon. Katrina Hildyard also joined for the presentation at the end of that day when attendees heard from service providers; community members, such as Cedar and Yarrow Place; and the Muslim Women's Association.

The Yellow Gate centre is a southern community one-stop drop-in service where women and families can access expert support services to protect them from domestic, family and sexual violence, and be provided with opportunities for growth and development. The Noarlunga centre offers an amalgamation of services, including health support and counselling; an information hub detailing local programs, assistance and financial aid; legal guidance and referral assistance; and culturally sensitive support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women.

The services offered at Yellow Gate are available to women located in the southern metro region of Adelaide who are seeking domestic violence support and are not in immediate danger. Existing services, such as Southern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service and South Coast Family Violence, remain appropriate points of contact for those in immediate danger, further to the police.

It was a particular privilege to hear from Dianne Newton, chair of the Southern Domestic Violence Action Group, who detailed the action group's advocacy work in getting to where they are to have the centre open, and the prevention and recovery hub that was formally launched last December following the Malinauskas government's election commitment to establish northern and southern metropolitan safety hubs to support and empower women experiencing violence at the earliest opportunity, and raising community awareness for the efforts that came to fruition.

The government has provided, I am advised, \$1 million in funding towards these hubs, which was further boosted through the National Partnership on Family, Domestic and Sexual Violence Responses within the Australian government. I would like to congratulate all of those involved in bringing The Yellow Gate hub to life and providing such essential services for prevention and recovery to victim survivors of domestic violence in South Australia.

I would also like to especially acknowledge Cathy McMorrine, the CEO of Southern Community Justice Services South Australia, for organising the event and the work that she and our community legal centres have done to support this initiative. I look forward to the success of this service in serving the women of the southern area of South Australia.

SOUTHERN OCEAN WIND FARM

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about wind farms.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Earlier today, the federal Minister for Climate Change and Energy, Mr Chris Bowen MP, travelled to Portland to make a much-anticipated announcement about the declaration of an offshore wind zone in the Southern Ocean, which originally crept into South Australian waters and specifically the township of Port MacDonnell. Given the proposal impacts her home town, can the minister update the chamber and all those listening with the good news regarding today's announcement as it relates to Port MacDonnell and South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for her question and her active interest in this very important topic. Today is a very good day for Port MacDonnell, for the Limestone Coast and for our South-East fishing industry, and indeed anyone who values the natural and ecological wonders of our region.

The proposed offshore wind zone off the coast of Port MacDonnell is no longer. The federal government has today announced that the zone will not extend into South Australian waters. Instead, it will be contained to waters off the western coast of Victoria, as indeed was called for in the state government submission to the federal DCCEEW consultation process.

A key component was the work done by the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) to assess the evidence available about the possible impacts of offshore wind construction and operation and what those impacts could be on fisheries. This informed the state government submission.

It also was very relevant to have the strong community campaign from Limestone Coast locals, rock lobster and other fishing industries, conservationists, and of course the submission from our government, in ensuring that the federal government, and in particular Minister Bowen, knew the concerns of all involved in having a wind energy zone declared in such a productive and important area for local industries and our environment.

Minister Bowen has taken into account the feedback he has received, including the detailed submission made by the state government opposing the zone's declaration. I also made a number of direct representations and follow-ups regarding this issue to Minister Bowen, who has been willing to listen throughout the process.

This shows a federal government that is willing to work with its state counterparts, and I must say it stands somewhat in contrast to federal governments over the past decade: the Coalition government. The Albanese government is clearly seeking to strike the right balance between advancing renewable energy and protecting existing industries, as they have done in this case.

South Australia's renewable energy credentials stand up against any in the world. In opposing this particular proposal, based on the impact it could have had on industry and the local community, it certainly takes nothing away from the huge investment the Malinauskas Labor government is making in clean green renewable energy that will power our state into the future.

It is simply about getting the balance right and building and investing in communities at the centre of the change, such as our government is doing in the Upper Spencer Gulf, but not risking long-established industries that provide so much to local communities, such as rock lobster in the South-East.

As minister responsible for those incredibly important industries in the region which would have been most impacted and, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros mentioned, as a local myself, I was very pleased to stand alongside the community and formulate the state government submission to the federal consultation process.

The department of course led all of that work, and it is to their credit that it has paid off so well. The Port MacDonnell community will, no doubt, be very relieved today and I dare say have some cause to celebrate their hard work in getting this outcome. I look forward to getting home soon and celebrating it with them.

SOUTHERN OCEAN WIND FARM

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:50): Supplementary: I thank the minister for her thorough response. Does she also acknowledge the unanimous support of this chamber from all sides of politics—crossbench and opposition included—in their opposition to this proposal, but more importantly the tremendous efforts of the local community in Port MacDonnell, including especially those groups who drove the advocacy: Southern Rock Lobster and Southern Coast Ocean Care?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:51): I certainly did mention in my response the rock lobster industry and Southern Coast Ocean Care of course was also very central to that. I am glad that there

was no opposition within this chamber. I am not aware whether the opposition made any submission to the commonwealth process—I am not aware that they did, but I am certainly glad they didn't oppose it.

SOUTHERN OCEAN WIND FARM

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:51): Supplementary: can the minister now rule out any other offshore wind farms in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:52): I am not aware of any others that are proposed. South Australia is a leader in onshore wind farms. We are a leader in renewable energy, and it is something that, as South Australians, we can be proud of.

SOUTHERN OCEAN WIND FARM

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:52): Supplementary: will the minister rule out or oppose any other proposed offshore wind farms?

The PRESIDENT: You are asking, the Hon. Mr Pangallo, for an opinion—that is not really a supplementary question. I will listen to yours, the Hon. Ben Hood, but then I am moving on.

SOUTHERN OCEAN WIND FARM

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (14:52): Supplementary: given that Minister Bowen and his department failed to even include the township of Port Mac on the initial conversations, can the minister—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: —can the minister confirm that Minister Bowen now knows where Port Mac is, considering he left the township off the original consultative maps?

The PRESIDENT: It is an interesting supplementary question, but not really a supplementary question. I call the Hon. Dennis Hood.

CHILD SEX OFFENDER REGISTER

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:53): Thank you, sir.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Now this is how you do it.

The PRESIDENT: Attorney, enough of the cheer squad.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding child sex offender registers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Just over a year ago, I asked the Attorney when state parliament could expect a bill to be introduced dealing with the public sex offender register, based on the Western Australian model, as per Labor's pre-election commitment at the last election. The Attorney-General stated in response:

...in the not too distant future I would expect we will have a system proposed, and up and running in South Australia. It was a key election commitment...

My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Does such a system exist?
2. If not, why is it taking so long to introduce a public sex offender register in South Australia?
3. When will one finally be introduced as per Labor's commitment?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in keeping South Australians safe. That was an election commitment that we are working on to fulfil. I suspect it will need legislation, but work continues on that.

As the honourable member indicated, there is a public-facing system which has various levels that is operating in Western Australia, and I know we have had officials liaising with Western Australia to see what elements of that would work in a different jurisdiction. It is a different legislative environment in South Australia.

That is something work continues on, and I hope we will have something as soon as possible but, as a minister, I recognise that my wishes and desires to have everything happen all at once are not always achievable. However, that work does continue. It is a commitment we intend to fulfill, and I suspect we will soon have the register set-up legislation before this chamber to provide for the indefinite detention of serious child sex offenders who are given jail time on a second occasion. These were both very significant election commitments aimed at keeping children safe from sexual predators.

We have delivered on a number of other things, including things that the Hon. Connie Bonaros has brought before the parliament in relation to significant increases in a whole range of child sex offences: childlike sex dolls, keeping children safe from working with serious child sex offenders in the workplace. So yes, it is something I can confirm remains an election commitment and something work continues on, but work continues on keeping children safe from the vile monsters who prey upon them in a whole range of areas.

FERAL DEER

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the council about her recent visits with landowners in the South-East to discuss the feral deer eradication program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his question. Feral deer are a declared pest under the Landscape South Australia Act 2019, and land managers are required to destroy feral deer on their land to protect primary industries, the natural environment and road users from the impact of feral deer.

As members could no doubt work out, when the act was created this was an initiative of the now the Leader of the Opposition and then environment minister David Speirs, which is why it is so surprising that the Leader of the Opposition in this place has continued to undermine the program.

This is a program that the government has strongly supported at the request of farmers in our regions, and these farmers—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —have already seen enormous benefits as a result of the aerial culling. We know that feral deer cost the South Australian primary production sector an estimated \$36 million in agricultural productivity losses in 2022 alone, and modelling predicts this could become as high as a quarter of a billion dollars by 2031 if the situation is not addressed. Since the eradication program started in the Limestone Coast over 6,500 feral deer have been eradicated, which is the equivalent of 10,000 sheep-worth of grazing pressure removed.

Last week, ahead of the next round of aerial culling activity, I had the opportunity to travel to Keilira in the South-East and meet with many landowners, the local landscape board and industry who are all highly supportive of the eradication program, and who wanted to show me firsthand the damage that has been done by feral deer to their properties. Landowners also shared with me their thoughts on the merit of the aerial culling program, and I had the opportunity to reassure them that the government remains committed to the continuation of this program.

It is clear, after speaking with many of them, that the program carries enormous support from farmers in the region. I want to specifically thank Peter Rasheed, whose property we met on, otherwise known as Boolapuckee. He was very generous with his time as he drove me around his property so that I could inspect some of the damage caused by feral deer. It is not only lost agricultural productivity that feral deer are responsible for but also significant damage to the natural environment, and that was certainly apparent during my visit.

Landowners shared with me their views that the aerial culling was already proving to be effective, as they had noticed a significant decrease of sightings of feral deer and an increase in the growth of lucerne. They were able to plant lucerne in areas that previously had not been able to maintain it because of the significant damage from feral deer.

Promisingly, in contrast to the Eastern States, South Australia's feral deer numbers are still considered low enough to completely eradicate the pest. That was certainly the message that landowners conveyed to me. It was somewhat disappointing, however, that the shadow minister once again, when interviewed on the matter recently, further undermined the program.

I would strongly encourage the shadow minister to visit the regions, get out and speak with affected landowners who are reaping the benefits of the eradication program and understand from them why they want this program to continue, instead of using every opportunity to undermine what is an essential program for them.

I want to thank all of the landowners, industry representatives and the landscape board for making time last week to discuss this incredibly important issue with me. I look forward to the continuation of the program and being able to update the chamber further about the work being undertaken to eradicate feral deer.

FERAL DEER

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): Supplementary: does the minister support the use of commercial and recreational hunters as part of the culling program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00): The Leader of the Opposition should be aware that those are part of the culling program.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: Do you support them? Do you support them ongoing, Clare?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Of course, they are part of the ongoing program. Some of the landowners that I met with last week indicated that they use commercial shooters as part of the eradication program, but they also emphasised that the effectiveness of that can in no way address the overwhelming problem of feral deer. That is why the aerial culling program is so important. That is why they continue to support it and that is why a number of them expressed their extreme disappointment to me about the approach of those opposite, who are supposed to be the farmers' friend.

FERAL DEER

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary: does the minister agree with her department forcing landowners to sign documents that make them liable for any members of the public who enter their property during the aerial culling program?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Excuse me, I will rule on this, and I don't need your help. The minister gave an extremely wideranging answer to the question. You can answer the supplementary question in any way you see fit.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Russell, don't quote standing orders to me.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): Thank you, Mr President. I support the landowners

assisting in undertaking their legal responsibilities. I wonder why the Leader of the Opposition does not.

SAPOL FIREARMS AND WEAPONS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister representing the Minister for Police on the topic of SAPOL firearms and weapons storage and safeguarding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Members will be well aware that in New South Wales in recent weeks the tragic deaths of Jesse and Luke, two young men, at the hands, allegedly, of a serving police officer and, allegedly, by a police firearm have shocked not just that community but, I think, the whole of the nation. That serving officer was able to take out of the station into his possession a firearm of the New South Wales police for at least several days, and it is still unclear whether it was then stored at his home, at another station or a combination of both. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can SAPOL weapons, be they firearms or other weapons, be booked out by staff who are not on duty?
2. If they can, what measures are put in place to ensure they are safely stored or safeguarded in general?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am sure all in this place would extend their sympathies to the family and friends of those whose lives were lost in the tragic circumstances. I will refer the question to the Minister for Police in the other place and bring back a response in terms of what the arrangements are in this jurisdiction.

FEDERAL BIOSECURITY LEVIES

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development and Primary Industries on biosecurity. I will ask for leave before I start the question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Leave granted.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you, the Hon. Mr Hood, because you must ask for leave before you give an explanation.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Thank you, Mr President. I am just so eager to ask this question. The Albanese government last week tabled new laws to establish a biosecurity production levy, which will raise \$50 million from farmers to bankroll activities that assist importers and other risk creators. The National Farmers' Federation has labelled this move as utterly staggering, given the level of opposition to the policy from farming groups. My question to the minister is:

1. Does the minister support the new biosecurity protection levy laws?
2. If so, what statement would she like to make to our struggling farmers regarding this additional financial burden that the levy will place on them?
3. What discussions has she had with her federal counterpart to advocate on behalf of South Australian primary producers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:04): The topic relates to the federal government, as was outlined in the member's first line. I suggest that that is the appropriate place for the discussion.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ben Hood, you are going to attempt to ask a supplementary question arising from that very brief answer. I will listen to it.

FEDERAL BIOSECURITY LEVIES

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:05): What statement would the Minister for Primary Industries in South Australia like to make to her farmers?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ben Hood, that is not a supplementary question. We are going to have to move on.

RETAIL WORKERS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Will the minister inform the council about the importance of securing the safety of South Australian retail workers?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:06): I wish to thank the honourable member for his question. The member, I know, has dedicated a large part of his still very young life to looking after the health and wellbeing of workers through advocacy and roles in the union movement previously. There is no doubt in relation to retail workers that, since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, we have seen an increase in the incidence of violence and aggression towards retail workers, particularly young retail workers.

On average, I am informed, there are something like 50 assaults a month that take place in retail settings. This has been reflected in several high-profile incidents broadcast on our screens, in the papers and on our news, including notorious confrontations between customers and staff at city McDonald's stores. That is why we went to the last election as the Labor opposition with a very clear policy to increase penalties for those who abuse and assault retail workers. We recognise that, for many young Australians, work in the retail and fast-food sector is their first exposure to the world of paid employment. They do not deserve to be the targets of abuse simply for doing their jobs.

The government's pledge in opposition was implemented following the election with new regulations introduced in August 2022 to make the assault of frontline retail workers an aggravated offence, as it is in a number of other areas of employment. People convicted of a basic assault against a retail worker while performing their duties can now face up to five years in prison, an increase from the previous two. Those convicted of assault causing harm against retail workers performing their duties now face up to seven years.

But we know that legislation regulation is only part of the solution. We also need to encourage safe work practices to ensure staff have the support they need to deal with difficult customer behaviour. A recent SafeWork SA campaign targeting violence and aggression in the retail sector showed that a major issue was a lack of training for staff on how to deal with violence and aggression. I was pleased to be able to join representatives of Woolworths and the SDA last Friday for a tour of one of the stores to hear directly from team members about steps being taken to deal with aggressive or abusive customer behaviour.

The tour followed the launch of the Woolworths Care and Respect campaign last November, asking customers to show patience, care and respect when engaging with retail workers. I saw during that tour genuine cooperation between the employer and the union to improve health and safety for staff. That was reflected in a significant investment in processes and systems for managing threatening customer behaviour. Some of those innovations include:

- new training packages which use virtual reality to simulate difficult or confrontational situations with members of the public to give team members confidence in how to deal with them;
- providing duress alarms for staff which can be used not only inside the store but also when travelling through public car parks to enter your car on the way home;
- the use of body-worn cameras to record aggressive incidents and encourage members of the public to de-escalate their behaviour; and

- the use of team radio communications to alert staff about problematic customer behaviour and seek assistance.

It is heartening to see this kind of collaboration that will have an effect in conjunction with what we do legislatively to protect retail workers.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:09): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question about the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yesterday in parliament, Report 3 of 2024 by the Auditor-General, Andrew Blaskett, was tabled. This report follows an earlier annual report tabled in September last year by his predecessor, Andrew Richardson. Yesterday's report summarises audit outcomes for 103 agencies, with particular focus on agencies with a modified independent auditor's report, significant matters raised through the audit, and other matters that, in the Auditor-General's opinion, need to be brought to the attention of the parliament and the South Australian government.

The report made for interesting reading, in particular concerns raised by the Auditor-General into the financial report of the Aboriginal Lands Trust (ALT). They include:

- the ALT's valuation of its land and buildings as at June 30 2023 of \$33.5 million was based on valuations performed between eight and 11 years ago, not complying with either the Treasurer's Instructions they be revalued by a qualified valuer every six years or its own accounting policies that require land and buildings to be revalued every five years;
- the trust did not have adequate procedures in place to ensure revenue it received from the Head of Bight whale watching tourist centre represented all its takings, an issue the Auditor-General first raised in 2011-12; and
- the trust did not have adequate procedures in place to ensure transactions with key management personnel and other related parties were identified. Consequently, the Auditor-General was unable to form an opinion as to whether the disclosure of them was complete.

The Aboriginal Lands Trust was established in 1966 to provide for the transfer of land by the Crown to the trust, to be held and managed for the ongoing benefit of Aboriginal South Australians. My questions to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs are:

1. Are you concerned over the ALT's financial reporting procedures, and why has there been wilful blindness to its statutory obligations?
2. What actions are the government taking to address the concerns raised by the Auditor-General?
3. The ALT holds titles to 65 properties comprising well over 500,000 hectares of land. Can the minister provide specific details of each of the lessees of these properties and the annual stipend the trust gets from each of them?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, that was hardly a brief explanation. I guess it was pertinent, but please can you reduce them going forward.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for his question. As the honourable member outlined in his question, the Aboriginal Lands Trust came into operation in 1966. I think it was then Attorney-General and Aboriginal affairs minister, and later to be Premier, Don Dunstan, who introduced that legislation. It was, as I understand it, the very first Aboriginal land rights legislation this country had seen. I remember well in 2016 the 50th anniversary of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, celebrating some of the achievements of the trust over that time.

As the honourable member points out, the Lands Trust has under its care some just over, I think, half a million hectares of land right around South Australia. A lot of that land is land associated

with former missions around South Australia. Places like Gerard in the Riverland, places like what was Point McLeay and is now Raukkan on the Coorong, places like Koonibba on the West Coast, Davenport, Umeewarra Mission around Port Augusta, and Point Pearce on Yorke Peninsula, are home still to significant populations of Aboriginal people in South Australia. Many of those places have a great deal of significance to the communities and families that live on those communities, being from places of missions—often Lutheran missions in this state.

In relation to income earned from their land, I am happy to see if annual reports have any information. I suspect they have information about income earned, but there is often minimal amounts of income earned from those lands because they are the home to many Aboriginal communities and families, not a commercial enterprise that is sought to be a money-making enterprise. I know that in some areas, like the farm at Point Pearce, it does return a limited, but some, commercial return, both for the Point Pearce Aboriginal community and for the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

In relation to audit findings, I am happy to raise the most recent audit findings with the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I have regular meetings with the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I do note that there has been in recent times—I think towards the end of last year, the start of this year—significant change in the management of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, but in terms of things like the revaluation of what, as the honourable member said, is a very significant landholding of some 500,000 hectares, I am happy to pass on the concern of the honourable member but also ask about the findings of the last audit report.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:15): Supplementary: can the Attorney-General then report back to the chamber after his discussions in relation to those issues?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:16): I thank the honourable member. I will take some advice. It might be that the more appropriate forum for reporting back is for the Lands Trust to report back to the Auditor-General about what they have done about the concerns that have been raised rather than me reporting back to the chamber. But I am happy to take some advice on that.

FEDERAL BIOSECURITY LEVIES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): I seek leave to provide a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on biosecurity.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Apple growers and other producers in the Adelaide Hills and indeed right around our state are outraged at the proposed biosecurity levy that they will face under the federal Labor government. The scheme, which was announced in the 2023 federal budget, without consultation, has the potential to add \$150 million to the existing levies farmers already pay to the government for biosecurity screening.

An *Advertiser* article entitled 'Fruits of Labor levy rotten to the core' spells out the uncertainty and outrage that producers feel here in South Australia, with the costs of doing business already high and producers now being told that they will have to pay to screen foreign food imports. Many farmers feel this is unfair, given many of those importers are direct competitors.

Just to be absolutely clear to those opposite, I am well aware that this is a federal levy; however, given it will impact on South Australian producers and farmers, I am asking this question of the honourable member in her capacity as the—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: —minister for primary production here in South Australia.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: And if she has any respect—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: —if she has any respect for the primary producers here in South Australia, I would expect her to answer this question appropriately. So my question is—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! And you will address your remarks and your question through me. What's your question, please?

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: My question to the minister is: does the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development support another levy on South Australian farmers and producers which will be used to screen foreign food imports?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18): I suggest that if the Leader of the Opposition is keen to impact on federal matters she speaks to her mate Tony Pasin and tries to get preselection above Anne Ruston on the ticket.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The member for Barker.

AQUACULTURE AND TOURISM

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about recent regulatory amendments to aquaculture legislation to streamline the assessment and approval process for aquaculture-related agri-tourism developments?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for her question about these South Australian regulations. On 9 December 2023, amendments were made to the Aquaculture Act 2001 through the Aquaculture (Tourism Development) Amendment Act 2021. The amendments extend the jurisdiction of the Aquaculture Act to include the approval and administration of aquaculture-related agri-tourism developments located within aquaculture zones in the waters of the state.

Proponents of tourism developments located within aquaculture zones, which do not directly involve the farming of aquatic organisms but meet prescribed criteria of the Aquaculture Act, including providing a benefit to or promoting aquaculture, will be able to apply directly to the Department of Primary Industries and Regions for the assessment and determination of their application by the minister responsible for the Aquaculture Act.

The amendments streamline the assessment and approval process for proponents of aquaculture-related tourism developments within aquaculture zones by removing the requirement for development consent under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 and altering the Seabed Authority requirements and replacing it with a single government agency assessment and approval process under the Aquaculture Act. This will encourage innovation, investment and the expansion of not only this emerging agri-tourism industry but also provide jobs potentially in regional areas of the state.

PIRSA undertook targeted consultation on the aquaculture regulations amendments through an intergovernment agency working group consisting of representatives from the Department for Environment and Water, the Environment Protection Authority, the South Australian Tourism Commission, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and the Department for Trade and Investment, as well as representatives from aquaculture sectors and the two current oyster

aquaculture tourism development operators. These stakeholders were supportive of the proposed amendments.

The opportunities these initiatives bring are exciting and I look forward to the growth of this emerging agri-tourism industry and the flow-on benefits to our aquaculture industry in regional communities where so much of our aquaculture industry is based.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge in the gallery the former member for Hartley.

Matters of Interest

HUMAN SERVICES PORTFOLIO

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:21): I rise to place some corrections on the record in relation to the human services portfolio. Firstly, I am concerned that the minister is trying to avoid public and media scrutiny regarding abandoned SA Housing properties by claiming that they are part of a domestic and family violence program. Members of the community raise these issues with us out of frustration, usually after large piles of unsanitary and unsightly messes have been left for weeks or months.

The government does have a dedicated commitment to a set of ring-fenced properties for domestic and family violence households. An FOI document providing an update of the program shows that there are just 45 properties out of a total of 45,000 social housing properties statewide. What are the chances that the houses brought to our attention are in that program—.001 per cent.

I am also concerned that the minister may have breached guidelines by publicly identifying to media outlets that particular homes belong to that program. By way of example, *The Advertiser* on 16 January 2024 stated that, 'The home is tenanted by a person who is a victim of domestic violence.' Secondly, in relation to maintenance contracts, two years into the job, 18 months after the minister signed the contract, and 14 months into the operation of the contract, the minister might like to take responsibility for them. After all, her own media release of 19 September 2022 crowed:

The new contractors have been selected after an extensive and transparent tender process and will begin delivering services from the end of 2022.

Time after time in radio, when asked why maintenance jobs are blowing out, I get blamed, which does not wash with interviewers or listeners.

Thirdly, I have also heard the minister claim that I slashed the number of staff from Housing SA. I assume she is referring to an efficiency dividend. These belt-tightening methods have been used by Labor many times. In my time, the Housing Authority found efficiencies from other means. In the interests of independent verification, the parliamentary library has done some work at my request, taking data from the OCPSE on FTEs, employee numbers, employee benefits and expenses. I seek leave to table this document.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Interestingly, the lowest numbers are from 2017-18, and the table speaks for itself. Fourthly, the minister wants to claim credit for South Australia's larger percentage of social housing. I was surprised to see that in January a number of ministers issued press releases when the annual Report on Government Services (known as the RoGS) was released, as numbers do not change much year on year. The Minister for Human Services, in a media release titled 'New data shows strong foundation for Labor investment in housing', issued a glowing report card with the following opening paragraph:

The first full year of the Malinauskas Labor Government and push to increase public housing stock has led to improved housing and homelessness services, according to new national data released.

The release goes on to say that there are more than 45,000 social housing properties, which are properties owned and/or managed by Housing SA or community organisations, and it further makes a favourable comparison between South Australia and national data on housing. The reader is led

to believe that Labor has magicked 45,000 social housing properties, yet the 2022 RoGS data showed South Australia had 45,690 social housing properties, 5.7 per cent of our state's dwelling stock, placing us ahead of Victoria, Queensland, WA and New South Wales, and equal with Tasmania.

It was the Marshall Liberal government that arrested the sales, as reported in 2020, after Labor had sold 7,500 properties in their 16 years previously and we were able to achieve net zero sales by 2022. There was an article printed at the time from 22 October 2020, entitled 'Housing sell-off capped'. I seek leave to have that document tabled.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In 2007, it was the Labor Party that baked forward sales into Housing Trust properties that led to that loss of 7,500 properties in Labor's last period in government. In fact, the Premier himself, in an ill-informed Dixer in 2022, misled the house when he blamed me for the forward sales, but being that he leads a government with ambiguous standards that one went through to the keeper. My suggestion is that Labor's RoGS release should have instead read: we are very sorry for all the properties we sold. Old data shows Labor's previous de-investment in housing.

INKLINGS AUTISM PROGRAM

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:26): I rise today to speak about the \$14.8 million Inklings early support pilot that was recently announced by the Malinauskas and Albanese Labor governments. On 30 January 2024, we announced at a local children's centre that South Australia would be piloting the Inklings program to provide early support for up to 1,300 families with babies aged six to 18 months showing early signs of social communication delays, which can be linked to autism.

The Inklings early support program, developed by the Telethon Kids Institute, uses short video recordings of the parent interacting with their baby to help parents better understand and communicate with their child. The program is not about changing the child's interactions, instead Inklings supports parents to build their own confidence and communication style so they can connect with their child in a way that is affirming for their baby.

The need for early support for families with babies and young children has been raised frequently by South Australia's autistic and autism communities during the dozens of forums and community catch-ups I hosted last year, with the common thread being, 'I wish I had known earlier' or 'I wish I knew how to best support my child or myself earlier'.

I want to share with you a story from the autistic and autism communities that demonstrates the importance of providing early support to our children. Sam is a South Australian public high school student. Sam was diagnosed autistic at age five and has gone on to become not only a successful school student but an accomplished entrepreneur as well.

I am sure many of us here know Sam's Popcorn. It is available in the Blue Room. If you have not yet had it, you must try it because it is truly the best popcorn. It would probably come in handy in most of our question times. Sam is almost at the end of his schooling years now, but his life changed forever when he was enrolled at a state public primary school in year 3. Speaking at an event last year, Sam shared how integral the early support he received at school had been to his current success. I will quote his words because he best describes them. He said:

When I started school, I had a pretty hard time. I had trouble settling into my school routine, communicating with other students and understanding that nobody really cared about whatever I was obsessed with at the time. I had great teachers who did the best they could, but they really didn't know how to help.

My parents suggested strategies that worked at home, but either my teachers didn't have the understanding to apply those strategies properly or they didn't understand the logistics of using them in a classroom with other kids.

Sometimes my teachers thought it would be unfair on the other students if I was treated differently, or they didn't truly understand the impact of my autism on how I learnt and communicated in a classroom.

Realising something needed to change, my mum and dad decided to see if another school could help. Luckily, we met with the Principal of East Adelaide Primary School, and I have no doubt that teacher changed my life.

I was incredibly lucky, but the education and wellbeing of our young people should never come down to luck.

Sam is absolutely right. The outcomes of autistic children and young people should not come down to luck. That is why the Malinauskas Labor government is working with the commonwealth government to introduce an Inklings early support program in South Australia.

MILITARY EXPORTS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:30): I rise today to reflect on Australia exporting weapons to Israel during the current conflict. Over recent months the state of Israel's attacks on Gaza have killed over 29,313 Palestinians and injured some 69,333 innocent people since 7 October 2023, the majority of those being women and children.

Hospitals have been destroyed, schools have been destroyed, places of worship have been destroyed, and those acts amount to illegal collective punishment and war crimes. Literally, babies are currently dying in hospitals of dehydration and malnutrition as the new weapons of war wreak their terrible effect.

After 7 October, the Palestinians were respectful when the Israeli colours lit up this parliament and, quite rightly, the Israeli colours were shown as a sign of solidarity and support for the Jewish and Israeli community in this state. But what have we seen in recent months? A refusal to acknowledge the pain, the trauma, and the loss of loved ones, of family members, of the Palestinian community in South Australia.

We have not seen this parliament lit up in Palestinian colours to reflect those tens of thousands who have been lost, some of whom are direct family members, friends and loved ones of South Australian community members. What we have seen is the fuelling of conflict through exporting military equipment, which of course only continues the violence at a time when our world is desperately calling for a ceasefire.

Experts from the United Nations, including Ben Saul, Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms while Countering Terrorism, has said:

International law does not enforce itself. All States must not be complicit in international crimes through arms transfers. They must do their part to urgently end the unrelenting humanitarian catastrophe in Gaza.

Since the Albanese government came into office in May 2022, they have signed fresh or extended contracts worth over \$300 million with the Israeli defence industry for military equipment for the Australian Defence Force. That includes at least \$18 million of contracts that were signed after Israel's invasion of Gaza in October last year—\$18 million worth of contracts.

We are literally sending Australian taxpayers' money to support the very corporations that are benefitting from the genocide in Gaza. We are buying equipment, like SPIKE missiles from Rafael Advanced Defense Systems, for example. These are missiles that have been tested on the population of Gaza for decades, missiles recently used to kill journalists in Lebanon and missiles designed to penetrate the concrete walls of Palestinian apartment buildings and send shrapnel through the rooms to kill every occupant.

Numerous human rights organisations have called for a two-way arms embargo with the state of Israel but, instead, Australia is selling military equipment to Israel. Meanwhile, the Albanese government, led in this case by the foreign minister, is gaslighting Australians, saying that we have sent no weapons to Israel for five years and that her own department figures are in error and that there is nothing to see here. Well, to quote my federal Greens colleague in the Senate, the Hon. David Shoebridge:

This is the kind of response we would expect from George Orwell's ministry of truth, where war is peace, slavery is freedom, ignorance is strength, and weapons are tennis racquets.

According to figures from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, between 2017 and 2022 Australia directly exported to Israel over \$13 million worth of arms and ammunition. This will likely be only a small amount of equipment contained within the 350 military export permits between Australia and Israel over the past five years. Australia's role in exporting arms material to Israel must be exposed, must be acknowledged and must be ended. The goal, of course, is a just and lasting peace for Palestinians and Israelis alike, and to do that we have to stop the export of arms and the senseless cycle of violence.

HEALTH FUNDING

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:35): I rise to speak on a matter of interest—at least it certainly is a matter of interest to honourable members opposite, especially these days to the members of the opposition in another place. But, first, do you remember the then Premier of New South Wales, Dom Perrottet? He was quite obsessed with Adelaide. I do not know if the bloke has ever been here. Perhaps members opposite could assist me in that regard.

It was not an unusual pastime for the Eastern States to bag Adelaide, but Dom Perrottet made it his whole personality. The digital driving licence being developed in South Australia was declared by Dom to be pretty poor 'like most things in Adelaide', and, 'Nobody wants to go and live in Adelaide, that's just the reality,' said Dom. A five-day washed-out test he saw as some sort of great result for the east coast, because it meant that it was still better than having to spend five days in Adelaide, according to Dom.

He was doing this not because it was particularly funny but because he thought it would make him relatable, likeable, maybe even popular. But, like the school bully who really craves attention but has no real idea how to get it, Perrottet hoped this weird piling on would endear him to people. Perhaps he recognised that there was not much else to recommend him. The people of New South Wales confirmed that when they turfed him out after only about 18 months as Premier.

I doubt that many people recall him with a great deal of fondness. I certainly do not. They say that you criticise in others what you hate most about yourself, which makes sense in this case because Dom Perrottet was actually really boring. It was not Adelaide: it was Dom. Why am I bringing all this up, Mr President? I am glad that you asked. I want to remind you of something.

In the first two years in power, the Steven Marshall Liberal government cut ambulance funding by \$13 million, making us the only state in the nation to cut ambulance funding. In their first three years, they made 339 doctors, nurses, scientists and other health staff redundant, including more than 100 nurses—that was during the COVID-19 pandemic. They cut \$5 million from the RAH and The QEH mental health services.

With South Australia's health system in crisis, the plan they took to the South Australian people was a \$662 million basketball stadium. Do you remember that? I do. That was the Liberal Party's priority, the showpiece of their election campaign: the audacity of proposing to blow hundreds of millions of dollars on something that was really quite unnecessary at a time when people were crying out for money to be spent on health.

The Malinauskas government was elected with a mandate from our community to build and improve key infrastructure across the state to deliver capacity in our health system and keep our community safe. Let me briefly take you through what the government has done so far. By the end of this year, we will have delivered more than 150 new hospital beds. We have already recruited more than 550 clinical staff, including nearly 100 doctors and more than 270 nurses, with even more due to come online later this year. We have 17 more ambulances on the road and have 171 more ambos already in the community, with 87 more to come online this year across the state.

Ambulance response times have turned around dramatically since 2022, and we have all three 24/7 pharmacies now up and running, just like we promised. In contrast, the Steven Marshall government did nothing. They did nothing to fix ramping. They had no plan. They had no policies to address the ramping and hospital system capacity.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I will get there. I can hear members opposite getting all pent up. They are very worried about something. The current Liberal opposition—as we can hear—

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. T.A. Franks): Order!

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: —still has no plan and no policies to address ramping and hospital system capacity, so when they criticise the Malinauskas Labor government for failing, after two years

in government, to fix ramping, there is a real whiff of Dom Perrottet about it. Just like old mate Dom, apart from talking us down they have nothing to offer the electorate.

I can tell you this for certain: they have absolutely no idea about how to fix ramping. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition in the other place even admitted on radio, 'Ramping gives us a significant political opportunity.' The Liberals want the next election to be a referendum on ramping, but if they are not careful it will be a referendum on credibility, and I do not think they are giving South Australians enough credit.

Time expired.

LIMESTONE COAST HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:40): I rise on behalf of the residents of the South-East, who have had their access to health services slashed by the Malinauskas state government. The latest victims of Labor's savage cuts to regional health services are the residents of Lucindale, Coonalpyn and Tintinara.

The Minister for Health and Wellbeing, in response to a question on this very topic two weeks ago in the other place, said that he would be happy to listen to the community's concerns about these changes. The minister has already had ample opportunity to listen when the whole cabinet visited the Limestone Coast less than five months ago. What was the point of their fly-in fly-out trip to the South-East if it were not to listen and act on the concerns of the community.

We know for a fact that regional health was a major topic of concern held by those who attended that town hall meeting, thanks to reporting by the local media. When local resident and owner of the local post office Geoff Robinson expressed his strong concerns about the cancellation of drop-in nursing services at the Lucindale Medical Centre, Minister Picton's answer was that this was done to spread appointments across the week when there was demand. As the *Naracoorte Herald* reported, the health minister responded to Mr Robinson saying:

Obviously it is important that we maintain those local nursing services for people in Lucindale and do it in a way which is going to get the most effective outcome.

If ripping nurses out of small regional towns is the most effective outcome, I hold grave concerns for what it means for the rest of our country communities. Robe-based GP David Senior, who visits Lucindale once a week, believes that the decision shows a lack of understanding of the work that Lucindale-based nurses do. Further highlighting the tin ear of this government, after listening to Mr Robinson's concerns, Minister Picton responded by saying, 'Obviously that's not meeting the expectations of Geoff, representing the community.'

Here we have an acknowledgement that the minister has known, for at least five months, about the changes to nursing services in Lucindale but has only recently committed to, again, listening to the community. The community has spoken, and they have done so loudly. The health minister can listen all he wants, but his lack of action so far shows that he is unwilling to intervene and act upon the concerns held by our regional communities.

Just in case the health minister is of the mistaken belief that this is just a beat-up by the Liberal Party, opposing government decisions for the sake of opposition, I can let him know that I was proactively reached out to by Lucindale disability advocate Ashley Reynolds. Ashley not only supports the other side of politics to me, he was, in fact, a Labor Party member and former unionist. Ashley was horrified to learn of the effective closure of the Lucindale nursing service, a closure that came with no consultation whatsoever with the local community.

It started with the removal of telephone nursing services, meaning calls for help and assistance went completely unanswered. He has personally had to ring the Naracoorte service multiple times for an appointment with a nurse in Lucindale but, invariably, none are available. Ashley has been a disability advocate for over 30 years and is very critical of this government's attempts to centralise health services in Naracoorte.

Arguably, he is most critical about the misappropriation of the well-founded law that is being used as an excuse to cut these service. This is Gayle's Law, which requires a second responder to

attend with a nurse to out-of-hours or unscheduled call-outs in remote areas of South Australia. This is, unfortunately, being misappropriated as a justification for nursing service cuts in small towns.

Sadly, it is not only Lucindale that is reeling from these cuts in nursing services. The Tintinara Community Health Centre was closed without notice last year after being staffed by local nurses and open four hours every week day. It has also now become an appointment only service with nurses travelling from Murray Bridge if Tintinara residents cannot travel 80 kilometres to Meningie or 115 kilometres to Murray Bridge. Local residents in Coonalpyn are disgusted with the cuts to their nurses, with the local health network claiming it is being done to provide services in line with need. Thankfully, the Coorong District Council is taking up the fight to return nurses three days a week in their clinic.

This government's attempts to centralise services in small towns like Lucindale, Coonalpyn and Tintinara simply do not make sense, due to their geographical spread. Make no mistake: I am seriously concerned that this is Transforming Health 2.0. Country Health Connect could not be more disconnected from the local people they are there to help, thanks to this Malinauskas Labor government.

DADS ALLIANCE ACTION GROUP

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:45): In January, I read a couple of newspaper articles about paid parental leave, which motivated me to do some checking on the entitlements available to fathers. The articles describe how a newly formed dads' alliance group, which has some high-profile supporters, including Red Wiggle Simon Pryce, comedian Hamish Blake and Bluey voice actor David McCormack, is launching a five-point action plan to help children thrive in their first five years of life.

The Dads Alliance Action Group is backed by the Minderoo Foundation and former SA Premier Jay Weatherill's Thrive by Five campaign. One of a few issues that the Dads Alliance Action Group is focused on that was outlined in the media report is for more help for fathers wanting to be active and caring parents. We all know how stressful juggling work and family responsibilities can be, especially for new parents.

In 2011, the parenting landscape changed with the introduction of paid parental leave. This was a game changer for Australian families. Twelve weeks of paid leave for the primary caregiver, fully funded by the then Gillard Labor government, was introduced, which included six weeks of flexible leave for dads and partners. At this time, many employers were not offering paid leave schemes, so for the first time parents had stability and support at a time of great change in their day-to-day lives.

In July 2023, the 12-week paid parental leave (PPL) period and six weeks of flexible PPL was removed and replaced with a single 20-week payment. This 20-week payment can be shared between parents after the birth or adoption of a child. From 1 July 2024, the scheme will be expanded by the Albanese federal government by two weeks each year, until PPL reaches 26 weeks in 2026, giving families a full six months of paid leave.

The expansion means that up to 22 weeks of leave will be available for one parent, with four weeks reserved for the other parent. Parents will have more flexibility, as they can now have four weeks leave together instead of two. These new structural changes allow parents to use their PPL in the way that works best for their family within a two-year time frame. Single parents can access the full entitlement.

In Australia, small businesses are required to comply with state or federal regulations regarding parental leave. The taxpayer-funded PPL scheme is a minimum entitlement designed to complement employer-provided leave; therefore, it does not act in substitution. The Dads Alliance Action Group I referred to is motivated to encourage employers and employees, unions and businesses to look at a more generous scheme on top of this minimum entitlement.

It is promising that data collected by the Workplace Gender Equality Agency shows the portion of businesses providing their own paid parental leave has increased over the last decade. Although implementing paid parental leave for fathers may pose a financial burden and present new challenges for our small businesses, the benefits of improved employee wellbeing and staff retention have the potential to contribute to their long-term success.

Small businesses may also begin to attract top talent and create a competitive edge in recruitment by supporting work-life balance. I very much hope the improvement to PPL, along with the new dads' alliance movement, helps to normalise the idea that men are able to spend time bonding and sharing responsibilities with their newborn or newly adopted child. Labor knows that, by investing in PPL, we benefit our economy and set a positive example for future generations for a more equitable and supportive society.

ABORIGINAL TOURISM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:50): I am excited to rise today to speak about Aboriginal tourism and more specifically to highlight an award-winning local tourism business, Kool Tours. As shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, it is such a privilege to work with so many outstanding tourism operators offering unique and wonderful experiences to our local and overseas tourists. They are making wonderful contributions to our tourism industry and our local economy.

Aboriginal tourism is a growing industry and contributor to the South Australian economy. In the five-year period up to December 2019, there was an average annual growth rate of up to 5 per cent in expenditure in Aboriginal tourism year on year, and a 168 per cent increase in domestic overnight trips that included an Aboriginal tourism experience. According to a 2021 report from the SA Tourism Commission for the year ending September 2020, \$195 million was spent by visitors into Australia on Aboriginal experiences. The pre-COVID peak on Aboriginal tourism spent by visitors was \$275 million, which shows that more can be done and there is a significant growth potential for this sector.

Today, I want to shine a spotlight on one of those Aboriginal tourism businesses. The business is called Kool Tours. I am sure honourable members will agree with me that it is pretty cool to have a business called Kool Tours, which is an adaptation of the surname of the business owner, Mark Koolmatrie. Kool Tours was recognised as a back-to-back winner of the Tourism Industry Council SA Tourism Award for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Experiences category in 2022 and 2023. Mark was also awarded the KPMG Indigenous Land Management Award at the South Australian Landcare Awards. Through these awards, Mark and Kool Tours have been recognised for demonstrating authenticity and cultivating a greater understanding of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island culture, history and tradition.

I still remember the day I first met Mark. It was at one of the tourism awards events. I recall I was sitting on the same bench with Mark and his lovely wife. With Mark's rich cultural background, infectious smile, friendly personality and passionate attitude about his family business, I instantly became a fan. Over the years, I have had the privilege to get to know Mark and met many members of his wonderful family. Mark Koolmatrie is an original tribal man of southern South Australia, also referred to as Munkanboli, a clever person and a man of wisdom and knowledge.

Mark's origin is from the Kukabrak tribes of southern South Australia, now referred to as Ngarrindjeri. As the owner of Kool Tours, Mark and his team offer intimate group, coastal, scenic and cultural experiences on Ngarrindjeri country in the Fleurieu Peninsula of South Australia. Mark has used his profound knowledge based on his ancestors over thousands of years and also his spiritual connection to land and water to preserve the strength of his rich culture.

Mark also has a long-term association with the Conservation and Hunting Alliance of South Australia (CHASA). As a proud Ngarrindjeri leader, Mark is passionate about engaging Indigenous people and landholders in the process of relearning Indigenous values and land management practices and preserving a more resilient landscape for the future. Mark is dedicated to looking after country and operating the old ways in the new world.

It was through the CHASA wild food fundraising dinner last year that Mark generously donated a prize, which consisted of a Coorong tour with him. With the enthusiastic bid of the Hon. David Speirs, the Leader of the Opposition, at that dinner, we were able recently to travel the Coorong with many honourable members from this house, and other members as well. I would like to take this opportunity to once again congratulate Mark Koolmatrie and Kool Tours for their contributions to South Australia and wish them all the best for a very bright future ahead.

*Bills***ELECTORAL (PROHIBITION OF CANVASSING NEAR POLLING BOOTHS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:56): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:57): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This particular bill that I am introducing today on behalf of the Liberal Party is obviously something that honourable members here would be very familiar with the process. It is not just as elected members and members of various political parties but also as individuals who have our own experience in and around polling booths on polling day. I think it is fair to say that times change and the way we deal with information and the like changes over time.

I would encourage people to review in particular a piece by Mr Antony Green, who is someone who I think we all highly respect for his contribution to the electoral process and his analysis. On his own election blog on 27 May 2020, he wrote quite a comprehensive piece entitled 'Should how-to-votes be banned at Australian elections?'. He talks about the history, a comparison between the various electoral systems and how-to-votes and the like, and makes the point that in times gone past people probably were not aware who the candidate was for particular parties and therefore the information printed on how-to-vote cards was incredibly important. I will not quote from it extensively, suffice to say:

...no other country compels voters to engage with such a complex voting system on pain of being fined.

Which introduces other issues related to but not addressed by this bill. He says:

Thanks to compulsory voting, polling places are the last chance candidates have to engage with undecided and disinterested voters who in other countries probably wouldn't turn up to vote.

I think we do have a very high level of engagement in Australia, and that is important, but this will not impact on that. He says further on:

There is clearly a problem when party workers engage in over-vigorous polling place campaigning. Voters should never feel intimidated when turning up to do their civic duty and legal obligation.

I think that is a very valid point to make, because we are all aware, whether we have engaged in it for a short period or a long period, that increasingly voters come to the polling booth knowing who they are going to vote for. They might have an electronic how-to-vote card or instructions on their phone. There is also, similarly to the bill that has been recently passed by this parliament in relation to what are essentially single-use plastics—the corflutes—the environmental aspect of the huge amount of printing that goes on just for one single day.

I always want to have a bit of a giggle when I hear some of the booth worker volunteers say, 'Give us your how-to-vote card back, and we'll recycle it.' Usually they are printed on both sides, so they might be reused by someone else in the next 10 minutes who comes into the booth, but essentially, unless they are blank on one side, you cannot even use them for writing down notes and shopping lists. They are a huge waste of paper for one particular day—or a few weeks if we include pre-poll as well—and most people know what they are doing, know how to access information. I also note clause 66 (1) of the Electoral Act 1985, which states:

The Electoral Commissioner must have posters formed from how-to-vote cards submitted by the candidates in the election prepared for use in polling booths on polling day.

We do hear that a lot from people who know that we are involved in the political process—complaining about this wastage and about being harangued. I think in Antony Green's article he talks about 'running the gauntlet' of people enthusiastically offering voters how-to-vote cards. We are also all very familiar with, on polling day or in pre-poll, the large queues of people lining up, and they can sometimes feel a little bit harassed. We have all seen the people who do not make eye contact. They just want to go into the booth and be left alone. This bill effectively respects all of those people who

wish to be left alone and who are worried about the huge amount of paper waste that is produced for elections.

This practice of canvassing directly outside polling booths, we believe, deserves a fresh look. Everyone knows you cannot campaign within six metres of the entrance to the booth. This is about the other 100 metres. It is not removing a party's ability to communicate with voters, but it is about giving voters respect, without feeling pressured, when they step within that space of 100 metres from a polling booth.

The Liberal Party believes it is a simple change to the Electoral Act which reflects what we have had as part of the feedback from many in the community. We have been very pleased that the parliament has accepted the ban on corflutes. That was a big step forward. We think the next step is banning the canvassing at the polling booth.

I have referred to the modernising of people's communications. This is about responding to that and also the frustration that many people feel in relation to the volume of material which is produced and which is thrust at voters as they go to the booth. It did take some change to convince other parties to change the laws about corflutes.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: It was that letter. The letter—very persuasive letter.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am reminded of the persuasive Mr Simms. The persuasive Mr Simms has reminded me about his persuasiveness in convincing the government with a single letter. He is a man with a very powerful pen. He has demonstrated that and, once we get him on board, I am sure he will convince the government that this is a good idea. I should not speculate about what his members might think, but I would be surprised if people with environmental concerns were not jumping on this to support the banning of single-use paper produced in large volumes. We have all seen the volume of boxes that are produced to prepare polling booth kits.

Information is vital in elections but information is transmitted and received much more electronically now. I have referred to clause 66(1) that exists in the act for the how-to-vote cards to be placed in there. We think this is a fairly sensible next step and in line with the expectations of South Australians, so I commend this bill to the house.

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

LAND AND BUSINESS (SALE AND CONVEYANCING) (BUILDING INSPECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:06): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:06): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill the Greens are introducing today is a simple proposition but one that will have a big impact on people who are looking to get into the housing market in our state. When you are buying a house, especially for the first time, you want to be assured about the quality of the property that you are buying. Homebuyers are not experts on defects in buildings and so one of the ways that they can have peace of mind is to order a building inspection. In South Australia, the responsibility for getting that building inspection resides with the purchaser, it is at their discretion.

Building inspections can cost between \$400 to \$800 for a small to medium-sized property, or up to \$1,000 for a larger property and so, if you are shopping around and putting in offers on multiple properties, that can add up to a hefty sum for a prospective buyer. Some people choose to place an offer on a property subject to a building inspection, and those offers could be looked at less favourably by the vendor than offers that are not subject to any such condition.

Indeed, we have anecdotal evidence that that is the case in South Australia and that potential buyers are foregoing building inspections because they want to give themselves the best possible

chance of their offer being accepted. This is particularly the case when we are in the middle of a once-in-a-generation housing crisis. The reality is that, in the housing market at the moment, the property owner holds all of the cards. If they are receiving multiple offers for their property then they are likely to accept the offer that is not subject to a building inspection.

It is a very different story over in the ACT. In the ACT, the vendor is responsible for providing the pre-purchase building inspection. This promotes equity by ensuring that all potential buyers are provided with exactly the same information and no-one is disadvantaged simply for doing their due diligence. At the moment in South Australia, I fear the property market runs on the principle of buyer beware. If you are unlucky enough to purchase a lemon, then you can be up for tens or potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars for rectifying a potential problem, and that is really not fair.

Knowing about potential building defects, such as cracking, rising damp or potential safety hazards, is really important for prospective homebuyers. Building inspections can prevent extra unexpected costs appearing further down the track. This Greens bill would ensure that potential buyers can request a building inspection, and this must be provided by the vendor or their representative within two days. This would ensure that this information is made available to a prospective buyer before they put an offer forward on a house, so they do so with their eyes open and with all the relevant information about the condition of a property.

Additionally, under this Greens bill, the building inspection would be included at the time the vendor's statement is served. We know this anecdotally as the Form 1. Under our bill, a vendor or the agent or auctioneer would be responsible for supplying the Form 1 at least 10 clear business days prior to settlement, including a current building inspection; that is, a building inspection that is no more than three months old. This information must be made available three business days prior to and at the auction.

The building inspection would also be supplied as part of any purchase. The buyer would then have time before the expiration of the cooling-off period to consider the building inspection report to make an informed decision, so if, when they receive that report, they become aware of defects and issues with the property they were not previously aware of, given that information is disclosed to the buyer during the cooling-off period, they can elect not to proceed with the sale. This change would ensure that buyers are given all the information relevant to their purchase.

Buying a home is the biggest purchase that most people will make in their lifetime. It is a significant investment that has huge implications for the life cycle, and we know that it takes most people up to 30 years or more to pay off a mortgage. So when you are making such a significant investment, it makes sense that you have all the relevant information at your fingertips. Why would we not ensure in South Australia that all potential buyers get access to this information at the point of sale so we can level the playing field for all and so that we can ensure that people make an informed purchase?

It is a simple reform, but it is one that I hope will enjoy support from across the parliament. I do intend to bring this to a vote in coming months and look forward to discussions with my parliamentary colleagues.

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

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (ASBESTOS REMOVAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:12): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Education and Children's Services Act 2019. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Aberfoyle Hub Primary School, Aberfoyle Park Campus Preschool, Aberfoyle Park High School, Adams Road Children's Centre, Adelaide Botanic High School, Adelaide High School, Adelaide North Special School, Adelaide Secondary School of English, Adelaide West Special Education

Centre, Agnes Goode Kindergarten, Airdale Primary School, Akuna Kindergarten, Alberton Primary School, Aldgate Primary School, Aldinga Beach Primary School, Aldinga Payinthe College, Allenby Gardens Primary School, Allendale East Area School, Amata Anangu School, Andamooka Primary School, Andrews Farm Community Preschool, Angaston Primary School, Angle Vale Preschool, Angle Vale Primary School, APY Trade Training Centre, Arbury Park Outdoor School, Ardrossan & Districts Community Kindergarten, Ardrossan Area School, Ardtornish Primary School, Ascot Park Primary School, Athelstone School, Auburn Primary School, August Park Primary School, Australian Science and Mathematics School, Avenues College, Avenues College Beatty Avenue Campus—and that is just the As that I have read from.

There are some 580 government schools—587 to be more precise—and preschools listed on the asbestos register as at December 2023, a list that was disclosed to me via a very recent freedom of information request, and so today I am introducing the Education and Children's Services (Asbestos Removal) Amendment Bill 2024 as a call to action for the development and execution of a strategic plan to rid our government schools and preschools of the legacy of asbestos once and for all.

The proposed legislation seeks to amend the said act, mandating the complete removal of asbestos from land, buildings and facilities of all government schools and preschools within a 10-year time frame. Further, it mandates transparency and accountability, requiring the Minister for Education to provide annual progress reports to parliament.

There are arguments, and certainly plans have been put in place previously to manage asbestos, that dormant asbestos can be managed. However, we are at a point now where we have to move beyond mere management. Our children deserve better, our educators deserve better, and the consequences of asbestos exposure are well documented. It is indeed our duty to ensure their safety without compromise.

Exactly what that plan looks like, granted, does not sit within my area of expertise, and I note that as a state we have in place a South Australian Asbestos Action Plan. That plan lists the various responsibilities for every department across government when it comes to managing, monitoring, and removing asbestos, including the Department for Education. I note that in the plan, when it comes to Education, the responsibilities are of management.

I think the point that I am trying to make through this bill, which is consistent with what other states are doing, is that we need to do more than just manage asbestos in those schools. Five hundred and eighty-seven education facilities across the state is an extraordinary number, and we do not know the degree to which asbestos is contained at all of those sites. We know that there are registers around asbestos that is present, but there is certainly scope for us to draw inspiration from initiatives in other states, such as Queensland's Statewide Strategic Plan for the Safe Management of Asbestos and indeed Victoria's removal strategy. Nationally, there is a collective effort toward the proactive removal of asbestos, and what we do know is that momentum is growing, and we need to get on the front foot in South Australia.

Just by way of explanation, we have previously had, I suppose, an ad hoc approach to asbestos removal across the country. It started with a reactive removal policy frame mind. It moved to some other schemes, then it moved to proactive removal in some states, particularly in Victoria, where, when it comes to removal, they have instigated the establishment of the Victorian Asbestos Eradication Agency, established in 2016, to provide Victoria with a coordinated whole-of-government plan for the ongoing removal of asbestos from its buildings.

That includes government offices, hospitals, train stations, community centres, prisons and TAFEs. The Victorian School Building Authority, which is part of the Victorian Department of Education, manages the asbestos safety program. They had a \$407 million investment to undertake the largest-scale asbestos removal program ever completed in the state between 2015 and 2020.

Following an initial audit in 2015 of 1,712 government school sites, high-risk asbestos was identified at 497 schools and was removed by March 2016. Asbestos that might pose a risk in the future, such as that behind walls or eaves of older buildings, was identified at 1,287 schools and was removed by the end of 2020. Part of the asbestos safety program included the installation of new

architecturally-designed permanent and sustainable modular buildings to replace older asbestos-containing buildings.

We have the example of Queensland, where asbestos was removed from 196 buildings across 133 schools during 2020 to 2021, with a further 55 removals scheduled beyond that time frame. The ACT government allocated \$15 million over four years in the 2021-22 budget for the removal of hazardous material, including asbestos. In South Australia, asbestos has been removed in over 50 schools. There are still 587 schools, and that was part of a \$1.5 billion investment in public education to modernise and upgrade schools. That is a far cry from what is occurring in Victoria.

The Tasmanian government's \$3.1 billion construction stimulus package for COVID-19 recovery also included a School Revitalisation Maintenance Program worth an initial \$10 million, with an additional \$6.5 million investment. There have been moves towards an incentivised removal program, and that really applies predominantly to commercial and residential properties making use of tax deductions on environmental protection, but when it comes to schools I think it is fair to say that we have two states leading the way, and they are Queensland and Victoria, which have made a concerted effort to rid their schools of asbestos.

We know that in those states a significant amount of investment was made into the removal of asbestos, but it is not a significant amount of investment that could be conceived as unaffordable or unattainable in budget terms, particularly in light of the issue we are considering. Despite the fact that we have the action plan in South Australia, despite the fact that we have an asbestos management program that operates in schools in South Australia—and that is the Asbestos Management Procedure, which helps high schools, early learning centres and childhood services to effectively manage the risks associated with the presence and removal of asbestos in buildings and facilities in line with legislative requirements—I think we have now all accepted that we have got to a point where we need to do more than just manage.

As I said before, there is plenty of evidence to show and to demonstrate that there are no safe levels of asbestos exposure or risk that we can afford to take. Now, \$407 million in the space of five years is not a great expense in the scheme of things when you have some 500 schools in Victoria that had all of their asbestos removed. In fact, I think it is a drop in the ocean compared to the long-term costs this has on our communities, our families and our societies.

We do have to confront a regrettable truth that the construction industry leant heavily on asbestos products in building and erecting many school buildings across South Australia before the nineties. We are fully aware of its presence, and the time has come to eradicate it.

I say that during a week when a national conference is taking place in Melbourne where asbestos advocacy groups are meeting. This is one of the issues they have been championing, one of the issues they want to see our state move ahead with in line with those other jurisdictions that have already taken very proactive steps as opposed to reactive steps. The feedback from them is basically that it is time to do the same here.

I am confident in the government's commitment to addressing dust disease issues, and I am really hoping for a positive and collaborative response from them. I acknowledge the work of many people in this place on the issue and the bipartisan approach that we have taken on this very important issue. In particular, I acknowledge the work of the Hon. Emily Bourke and the Hon. Reggie Martin as well as the Hon. Tammy Franks, and I acknowledge the Attorney's commitment to addressing many of the issues I have raised with him directly as they relate to dust diseases and the necessary changes to the legislative frameworks that exist.

The government has been open-minded and keen to address what, over time, have become shortcomings in our laws. There are changes we are expecting this year around return-to-work laws, which are simply no longer meeting the needs of people suffering from asbestos-related diseases. As a whole, I think this parliament has done an extraordinary amount of work on this issue; it is certainly work we have all taken a great deal of pride in. I also acknowledge the Attorney's commitment and indeed the Hon. Tammy Franks' commitment on the issue of engineered stone, and we are seeing how far we have come in terms of moving to address that issue here.

There is no question in my mind that we all share the same concerns on this issue when it comes to asbestos exposure. Many of us here have been touched personally by the effects of asbestos exposure, and we all want to do what we can.

As I said, this bill is very much a skeleton bill. I have not set out what the plan should look like; I am mindful of the fact it needs to be costed, I am mindful of the fact it will require further audits. I am also mindful of the fact it will need to be considered in the context of the current existing management plan, but that is only one in terms of managing asbestos in buildings. What we are saying now is that we really need a plan for removing that asbestos from those buildings, and I cannot think of a better place to start than with our education facilities.

I think 587 is an extraordinary number, and of course there are varying degrees of asbestos in those buildings. However, I think what this bill does do is set a minimum benchmark. I have set 10 years in this bill; I have said that within 10 years we should have removed asbestos from all those schools. That might be something we need to tweak as well, as I said, but I do ask honourable members to take into account that in other jurisdictions they have managed to do this within time frames of as little as four or five years.

It is not an impossible task, but it is a hugely important task in order to prevent asbestos exposure and the risks associated with asbestos exposure. So I am saying let's start somewhere. Let's put in place a plan and set a time frame that we can all agree to work towards. Queensland is doing it and Victoria has started doing it. As I said, the costs have not been unachievable in those jurisdictions.

In fact, I was quite surprised at the figures I was given when I looked at those jurisdictions, because I thought it would have cost a lot more. It did not, it has not, so I think that is something that is well within our grasp. I am hopeful that the government, the opposition and the crossbench will consider this bill with the intent with which it is put forward. That is one of collaborative work amongst all of us to ensure that as far as possible we eliminate the risk of asbestos exposure. With those words, I commend the bill to the chamber.

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

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:30): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the establishment of various parliamentary committees, to define the powers and duties of those committees, to make related amendments to various acts, to repeal the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I think everybody here knows what this bill is. I do not plan to speak to it at great length today, but effectively we have all come to terms with the fact that our current committee processes and structures in South Australia are not only lagging behind other jurisdictions in a dramatic way but impacting all of us here. They are impacting staff, they are impacting the Clerk's office, they are impacting members in terms of being able to undertake all of our responsibilities and duties.

Certainly, when the committee on committees was established I guess I was pleasantly surprised that at the conclusion of that committee in 2021 we reached a position where we had unanimous support for much-needed reforms to our current processes. I note, obviously, the involvement of the Hon. Ms Franks, the Hon. Mr Hanson, the Hon. Rob Lucas, the Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos, you yourself, Mr President, and myself.

There was a great deal of time put in by all of us to appreciate what it is that other jurisdictions are doing and how it is that we can improve our current structures. I want to thank the Treasurer at the time, the Hon. Mr Rob Lucas, for the amount of work that he put into this as well, because we wanted to reach a position where we had unanimous support.

I think from where the Hon. Tammy Franks and I sat—I am not putting words in the honourable member's mouth—it was very clear to us that we needed changes, but getting both of the major political parties on side to reach a unanimous decision was no small challenge. We did that because the recommendations are extremely reasonable. They are straightforward and they do bring us into line with other jurisdictions.

We all know that as members of this place we establish select committees to drive the issues that we want to raise in this place, and they are an effective tool, amongst many, that we use. But I think, overwhelmingly, the reason why we use that tool is we have an ineffective committee structure and if we had a more effective committee structure, as exists in the federal parliament and in those other jurisdictions, then we would not always be looking to establish select committees that will enable us to participate in the way that we all hope to.

The committee itself looked at all the other jurisdictions. It also looked at what happens at the commonwealth level. Some of the criticisms that were levelled specifically at South Australia were the lack of a human rights committee, the lack of a human rights impact statement attached to bills, the lack of an explanatory memorandum attached to bills for the benefit of all members, and also the lack of scrutiny of bills and delegated legislation.

Those members who have had the benefit of working in the federal jurisdiction would know that they take a very different approach to bills when it comes to scrutiny. Effectively, by the time you get onto the floor of parliament, you have a lot of impartial information that has been provided to you that has been the subject of inquiries and reports that all sides of politics feed into.

There is an understanding that the work that should take place is not politically motivated or driven. It is done so that, by the time you get to the chamber, you have a body of work before you that includes all the pros, cons, concerns about a piece of legislation or whatever the case may be, but it is not politically motivated and driven.

The biggest criticism, though, I would say that we have faced as a jurisdiction is the lack of a scrutiny of bills committee, whose job it is in those other jurisdictions to do precisely what I have just outlined. There is no question that, putting members and their needs and their time to the side for a moment, it is the staff that we have relied on in this place who are completely drowning and overwhelmed. I do not think there is enough.

We were talking about this the other day in terms of there being committees for every single member of this chamber at the moment. The Hon. Tammy Franks raised that with me just the other day and obviously there are staff, secretariats and research officers. It puts a strain on the budgetary constraints that we have here as a parliament and it is taking its toll on everybody.

The bill itself incorporates the recommendations of that report. I am happy to circulate the report to all members who have not had the benefit of reading it. There have been minor tweaks in line, only taking into account changes that have happened since 2021. I will allow members to go through it at their leisure and ask any relevant questions of me during briefings and whatnot, but I think overall what I would say is there are going to be potentially two or three elements of this bill only that would really be the subject of any debate around whether or not they should form part of the bill. The explanatory memorandum might be one of them, for instance.

But, in all, it is entirely consistent and in line with other jurisdictions which are doing things in a much more timely and effective manner when it comes to their parliamentary processes. We all know how important those parliamentary processes are to us, but the reality is that we cannot keep going down this path of trying to find staff to work on these committees and the continual establishment of these committees. Something has to give.

Just briefly, for those members who have not had the benefit of how those other jurisdictions work, the Senate is certainly a good example. I think the Legislative Review Committee is sick of hearing this from me. If you want any change, then this is where we start. One of the examples—and this will be contained in there—is the ability, much like Budget and Finance, for members to hop on and off of committees for the purposes of taking part in inquiries that concern them, so that when you do establish a committee it is referred to an existing committee as opposed to establishing a

standing committee. But that does not mean that you do not have any role in that process; you can still partake in that committee process.

The other one, of course, is ensuring that we have the appropriate committee set up, so that every time there is a bill that is introduced into parliament we have the appropriate committee to refer it to. That again, based on the findings and recommendations of the report, is something that should be subject to change.

Also, when it comes to the staffing of these committees, we have talked previously about the fact that in those other jurisdictions there is a pool of ongoing committee staff who work on an inquiry basis while maintaining corporate knowledge on scrutiny and statutory committees. It is a much more flexible approach than what we have historically had in South Australia. I do note that is something we have tried to implement on an ad hoc basis, but we have not been able to implement it to its full effect because we do not have the legislative framework to be able to do that. That is one of the other things that this bill seeks to achieve.

The only thing I would urge members to consider is we certainly do not want to be the laughing stock of the nation when it comes to our committee processes here—not because of the work that is undertaken in the committees but because of the systems we have in place. That is through no fault of any of us; that is what we have inherited. But we also do not want to be limiting what it is that we can do because we do not have the right processes in place. I think that what we have seen, all of us as a collective, is that over time we have outgrown. All jurisdictions have seen that.

I think if you ask quite candidly, and I have spoken to people who attend these sorts of forums interstate and federally, it certainly was raised to the committee itself: 'How on earth do you manage with the structure that you've got in place in South Australia, because it's not practical for anybody?' That is not just members I am talking about. I am talking about the staff in here, the Clerk's office, who have to make these committees function. But I do note in particular the evidence that was provided to that committee by witnesses who spoke specifically about the lack of scrutiny that appears in South Australia.

Last time I spoke on one of these issues, it was in the Legislative Review Committee context. I noted that it is now over 90 per cent of our legislation that is being made by way of delegated legislation. That means that most of us in this place—unless you are on the Legislative Review Committee, which has had a huge workload, granted—do not know what most of the laws we are passing every day are, because they are being made by delegated instruments.

That is not a good outcome for democracy, when we are using these by-laws and regulations and guidelines and codes to make laws that impact lives of South Australians every day and most of us in here would not have a clue what they are. Sometimes the list is 500 instruments long that we are sitting there trying to sift through in the Legislative Review Committee. There is no way you can give all of those regulations the time and effort that they warrant, given that they are resulting in laws that apply to our state and our communities more broadly.

In all, I think it is pretty self-explanatory. The report is available in terms of the background of the recommendations, it is in line with the other jurisdictions, and I am very, very hopeful that we will be able to move forward with our committee structure and make some much-needed efficiencies and reforms.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ELECTIONS) (DISPLAY AND PUBLICATION OF VALID NOMINATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:44): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Being ethical, open and honest are key characteristics of successful councillors. It is also important for the ratepayers to know who is seeking to represent them. I want to see councils being more open with the community when it comes to its nomination and voting processes. Ratepayers want to know that the people seeking to represent them are going to make decisions that are in their interests.

There has been much criticism of the secretive nature of the South Australian Voice candidate nomination process and the difficulty in finding clear information about what the government is spending on the upcoming election and who the candidates are. As is the case with councils, the public cannot easily scrutinise these nominations until after the candidate nomination period has closed.

Councillors play an important role, as they find out what local people want and endeavour to represent their views. Working with other councillors, they make decisions on what the council agenda will need to be to meet these needs. They have the responsibility of deciding how to best allocate and spend ratepayers' money, ensuring that these decisions are in the best interests of the community.

However, we know that councils and common sense do not always go hand in hand. I read with interest Kathryn Bermingham's article in *The Advertiser* last week detailing the situation where the Adelaide City Council voted down a proposal to erect a 1.1-metre high fence around the Adelaide Comets Football Club's western Parklands pitches so it complied with Football Australia requirements to host National Premier Leagues matches. The decision was overturned but is symptomatic of the often out-of-touch individuals who are elected to represent or, in this case, misrepresent their community.

We have seen councils playing politics and investing in self-interest and virtue signalling to a public that has had enough of this nonsense. I use the example of the Mitcham council voting to allocate \$40,000 to support the Yes campaign, a decision that was made without consulting its ratepayers. The motion, put forward by Mayor Heather Holmes-Ross, to allocate the funds was carried by a majority of councillors. Thankfully, the council backflipped in response to community pressure, with ratepayers making it clear that they want councils to focus on core business, not playing politics.

Currently, we have a council election candidate nomination process that allows for the potential for nominations to be confidential. This means that the public may not be able to scrutinise nominations until after the candidate nomination period has closed. I hope to achieve transparency by making these changes to the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999.

This amendment will require returning officers to display a copy of the nomination in the principal office of the council in respect of which the nomination was made. This is to be done as soon as possible after the receipt of a valid nomination. It will also require a copy of the nomination to be published on the internet. There is also a requirement for the returning officer to provide a council with a list of all valid nominations relevant to the council's area and publish a list of all valid nominations on the internet within 24 hours after the close of nominations.

Ratepayers rightly expect councillors to be honest and ethical. These changes will provide for a more open and transparent candidate nomination process and will allow for greater scrutiny by the public, thereby improving the quality of candidates. If the community can easily access information on who has been nominated before nominations close then community members will have a better idea of how they will be represented and whether there is a diverse pool of candidates.

We had an incredible situation in 2023 where eight council areas headed back to the polls at taxpayer expense after failing to receive enough councillor or mayoral nominations. This included the Tumbay Bay area. It is likely that if this had been publicised before nominations closed, that members of the community inclined to consider running would have thrown their hats into the ring.

We have seen the steady rise of Greens candidates infiltrating councils and pushing work policies that are out of touch with community sentiment. Decisions are being made that are not representative of the majority of South Australians, be it banning nativity displays at Christmas time, removing traditional prayers from council meetings or cancelling Australia Day citizenship

ceremonies. This needs to stop, and my bill will ensure that candidates can be scrutinised in a fair and timely manner.

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

Motions

GREEN SPACE, KENT TOWN

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:50): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that Kent Town is the only suburb in the Norwood Payneham St Peters council with no green space available to the public;
2. Recognises that Kent Town residents' access to the adjacent Adelaide Parklands is obstructed at various periods throughout the year due to fenced-off special events; and
3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to acquire the vacant lot 26 on College Road, Kent Town, from the federal government for the purposes of turning it into a publicly accessible park for the local community.

As I said, Kent Town is the only suburb in the entire council area of Norwood, Stepney and St Peters that does not have access to green space within its own community. The Malinauskas government can change that. A small space could be a big chance for a community win, and a Dunstan by-election is the perfect opportunity for perhaps Pete's Park to be a pocket park for the people of Kent Town.

Kent Town residents have long lobbied for this former bomb space—I am sorry, but if you are going to do that, it is really distracting. I am sorry, Mr President, I seek your protection in terms of people in the gallery having meetings behind me.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Discussions in the gallery are out of order. The Hon. Ms Game and Mr Vezis, have your meeting outside.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Thank you, Mr President. The people of Kent Town deserve a pocket park. In fact, this could be Pete's Park and the Dunstan by-election is the perfect time to make this happen.

This is not a new idea. For three years the Kent Town Residents Association has been asking for a disused piece of green space, the only possible green space at the moment in Kent Town, to be turned into a community space, to remove the lock and to let them through the gate and allow them to have their children walk on grass, have a quiet place to reflect or, particularly for elderly residents, have a place that is not across a significant barrier, and for that lush green space that we all deserve to have in our lives to be accessible.

Indeed, beautiful lush greenery in our local parks is something that we Adelaideans and South Australians treasure. Of course, it not only looks beautiful but it also helps our community to stay healthy, both mentally and physically, especially in urban areas. It does not get more urban than Kent Town, and that is why this place could be such a boon.

Our urban parks provide benefits in public health. Scientific evidence shows that spending time in green space can strongly protect against mental ill health, such as depression, anxiety and stress-related issues. Over recent years, the Kent Town Residents Association has been working really hard to gain access to a very small block of land that is located on College Road, Kent Town, to turn it into public green space.

Until 2020, this land housed weather measuring instruments for the Bureau of Meteorology. The Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) moved to West Terrace and the instruments that had been used in this little grassed area were also removed. What is more, since then that 70-square metre block has been left unused and inaccessible. In 2022, it was placed on the commonwealth land disposal list.

Kent Town, of course, is a small inner-city suburb with an increasing residential population due to a number of multistorey apartment blocks being built and planned to be built. As such,

Kent Town's residents face challenges on both public and private land, including a decrease in their tree canopy cover, an increase in hard surfaces and a reduction in available ground that can be planted. Currently, residents literally have no safe accessible green space within their own suburb.

The residents' association has met with local, state and federal government representatives over many years to discuss the possible purchase of this land for community use as a pocket park, sadly, with no success. This small fully fenced area has been lying vacant now for almost five years, with only an occasional whipper snip to keep the grass down as residents have wryly noted.

I have a series of correspondence between the Kent Town Residents Association, the BOM and the federal Minister for the Environment and Water, Tanya Plibersek, that I seek to table for the benefit of council and other parliamentary members to reflect on this particular issue. I seek leave to table these documents.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I hope members of this parliament on reading those documents will see that the Kent Town residents' request is a small but significant one. There has been a purchase of part of this land already by an adjacent school, I understand, to now erect a car park; however, there is still another small pocket of that land that used to hold the instruments for BOM that could be used for the residents of Kent Town.

As I said, this could be Pete's park, if the Premier wished to step in, and certainly the people of Kent Town would be eternally grateful for any member of this parliament who seeks to support what is I think a pretty deserving cause. I look forward to Pete's park, the pocket park, the Kent Town community park—whatever form it takes—being employed instead of sitting there unused and inaccessible because the BOM moved out. With that, I commend the motion to the council.

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

PLAYFORD MEMORIAL TRUST

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:59): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Playford Memorial Trust for its important role in supporting education in South Australia and for achieving its 40th anniversary in 2023;
2. Recognises that the Playford Memorial Trust was established in 1983 to honour the memory of Sir Thomas Playford, the state's longest serving premier, through its objective to establish 'a fund to promote, encourage and finance research and development of projects relating to the primary, secondary and tertiary and mining industries which will be of practical use and benefit to South Australians';
3. Acknowledges the importance that the Playford Memorial Trust has in providing prestigious scholarships, awards and internships for high-achieving students working in areas of strategic importance to the state; and
4. Shows appreciation to the Playford Memorial Trust chair and board members for bringing extensive experience from a range of sectors and recognises their commitment to continue the legacy of Sir Thomas Playford and for their role in reviewing and developing the trust's strategic priorities to ensure South Australia's future needs are met.

I rise today to speak to the motion and gladly congratulate the Playford Memorial Trust for serving our community in South Australia for 40 years. The Playford Memorial Trust is an independent, not-for-profit charitable trust operating under its own deed, which was established on 26 September 1983. It has enjoyed bipartisan support since it was established to honour the memory of Sir Thomas Playford, the state's longest serving Premier.

It is Sir Thomas Playford's important legacy that shapes the goals of the trust. Before running for political office, Sir Thomas Playford was involved in World War I as a soldier and fought at Gallipoli, France and Belgium. While fighting on the Western Front, Sir Thomas Playford was shot and wounded, sustaining injuries to his body, as well as suffering permanent hearing loss.

Despite being out of action for a year, and with some of the shrapnel remaining in his body, Sir Thomas Playford would return to his battalion to fight again. He was an incredibly strong man,

committed to serving his country. Sir Thomas Playford would eventually be honourably discharged with the rank of lieutenant and returned to South Australia in 1919.

Sir Thomas Playford was South Australia's longest serving Premier, who served for 27 years, and held the office from 5 November 1938 until 10 March 1965. This is, in fact, the longest term of any elected government leader in Australian history, at both state and federal level. In total, Sir Thomas Playford served as a member of parliament for 35 years, from 1933 until his retirement in 1968. During those years, in addition to serving as Premier, Playford was the member for Murray, the member for Gumeracha, Treasurer, and Leader of the Liberal and Country League.

As described by Baden Teague in his recent book, which researched the history of the Liberal Party, Playford is principally responsible for South Australia's push into secondary industries and reducing independence on exporting primary products. During his time in office, Sir Thomas Playford accomplished much for the state, with achievements in areas such as manufacturing industry, particularly during World War II, and later with the automotive industry, as well as in agriculture, mining and housing.

Sir Thomas Playford also extended the Royal Adelaide Hospital (RAH), built The Queen Elizabeth and Lyell McEwin hospitals and, in 1960, established the Adelaide Festival of Arts. Playford's policies allowed for the supply of cheap electricity to factories, minimal business taxes and low wages to make the state more attractive to industrial investment. He kept salaries low by using the South Australian Housing Trust to build public housing and government price controls to attract workers and migrants.

Playford's successful economic policies had fuelled a rapid expansion of the middle class, which wanted more government attention to education, public health care, the arts, the environment and heritage protection. On the basis of this legacy, the Playford Memorial Trust's original objective, as expressed in the trust's deed, was to establish 'a fund to promote, encourage and finance research and development of projects relating to the primary, secondary and tertiary and mining industries, which will be of practical use and benefit to South Australians'.

Sir Thomas Playford was particularly interested in horticulture and aquaculture, and is well known as developing the 'legacy of [delivering] one of the best distribution systems of electricity and water of any state in Australia' as described by another former Premier and former chair of the Playford Memorial Trust, the Hon. Dean Brown AO.

So it was most appropriate that the Playford Memorial Trust's initial focus was on supporting PhD students studying in horticulture and aquaculture. Over the years, it has been expanded to include advanced manufacturing and new technologies; agriculture, aquaculture and food production; water, energy and climate change; space and defence technologies; health sciences and enabling technologies; and mining and resource development.

As the board themselves have stated through their website, they regularly review these strategic priorities to reflect South Australia's economic strengths and imperatives. In doing so, the trust helps guide our best and brightest students into areas which align with the government's priorities and complement the South Australian government's STEM strategy.

This year, the trust and its partners across industry, government and the education sector and our South Australian community will provide around \$700,000 in scholarships, internships and awards to university undergraduates, Honours, Masters and PhD students, as well as to students at varying levels of TAFE. This incredible support for our students and future industry leaders is spread across an astonishing 21 different scholarships, and over the past 10 years funds have been distributed to more than 600 students.

Traditionally, the funding for the trust came from the South Australian government and was supplemented with donations from philanthropic individuals and the corporate sector. In recent years, the Playford Memorial Trust has taken a more proactive approach to engage with industry, university and community partners to significantly increase the number of scholarships and awards it offers and the value of its annual disbursements.

Thanks to the very active approach to engagement with industry and community, the Playford Memorial Trust has forged important partnerships with some of South Australia's most

respected businesses, professional organisations and the research sector. This allows the trust to work with universities and TAFE to align students and research projects with each partner organisation's specific needs, creating a targeted pathway between academia and research to the employment and industry needs of our state.

Some of the trust partners include our state's major universities, TAFE SA, Santos, SA Power Networks, Coopers, the Department of Defence, the Andy Thomas Space Foundation and many others across a wide range of industries and areas of emerging technologies. I want to take this opportunity to place on the public record our appreciation and thank the current members of the board, led by the chair, the Hon. Dr Diana Laidlaw, AM, who many would remember served this place really well as a member of the Legislative Council for over 20 years.

She also served as a member of the Liberal government during the leadership of the Hon. Dean Brown, the Hon. John Olsen and the Hon. Robert Kerin. During her time in parliament the Hon. Diana Laidlaw served as minister for transport, the arts and the status of women, as well as urban planning. Dr Laidlaw's experience goes beyond our parliament, having served on various boards and committees, where she has actively advocated for the arts and promotion of projects supporting women and STEM careers.

The deputy chair also served well on the trust, the Hon. Paul Holloway. Many members, our parliamentary colleagues, would know that the Hon. Paul Holloway was Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council during the Rann Labor government. He held a range of portfolios, including agriculture, food and fisheries, mineral resources development, Attorney-General, police, industrial relations, trade and industry, urban development and planning.

Other members on the board include Mr Llew Jones, Professor Don Bursill, AM, the Hon. Robert Lawson (also a former colleague of this Legislative Council), Ms Bunty Parsons, Mr Nick Carne, Professor Christine Charles, Professor David Day, Dr Kate Delaporte, Mr Mark McGeough and Dr Leanna Read. A huge thankyou to all the board members who provide their service in a voluntary capacity. Thank you also to Kate Cunningham, who assists the board as the scholarship executive officer.

I also take this opportunity to recognise some past board members and chairs of the trust for their many years of leadership and guidance of this very prominent organisation. Some of the former chairs include names that are well known to this place. They are:

- the Hon. Don Laidlaw, who was the first chair of the trust and previously served as a Liberal member of the Legislative Council;
- the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore, formerly the Liberal member for Coles (now known as Morialta) and served as Minister for Health and Minister for Tourism during the leadership of the Hon. David Tonkin;
- the Hon. Dean Brown AO, who I mentioned before, former chair and also a former Premier of South Australia; and
- the Hon. David Wotton AM, formerly a Liberal member for the seats of Murray and Heysen.

Once again, it is a great honour today to pay respect to and congratulate the Playford Memorial Trust for its great contribution over the last 40 years. I also want to congratulate all the students who have received a prestigious scholarship award for internships working in the areas of strategic importance to our state of South Australia. With those words, I commend the motion to the chamber.

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

Bills

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) (WATER ENTITLEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 February 2024.)

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:11): I rise to make a brief contribution on behalf of the government on the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) (Water Entitlements) Amendment Bill. At the outset, I can indicate that the government does not oppose the passage of the bill through the Legislative Council, and will further consider our position when the bill is before the House of Assembly.

This bill was introduced in the last sitting week by the Hon. Sarah Game, and seeks to require the disclosure of water entitlements owned by members of parliament or their relatives in each MP's annual disclosure of interests. The Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983 requires members of both houses of parliament to lodge an annual return with the Clerk of the relevant house. The act sets out a range of interests which must be disclosed in that annual return.

The Hon. Ms Game is proposing to insert a new provision requiring the disclosure of schedule 4 entitlements within the meaning of the Landscape South Australia Act 2019. The definition of schedule 4 entitlements include water licences, water access entitlements or parts thereof, forest water licences, water allocations or parts thereof, or delivery capacity entitlements.

In her second reading explanation the Hon. Ms Game foreshadowed her intention to introduce a further bill relating to the topic of ownership of water entitlements. The government would welcome the opportunity to consider matters in that bill alongside the current bill in order to take a holistic approach on this issue. Accordingly, the government will not oppose the passage of the bill today and will further consider our position in the other place.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:13): I rise today to speak on behalf of the Greens in support of this bill. Improved transparency is always an initiative that the Greens will support, especially around a resource as vital as water. Without water our way of life, particularly in our regional communities, cannot exist. Australian water should be used for the benefit of all of us.

Right now water ownership is effectively secret, but why are valuable water entitlements hidden from public scrutiny? It is a principle we are pleased to uphold and must uphold. As politicians we are expected to declare land, property, jobs and shares but not water. This is simply hidden wealth, hidden because it can be and because so far it has been allowed to be.

The Greens support the fact that water should be declared in our register of interests. This is the first step to transparency around water ownership and will shine a light on the integrity of this place. As members of parliament we make decisions that ultimately impact on the supply and price of water: if we own water then the public has a right to know that.

At the heart of our democracy it is the voters' right to know, and I thank the Hon. Sarah Game for bringing this issue to the council and for encouraging a transparent democratic process. With that, I commend the bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:14): I rise to say briefly that I will be supporting the motion in relation to the one that has been put up by the honourable member.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:14): I rise on behalf of the opposition to make a brief contribution today in support of this amendment bill. The Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) (Water Entitlements) Amendment Bill is about a specified registry for water entitlement, but to me it is more so an amendment bill about the importance of transparency and integrity.

Transparency in state parliamentarians is a cornerstone of a healthy and functioning democracy, playing a pivotal role in fostering trust, accountability and effective governance. It serves as a powerful mechanism to bridge the gap between the elected representatives and the citizens they serve, ensuring that the democratic process remains robust, responsive and reflective of the people's will.

First and foremost, transparency builds trust between the electorate and their representatives. When citizens are well informed about the decisions, actions and motivations of their parliamentarians they are more likely to believe in the integrity of the democratic process. A transparent parliament helps dispel doubts and suspicions, promoting a sense of confidence that

elected officials are acting in the best interests of the public. Transparency also enhances the effectiveness of governance by facilitating informed public discourse, such as the discourse around water and who does and should own it.

Water is an asset and should be disclosed. I already disclose on my register of interest my water ownership, which was acquired through the purchase of my home property in the beautiful region of the Riverland. I have never hidden that fact, nor the fact that I am the daughter of commercial horticulture farmers in Winkie, a little town on the flood plains of the River Murray in our beautiful Riverland region. It is a fact that I am extremely proud of, and I still live on an orchard property in that same town.

Unlike those members of the government benches, we on this side of the chamber strive to be open and transparent with the South Australian public because that is what they deserve, which is why we have absolutely no hesitation in supporting this Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) (Water Entitlements) Amendment Bill. Transparency in state parliamentarians is indispensable for the vitality of a healthy democratic society. It fosters trust, strengthens accountability and facilitates informed civic engagement. Who else should model that but us as elected officials? With that, I commend this bill to the chamber.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:17): I rise to echo the sentiments of members and indicate my support for the bill, for the same reasons that have already been outlined by other honourable members. I note that in relation to the bill itself there are obviously a number of requirements that are already applicable to all of us in this place, regarding income sources of financial benefits, directorships, travel contributions, gifts, use of property, contracts with Crown, investments, shares, political trade and professional bodies, trusts, beneficial interests in land—I note that this is probably where we have those beneficial interests in land differentiating from land when it comes to water, so there is now an explicit requirement, if this bill were to go through, around water—contributions made to funds for members' benefit, creditors, debtors.

I note also 4(3)(g) of the current requirements, which basically stipulates that we are required to disclose other substantial interests, that is, to include details of all other substantial interests, whether of a pecuniary nature or not, of the member or a person related to the member of which the member is aware and which the member considers might appear to raise a material conflict between the member's private interests and the public duty that the member has, or may subsequently have, as a member.

While the bill would make it explicit that any water entitlements would be required, I think we should not overlook that, as the Hon. Nicola Centofanti has spoken to in her contribution, there is already a requirement there. This is a saleable asset that we are talking about, just like land and other property. Subject, I suppose, to advice that members have received, I would not see this as something that falls outside the scope of what is already disclosable under the register of interests. If it is not captured by one of those other provisions that exists, then it certainly ought to fall within 4(3)(g).

That is not to take away from the bill itself, which would make it explicit, which would make it manifestly clear that this has to be disclosed as part of a member's register of interest. I note for the record that there are those provisions already existing that apply to all of us. With those words, I indicate that, for the reasons already outlined by members, I will be supporting the bill.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:20): I want to thank those honourable members who contributed to the debate: the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and the Hon. Connie Bonaros. This bill seeks to increase transparency and accountability by requiring members of parliament to disclose their water-related interests and this allows the public to better understand potential conflicts of interest between MPs' holdings and their legislative duties related to water management.

The purpose of this bill has been clear from the start: accountability and transparency with regard to water ownership from our state's politicians. It has been extremely disappointing, therefore, that discussion of this legislation has been used by the honourable Leader of the Opposition to make misleading public assertions, which were reported today in *The Murray Pioneer*. We might be in the

same corridor but we certainly do not seem to be on the same page. The Hon. Nicola Centofanti is quoted as saying:

It is a reckless and thoughtless and irresponsible proposal by One Nation's Sarah Game to contemplate restricting trade between those in the consumptive pool.

Let me be clear: One Nation supports high-security water being traded between farmers in South Australia. If a farmer has an excess of water, it is absolutely desirable to trade with a farmer in need.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Game, you are supposed to be concluding the debate on this bill. You seem to be reaching into another area, so conclude the debate, please.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: Thank you, Mr President. I will seek clarification at a later date on how I can set the record straight. I note the federal government is on the hunt now for more water for the environment. Victoria will not allow any more water buybacks to the commonwealth and neither should South Australia. The commonwealth has already bought one-third of all high-security water used for food production in this state and the federal government is now buying more high-security water without any consideration of the effect on farming and the ability of South Australians to buy fresh fruit and vegetables at a reasonable cost.

Today, \$7½ million of water is for sale in the Central Irrigation Trust. If the federal government buys this water from desperate farmers affected by low grape prices, then it is possible there will be a domino effect where other viable farmers will go out of business along the same pumped pipeline. Why? Because as water leaves irrigation trusts, the pumping costs get shared amongst fewer farmers until the cost is so high they go out of business. It is the Swiss cheese effect.

What is needed right now is support for farmers and that can come in many forms including new legislation to make water buybacks subject to certain rules so we do not destroy irrigated farming. I will be introducing this legislation later in the year. I look forward to the passage in the upper house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: How will this bill impact on water buybacks?

The Hon. S.L. GAME: My understanding is that the nature of this bill is simply to ensure that on the register of interests politicians declare their water entitlement or their water ownership.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: So, to be clear, is the member saying that this bill will have no impact on water buybacks?

The Hon. S.L. GAME: I might need further explanation from the honourable member as to what her intention is. I am not sure how else to answer it.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I refer the member to her second reading concluding comments where she just waffled on about water buybacks. I wondered what this bill had to do with water buybacks so I asked her, 'How will this bill impact on water buybacks?'

The Hon. S.L. GAME: This is a simple bill which seeks to increase transparency and accountability to ensure that if politicians own water under schedule 4 that is declared under the register of interests.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (2) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

PRESIDENT OF TAIWAN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

1. Congratulates Dr Lai Ching-te on his election as the leader of the Democratic Progressive Party to President of Taiwan, on 13 January 2024;
2. Joins with the Australian government, Australian opposition, state governments and governments around the world, including the US, the UK, the EU, Canada, Japan, Singapore and the Philippines, in congratulating Dr Lai Ching-te on his victory in the election;
3. Congratulates the people of Taiwan on the peaceful exercise of the democratic rights to ensure that the outcome truly represents the will of the people;
4. Notes that the smooth conduct of the elections and congratulations received from Australia and around the world are testament to the maturity and strength of Taiwan's democracy; and
5. Encourages South Australia to continue to work with Taiwan to advance our important trade and investment relationship, and to foster our deep and longstanding educational, scientific, cultural and people-to-people ties.

(Continued from 21 February 2024.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:27): I rise on behalf of the Greens to speak in support of this motion to congratulate Dr Lai Ching-te on his victory in the Taiwan elections. The people of Taiwan deserve to choose their own future, and self-determination is a fundamental human right. Taiwan takes its political freedom very seriously and is ranked highly in the areas of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, health care, public education and religion. Something that Taiwan has a real emphasis on is the idea that they are a free society. It is clear that Taiwan shares much in common with what we value here.

In particular, I want to highlight the progress Taiwan has made with regard to climate action and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As a member of the global village and in line with the Paris Agreement, Taiwan has actively encouraged all stakeholders to do their part and strengthen efforts towards reducing carbon emissions. Taiwan has passed the Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Management Act, under which five-year carbon reduction targets have been formulated. Taiwan has also created the National Climate Change Action Guidelines and implemented the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Action Plan, which targets six major sectors: energy, manufacturing, transportation, residential and commercial development, agriculture, and environmental management.

By setting emissions caps, promoting green finance initiatives, cultivating local talent pools and education, encouraging cooperation across central and local government agencies and of course industry, and involving the general public, Taiwan seeks to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 to less than 50 per cent of 2005 levels.

In order to find a proper balance between economic development and environmental protection, Taiwan is also promoting the circular economy as part of the 5+2 Innovative Industries Plan. There is a widespread international consensus that the circular economy plays a vital role in achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement.

Taiwan has already made significant progress over the past two decades in recycling and reusing resources. Today, Taiwan boasts a world-beating recycling rate of 55 per cent, and daily waste disposal has dropped drastically from 1.14 kilograms per person in 1998 to 0.4 kilograms per person by 2015. These certainly are real lessons we can learn from and use to help us meet our own emissions and waste reduction targets here in South Australia. To quote the former Minister of Environmental Protection Administration of Taiwan, Dr Lee Ying-yuan:

Climate change is a matter of our planet's survival, and should not be reduced to a political issue. Taiwan has long been unfairly disregarded by and isolated from the United Nations system. This has not discouraged us. On the contrary, we have doubled our efforts based on our belief in the Confucian saying that 'a man of morality will never

live in solitude; he will always attract companions.' In a professional, pragmatic, and constructive manner, Taiwan will seek meaningful participation in international organizations and events, and fulfill its responsibilities as a member of the international community.

No country should seek to interfere, undermine or subvert the democratic process any community undertakes to elect its leaders or choose its policies. Nearly 90 per cent of the Taiwanese community support the status quo, and all countries must respect that and not use Taiwan as a geopolitical wedge in a wider campaign.

I am grateful for the opportunity to recognise their world-leading work and look forward to us building stronger relationships with Taiwan in the future. With that, I commend the motion.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:31): I rise to speak on this motion and also speak on behalf of the Liberal Party in thanking the Hon. Frank Pangallo for moving this motion congratulating Dr Lai Ching-te on his successful election as the new President of Taiwan.

On 13 January 2024, Taiwan held its elections for its presidency and 113-seat legislature, which saw the Democratic Progressive Party elected for a record third consecutive term. Dr Lai Ching-te, who also goes by the name of William Lai, succeeds outgoing President Tsai Ing-wen, having served under her as Vice-President during her eight years in office. Dr Lai will be officially sworn in as President of Taiwan during his inauguration on 20 May this year. His election marks the first time in Taiwan's history that a single political party has secured three consecutive terms in office.

We are very fortunate to be living in a democratic country like Australia. Some of the benefits of democracy that all honourable members would recognise and our citizens will value in Australia include that our society supports the development and wellbeing of individuals and their right to make their own choices. In this country opposing ideas are tolerated and respected; people listen to different points of view in parliament and society.

We have an inclusive and equitable society. People have freedom of speech, association, movement and belief. All our people enjoy the freedom to act, speak and think freely as long as it does not stop others doing the same. Everyone is equal before the law and must follow the law, including the people who make law, like legislators in this parliament. We enjoy a safe and secure community. In this country there is government that is transparent responsive and accountable to the people, and our people have the ability to hold elected representatives accountable.

These are fundamental values of our Australian democracy, and it is important that we have this opportunity through this motion to show our support to other international jurisdictions that hold these values that are close to our heart. These democratic beliefs and values have received and will always receive bipartisan support. I am glad to see the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade issue a statement that reads:

Australia congratulates Dr Lai Ching-te on his victory in the Taiwan elections held on 13 January.

We also congratulate the people of Taiwan on the peaceful exercise of their democratic rights.

The smooth conduct of the elections is a testament to the maturity and strength of Taiwan's democracy.

Australia looks forward to continuing to work with Taiwan to advance our important trade and investment relationship, as well as our deep and longstanding educational, scientific, cultural and people-to-people ties.

These sentiments are, of course, openly shared by the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Peter Dutton, and Senator the Hon. Simon Birmingham, shadow minister for foreign affairs. I quote:

Australia shares the celebration of elections held in a peaceful and orderly manner which genuinely reflect the will of the people.

In addition to Australia, there has been extensive international support for Taiwan's election, including from the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the European Union, Canada, Japan, Singapore and the Philippines.

I would like to now briefly speak on the relationship between Taiwan and Australia to highlight its importance. Taiwan was Australia's seventh largest two-way goods and services trading partner in 2022-23, worth \$41.5 billion. Taiwan was Australia's sixth largest goods and services export market in 2022-23, worth \$29.9 billion. Taiwan and Australia share a wide range of people-to-people

links developed through business and tourism-related travels, academic exchanges and Australia's Working Holiday Maker scheme. In 2022-23, 15,374 people from Taiwan were granted a visa to come to Australia under the Working Holiday Maker program. In 2022, 8,676 Taiwanese students studied in Australia, making Australia Taiwan's second most popular destination for overseas studies.

The number of Taiwanese students in South Australia has grown to such an extent that the Formosa International Student Society was recently established at the University of South Australia in 2021. As shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, I have seen the growing number of visitors from Taiwan. The South Australian Tourism Commission's most recent report on international performance shows that visitor numbers from Taiwan into Australia have increased significantly, by 38 per cent for the year ending September 2023.

As shadow minister for multicultural South Australia, I mention the small but growing Taiwanese community in South Australia and their contributions to strengthening our diverse state. From the 2021 Census data, 1,739 people in South Australia were born in Taiwan, and more than a third of this group have migrated to South Australia recently during the 2016-2021 period. Many of them I have been fortunate to know as friends. This is a highly educated group which is strongly proficient in English, and relatively young. They have come to our shores with aspirations, with ambitions, and are highly capable of contributing to all aspects of our society.

I pay tribute to the Taiwanese Association of South Australia for their great work in serving the Taiwanese community in South Australia. I also make a quick mention of the Tzu Chi Charity Buddhist Foundation that was founded in 1966 by a Taiwanese Buddhist named Cheng Yen. I know that the Tzu Chi foundation in Adelaide has been doing great work in providing medical aid, disaster relief and environmental work as well.

On a personal note, one of my nieces spent a number of years studying in Taiwan in a technical college. I have personally travelled to Taiwan on two separate occasions. Honourable members who enjoy drinking bubble tea—which was called the tea and pearl milk tea—might like to know that it originated in Taiwan in the early 1980s. With those remarks, once again, I would like to add my congratulations to Dr Lai Ching-te on his election and wish the new government every success. I commend the motion.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (17:39): I rise to support the honourable member's motion and offer my congratulations to Dr Lai Ching-te on his election as President of Taiwan. On 13 January, Dr Lai was elected as the leader of the Democratic Progressive Party to the presidency of Taiwan. As honourable members have highlighted, this is a matter of global significance and one which has rightly been acknowledged by our strong allies and democratic nations the US and the UK. I am pleased with the outpouring of support by our country's leaders and even more so by the combined support of our global community for Dr Lai's presidency.

Not only do I extend my congratulations to Dr Lai but also to the Taiwanese people for their determination and their will to fight for democracy, which truly attests to their maturity as a nation. We in Australia are fortunate to hold a representative government and representative leadership is certainly something that cannot be understated. The member's motion resounds our country's progressive approach to governance and our pride for democracy must be voiced nationally to encourage and support countries like Taiwan in taking steps towards enforcing democracy.

In June of last year, along with a number of honourable members in this place, I had the profound pleasure to travel to Taiwan and meet with many important figures, including the then Vice-President, Dr Lai. Dr Lai is not the troublemaker that some would depict him to be, rather, as I had the pleasure to observe, Dr Lai is an intelligent and welcoming representative whose focus is unwaveringly set on ensuring the prosperity of Taiwan and its democracy. Dr Lai's pledge to defend Taiwan's right to democracy and peace speaks directly to his approach to leadership and selflessness in the face of the existential threats that the Taiwanese people face.

There is no doubt that the president will lead the Taiwanese people through a period of great challenges. Like Dr Lai, I found the Taiwanese people to be a generous, resilient and steadfast peoples in their desire for peace and stability in the region. It is exactly these qualities that will surely see support for the newly elected president and allow Taiwan to emerge as the independent and

economic powerhouse that it is in the face of political unrest. Dr Lai's dedication to public service remains true to Taiwan's desire for independence and fight to maintain a democracy.

As I have said before in this place, Australia and Taiwan's relationship goes beyond our relationship, politics, trade and investment to our fundamental doctrine for a nation that is resilient and proud of its culture. Let us here cherish and foster this connection for the future.

Along with my colleagues, I wish President Lai and the Taiwanese people the very best for the future and I will continue to offer support to Taiwan as they seek to exist peacefully in our global community. I thank the honourable member for bringing Dr Lai Ching-te's election to a motion. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:42): I, too, stand in support of this motion from the Hon. Frank Pangallo in congratulating Dr Lai Ching-te on his election win as the President of Taiwan. Following on from the Hon. Frank Pangallo's sentiments, I was fortunate enough to visit Taiwan in June last year with the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Laura Henderson, the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, the Hon. Ben Hood and the Hon. Frank Pangallo.

There were many highlights on the trip, but as politicians for us it would be the opportunity to meet President Dr Lai, who at the time was Vice-President. The South Australian Taiwan Parliamentary Friendship Group, which is co-chaired by the Hon. Laura Henderson and myself, issued a statement when Dr Lai was elected president, which read:

The South Australian Taiwan Parliamentary Friendship Group commends the people of Taiwan for their peaceful democratic elections held on 13 January 2024. This peaceful election demonstrates the maturity of the Taiwanese people and their democratic system.

We send our congratulations to all who participated in the election but especially to the newly elected President, Dr Lai Ching-te, and his Democratic Progressive Party on its re-election.

In our recent trip to Taiwan last year, the South Australian Parliamentary Friendship Group was fortunate to meet many political leaders from all parties, including President Dr Lai Ching-te. We look forward to continuing to build on our existing friendships and to further explore new opportunities for collaboration to further strengthen trade and investment opportunities for Taiwan and South Australia.

From my perspective, I found Dr Lai to be very down-to-earth and friendly. During our visit, Dr Lai was in the demanding position of Vice-President with a very busy workload. At the time, he was also campaigning hard to have his political party elected for a third term; however, Dr Lai was generous with his time and made sure he could personally greet us South Australian members of parliament—none of whom are ministers—which speaks volumes of his humbleness and welcoming spirit, which the Hon. Frank Pangallo also spoke about.

The reality is, as many honourable members know, when we go overseas not many people have heard much about Adelaide, South Australia. People overseas think Australia only has three cities: Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. And so it is always a surprise to these people when you tell them about a hidden gem city called Adelaide.

The trip gave us all an opportunity to promote South Australia as a destination for tourism, education, agriculture and clean energy. We all individually emphasised these points when each of us were asked to speak. Once again, congratulations to President Dr Lai Ching-te, his Vice-President Hsiao Bi-khim, and his team for winning central government for the third time, and to the Taiwanese people for a peaceful election.

To conclude, I would like to thank Mr Lu Ming-Tse, or as he likes to be called, Ray, a director-general of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Melbourne, and his staffer Mr Kuo Shih-Chun, for their support in organising our trip to Taiwan. Ray has previously worked in parliament for the central government, and certainly showed us his vast networking skills. He was able to organise for our delegation to meet with various high-profile members of parliament, ministers and mayors from various cities.

As honourable members may not know, each city in Taiwan is like a state in Australia, so the Taiwanese mayors have a role equivalent to the role of a premier in Australia. For Ray to successfully convene meetings with then Vice-President Dr Lai, while we were touring the presidential palace, is indicative of his influence and the connections he has nurtured and maintained in Taiwan.

Finally, I want to thank my parliamentary colleagues in this place who came on the trip. Although we all come from various political parties, we all worked together as Team South Australia, promoting our beautiful homeland as we travelled together. With Dr Lai as President, with Ray's skilful liaising, I am hopeful that Taiwan and South Australia's relationship will continue to flourish as new opportunities for both our nations to prosper and grow are explored.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:48): I would like to thank the honourable members—the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Ben Hood, and the Hon. Tung Ngo, who led our delegation to Taipei—for their considered and enthusiastic support for the democratic process in Taiwan, recognising also the importance of the Republic of China, Taiwan's place in the world economy and our own bilateral interests, and also for extending their warmest congratulations to Dr Lai Ching-te. As the Hon. Tung Ngo and the Hon. Ben Hood have mentioned, we met with Dr Ching-te when we were in Taipei. He certainly impressed us as a leader, and I look forward to his inauguration.

I also point out that recently the European parliament adopted two resolutions on the same day, stressing that neither Taiwan nor China is subordinate to the other, and that only Taiwan's democratically elected government can represent the Taiwanese people on the international stage. This is a significant move and goes a lot further than Australia has ever gone in its recognition of Taiwan.

These motions were passed overwhelmingly by the European parliament—338 for one and 350 votes for the other. Both resolutions strongly condemn China's attempts to unilaterally change the status quo and the peace and stability of the Taiwan Strait, while also reiterating the European parliament's staunch support for Taiwan's international participation, bilateral trade and investment and recognising the significant role it plays in global supply chains.

The resolutions denounced statements by the Chinese President that China will never renounce the right to use force over Taiwan, strongly condemned China's continued military provocations against Taiwan and denounced China's blocking of Taiwan's participation in multilateral organisations. Interestingly, after Taiwan's recent transparent and fair elections, China announced the unilateral cancellation of the six nautical mile westward deviation of the M503 route's southbound flight and the activation of the W122 and W123 routes for eastbound operations that were effective from 1 February 2024.

China's attempts to change the status quo of Taiwan Strait only served to destabilise the Indo-Pacific. Finally, it is also noteworthy to point out that Taiwan shines as the second freest country in Asia and seventh worldwide, according to the 2024 Freedom in the World report by Freedom House. Taiwan earned a stellar score of 94 out of 100 for its dedication to protecting civil liberties. Despite external pressures, Taiwan stands strong in defending freedoms against attempts to influence their democracy. So let us keep Taiwan free. In closing, can I say: xin lai Taiwan—trust Taiwan, trust William Lai.

Motion carried.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.L. Game:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that the South Australian First Nations Voice was not democratically agreed to by the people of South Australia;
2. Recognises that the federal Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice referendum campaign has caused deep division and uncertainty in the community.

(Continued from 27 September 2023.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:55): I rise today to speak on behalf of the opposition in support of this motion and to thank the honourable member for bringing this motion to a vote. While I am cautious to not anticipate debate on any other matter on the *Notice Paper*, I do draw the chamber's attention to the Hon. Ms Game's repeal bill, and the opposition

have indicated our support for that bill and we encourage the honourable member to bring this bill to a vote in the near future.

This motion addresses a critical issue that concerns the very fabric of democracy in South Australia. The recent announcement of the South Australian State Voice elections has stirred significant opposition out in the community, particularly in the wake of the overwhelming no vote during the federal referendum.

The federal referendum on the Voice ignited profound divisions within the nation and was a referendum that Prime Minister Albanese pushed onto the Australian people. The discourse surrounding the referendum underscored the deep-seated complexities and apprehensions associated with altering the foundational document of this country.

There were legitimate concerns raised at the time about the implications of constitutional amendments and many Australians and indeed South Australians were extremely worried that formalising an Indigenous Voice could introduce legal ambiguities and compromise the principle of equality before the law. Many Australians also feared it would exacerbate racial divisions rather than promoting unity and national cohesion.

The campaign around the Voice referendum has left scars on both sides of the debate. Referendums should be about bringing people together. They should not cause division, but unfortunately the latter is what we saw with federal Labor's Voice referendum. A great portion of South Australians are rightfully disappointed with the Malinauskas state Labor government, who they feel have ignored a clear statement made by the community that they do not want a Voice to Parliament.

South Australians have very good reasons for saying no. First and foremost, they do not want another layer of bureaucracy. Instead of streamlining processes and ensuring efficient representation, the South Australian Voice will only add layers of red tape and complexity to our political landscape. The Malinauskas government is effectively implementing bureaucracy, which will only serve to overshadow the voices of the people it is meant to serve.

This extra layer of bureaucracy will delay what is already a slow-moving government and it will do so because section 7 ensures the continuance of existing Aboriginal bodies around the state. So this act will not reduce or replace an already existing layer of bureaucracy, it will only add to it and also add to the cost.

If there is one thing I have learnt since coming into this place, and I have said here on multiple occasions, it is that more bureaucracy usually equals fewer practical outcomes on the ground, because ultimately we all want to see practical outcomes for First Nations people, but this is not the way to achieve it. We should be taking the advice of Senators Jacinta Price and Kerryne Liddle, who are calling for an audit or inquiry into the billions of dollars the South Australian and Australian governments spend on Closing the Gap each year and for more accountability on that spending.

Furthermore, the failure to acknowledge the principle of one vote one value is a fundamental breach of democratic principles. Each vote cast should hold equal weight regardless of geographical location or socio-economic status, yet the State Voice system seems to undermine this fundamental tenet of democracy, leaving many South Australians feeling disenfranchised and marginalised.

Equally concerning is the lack of widespread communication about this policy prior to the 2022 state election. It is the duty of our elected representatives to engage in transparent and inclusive dialogue with the electorate, particularly in the lead-up to an election, to ensure that citizens are well informed about significant policy changes that may impact their lives. Unfortunately, Labor's failure to adequately communicate the implications of the State Voice has left many feeling betrayed and unheard.

It is by virtue of Labor's failure to communicate clearly and comprehensively prior to the election that I move the amendment standing in my name. I move:

Add the following words at the end of paragraph 1—

by virtue of the fact that many South Australians are of the view that the Labor Party did not communicate their election commitment for Voice, Truth, Treaty widely prior to the 2022 state election.

A referendum is the purest form of democracy. Promises made during an election campaign which were not widely disseminated in any case cannot be appropriated by the winners as proof of endorsement of legislation such as the State Voice. The two-thirds vote for no in the referendum is proof positive that the majority of South Australians do not want it. It is a disregard for democracy on the part of Labor, and they need to cease all pretence that they are the proponents of democracy and are representatives of the will of the people. It is simply not true in this case.

As citizens of South Australia, the public rightfully demands accountability from our leaders, and South Australians should not stand idly by while they feel their democratic rights are being eroded and their collective voices silenced. It is incumbent upon us as members of parliament to be accountable for our actions and demand reforms that uphold the principles of transparency, equality and representation.

I also indicate that the opposition will be supporting the amendment to the motion in the name of the Hon. Frank Pangallo, as we believe it is consistent with the motion's intent. In conclusion, the opposition to the South Australian State Voice is not merely a matter of politics, it is a matter of principle. We must stand united in our commitment to preserving the integrity of our democracy and ensuring that the voices of all South Australians are heard and valued.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (18:01): I rise in support of the motion put forward by the honourable member and the amendments from the Liberal Party in this chamber. It is our first and foremost duty to do the right thing—a simple yet profound obligation. Part of that duty is to listen, truly listen, to the people we are sworn to serve, the people of South Australia.

Under the Malinauskas government it seems we are facing an unfortunate case of blatant disregard of that very principle, despite a staggering 64 per cent of South Australians giving a resounding no to the Federal Voice to Parliament. Despite that loud and clear chorus from the community shutting down the idea of a Federal Voice to Parliament, this government has ploughed ahead regardless with the State Voice.

Instead of acknowledging this decisive outcome, the government has chosen to sideline the broader public interest of South Australia. Let us not mince words about the claim that an SA Voice is different from the Federal Voice. It is a distinction without a difference; technically different perhaps, but in spirit and in substance it is the same undemocratic push.

South Australians, canny as they are, cannot be fooled. They see past the smokescreen of political correctness and identity politics, and they now understand that such a Voice will only serve to divide and cost dearly, and ultimately fail in delivering real outcomes because they know that adding more and more levels of bureaucracy is ultimately more of the same.

Then there is the argument about pre-election commitments, as if announcing a policy almost three years before an election gives you carte blanche. Memories are short, and the supposed mandate this government claims is nothing but a mirage. The referendum spoke volumes, rendering any assumed mandate obsolete. The Premier himself has turned his face away from the promotion of the State Voice elections, and his absence has been duly noted by many.

We must, at times, have the courage to make unpopular decisions when they are in the best interests of the state; however, this is not one of those times. A democratic process has already provided representative voices in this parliament without bias or special provisions for any minority or race. Our constitution clearly states that parliamentary representation is determined by the people of the electoral districts, not a government fiat that flies in the face of democracy and the rule of law.

If the Malinauskas government truly wishes to serve the Indigenous community it would engage with them directly, understand the on-the-ground realities and act decisively on those challenges, not retreat to another layer of needless bureaucracy. The appearance of action is no substitute for actual results. We all recognise the genuine need for support for Indigenous Australians; however, pandering and paternalism will not deliver the results that are so desperately needed.

Where is the accountability in this legislation? When will the government declare that their objectives have been met, or is this Voice to be an eternal reminder of division and disadvantage? The federal referendum's results have already sown division, distrust and disquiet among the people.

The State Voice, now understood and known by more South Australians, has done the same. My office has been inundated with concerns from constituents feeling unheard, and even some who were censored on the Premier's social media for expressing their honest and deeply held dissent. The government's refusal to listen is not just arrogant but is profoundly undemocratic.

So it is with a sense of urgency and resolve that I commend this motion to the chamber. It is high time that we return to the core of what our roles are in this place that is representative of all the people, stand up for the values that make South Australia great and ensure that our actions in this house reflect the true voice of the South Australians whom we are here to serve.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (18:05): I rise to speak against this motion. In so doing, I want to call out the One Nation party for engaging in cynical and divisive politics and to call out the opposition in this place for debasing themselves by aligning with One Nation in this way—rolling in the mud with the One Nation party in this way. I actually think it is outrageous. I think it is shameful. What is particularly galling about this is that the previous speakers have talked about division and wanting to bring the community together, yet they are lining up with the mother of all divisive political parties, One Nation. They are lining up with those who seek to fan the flames of division and disquiet in our community and are seeking to wreck this Voice to Parliament. It is deeply disappointing.

I had hoped, when we saw members of this chamber speak against the Voice to State Parliament, that when they did not get their own way they would hope that this project, this ambitious plan, would succeed. But no. Instead, they have embarked on a very different mission; that is, to try to wreck and undermine this project, and I think that is deeply, deeply disappointing.

I want to speak to some of the elements of this motion, the first being in relation to the point that the South Australian First Nations Voice was not democratically agreed to by the people of South Australia. That is complete nonsense. I refer to an article in *The Guardian* on 6 July 2019:

Indigenous leaders welcome SA Labor's vow to take Uluru statement to polls...Peter Malinauskas says party will establish a voice to parliament if it wins next election.

I seek leave to table the document.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: That article makes it very clear what the Labor Party's commitment was. They made it very clear, heading into the last election, that they were seeking to establish a State Voice to Parliament if they won the election. The Greens party made it very clear that that was something that we would support if we were in a position of balance of power in this place.

We had an election—the greatest test of our democracy that we have in our state in terms of reaching democratic agreement. There was an election and the Labor Party formed government, and the Greens found ourselves in a key position in this place. So, together, the Labor Party, the Greens—and I acknowledge also the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. Connie Bonaros—supported a Voice to Parliament. End of story. That is democracy in action. This nonsense of 'Well, the outcome that we got is not what some people in this place wanted and therefore it's undemocratic and needs to be undermined and wrecked,' I think is utterly ridiculous.

I think also that the approach that is being taken by the Hon. Ms Game of One Nation, which is being supported by the opposition, is really disappointing because it is also a slap in the face to the First Nations people who have engaged in this process in good faith. I think it is important to track the history of this reform here in this place.

Indeed, the South Australian government committed to a state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, and as a first step in July 2022 the government appointed the inaugural Commissioner for First Nations Voice, Dale Agius, who led a series of community engagements and provided advice to the government on these engagements.

The commissioner held two rounds of engagements, I understand, with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people across South Australia between August 2022 and January 2023. The first round focused on input from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities on the underpinning design principles for the Voice.

This engagement found that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were seeking a direct Voice to the South Australian parliament; a Voice that is elected by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to represent local communities; a Voice to represent the diversity of South Australian and Torres Strait Islander communities, including nation group diversity, gender, youth and elders; and direct access to government decision-makers, i.e. ministers and chief executives.

Following this, the South Australian government developed a draft bill and a model based on these findings. The draft bill and two boundary options were released for feedback. In November 2022, the commissioner commenced a second round of community engagement to seek feedback on the draft, the bill, the model and the boundary options.

This included face-to-face statewide engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait communities, as well as written submissions from the broader community. Feedback was received and that process informed the final design of the model and the legislation. In March 2023, the South Australian parliament passed the First Nations Voice Act—March of last year.

How is that not a democratic process? The government embarked on a truly representative consultative process that engaged with First Nations communities. We are now in the middle of an election. I am not sure, Mr President, whether you have had the opportunity to look at the nominees. Some really impressive people have put themselves forward to represent their communities, and I think that is a really great thing.

I find it really saddening that rather than get behind that and say, 'Great, let's hope this succeeds,' you have the One Nation party, with the support of some of the members opposite, trying to wreck this and undermine it, peddling Trumpian policies where they talk about people not following democracy, making a series of half-truths and whatever.

Really, I think the people of South Australia have had a gutful of this kind of misrepresentation and divisive politics. Surely the least that this parliament can do, after generations of dispossession of Aboriginal people, the stealing of land and the stealing of children, is to actually give First Nations people a Voice in this place? I find the arguments against it, quite frankly, insulting.

I also want to remind the members opposite, who are in the middle of a tight by-election campaign, that electors in the seat of Dunstan, a seat that they currently hold by a wafer-thin margin, voted 55.3 per cent in favour of a Voice. I look forward to going out, continuing to campaign in that seat and reminding people in that seat of the views of the Liberal Party in this place, because I think many people in the seat of Dunstan will be, quite frankly, horrified that the party that is seeking to represent them in this chamber is peddling this sort of nonsense.

Shame on the Liberal Party for debasing themselves and rolling in the mud with One Nation. Surely, we have had enough of this. I say to the Hon. Ms Game: I hope this motion is knocked on the head tonight and then let that be the end of the matter. Stop trying to undermine the South Australian Voice to Parliament. Stop trying to wreck it. Get behind it, hope that it succeeds and actually listen to the views of First Nations people. That is what we should be doing, not seeking to silence them, not peddling the sort of nonsense that we have heard in the chamber just now.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (18:13): I rise to speak in support of the motion of the Hon. Sarah Game regarding the South Australian Voice to Parliament. I will flag that I do have amendments to the honourable member's motion, which I shall outline and move shortly. The member's motion seeks to address two points: (1) that the First Nations Voice was not democratically agreed to by South Australians, and (2) that the federal government's Voice referendum caused division and uncertainty in the community. I supported the South Australian Voice to Parliament legislation, which the honourable member also seeks to repeal.

As we know, there was an overwhelming result for the no case in the referendum held in October last year. A resounding 62 per cent of South Australians voted no. I was one of them, but I will not stand for claims that were made by Aboriginal activists like Professor Marcia Langton, who was on the government's Voice advisory group, that people who supported the no vote were propagating 'stupid and racist claims'. This was based on a video of a meeting she had at Edith Cowan University and later published in the *Bunbury Herald* during the campaign.

Ms Langton, an avowed socialist intellectual, then took offence when her comments were interpreted by many as meaning 'no' voters were stupid and racist. Propagation means the spreading of something or generating something. She might draw a different distinction at what she said about the no case rather than its voters, yet that is how it came across to many. Here is what she also said, and I quote:

Every time the no cases raises one of their arguments, if you start pulling it apart you get down to base racism. I'm sorry to say it but that's where it lands, or just sheer stupidity.

The no case were 'no' voters. No matter the spin she put on it, her comments, no matter which way you view them, were perhaps the most damaging to the yes campaign.

Last December, in the annual Hawke lecture at the University of South Australia, Professor Langton doubled down on her attacks on the supporters of the no campaign, particularly opposition leader Peter Dutton, shadow Indigenous Australians minister Jacinta Nampijinpa Price and Warren Mundine, accusing them of cementing race hate into the fibre of Australia and further entrenching structural racism in our lives and then gloating about it. 'They did so with disgusting glee and arrogance,' she said. It was more divisive talk. Yes campaigners like her refused to accept the verdict of the Australian public and then lashed out at them in a show of sour grapes.

Professor Langton declared that reconciliation was dead. Really? Why would she continue to drive a hate-filled wedge between Australians? I did not see any evidence of no campaigners wildly celebrating the result, which Professor Langton describes, but resentment from the yes campaign was pronounced and inflammatory. I have never witnessed a political campaign, mostly led by elites from the left, that was so ugly, nasty, hateful and divisive—derogatory insults like: 'no' voters are uneducated.

I do not believe most Australians bear ill will or are racist towards Aborigines. There are lessons we can all learn and have learned from the past, but the Australia of today is much different and inclusive than it was more than 200 or 100 years ago. It is a great place to be when you see what is happening elsewhere in the world, yet we have people today who hate Australia so much and want to bring down its values.

The Prime Minister must also shoulder much of the blame for the referendum's failure, because he failed to articulate what a Voice would do to our federal parliament and to our country. Australians failed to understand what was going to happen and it instilled fear and concern at the direction the country was taking. This is why I voted no.

Professor Langton now wants the federal government to set up legislated regional Voices, calling for Treaty and truth-telling through a Makarrata Commission. She just will not accept the outcome, nor the democratic will of the majority. Instead of further fanning fires of hate and division based on race, Professor Langton should be looking at taking a more conciliatory approach.

As I said earlier, I voted for our Voice based on the assurances that were given by our Attorney-General and chief architect of the Voice legislation that it was more about giving a say to Indigenous people in the state, giving them access to cabinet ministers and bureaucrats about decisions or legislation that concern them. It is about being heard without compelling the government of the day to act on any demands or advice. It will be a connected, direct and independent line of communications to the parliament and government.

The bill went through quickly because the government had the numbers and the details were never really fleshed out. On reflection, and following the referendum, I wish I had more time to consider what it could do once it is in place. While I will still stand by my vote, I am beginning to have some reservations. Until the Voice is up and running, we will not know the extent of its powers and influence.

The Malinauskas government can say that establishing a Voice was part of its 2022 election commitments, following on from a gesture by the former Marshall government that was never followed through. However, neither the Premier nor the Attorney-General ever spelled out to the people of South Australia during the election campaign what this Voice was all about, how it would be funded, how it would work—it was there, buried in its long list of election promises. Voters here

never had an opportunity to analyse it, unlike the federal proposal. I hope this does not turn into another bloated Aboriginal bureaucracy draining taxpayers.

I note that there is the Voice and then there are Voice committees, which Voice members cannot be on, and that they can have as many committees as they like—so not just 47 Voice members but over 100 on the payroll. They will meet in facilities hired at a tentative cost of \$750 and be supported by a secretariat with up to six staff, including a director on a salary cap of up to \$250,000, who is Mr Dale Agius. While South Australians comprehensively rejected the Federal Voice, the state government is ploughing on with its own legislated version, with a \$10.3 million budget over four years and more than 100 participants and no cap on the number of committees it can establish.

The government has provided \$6.1 million to establish and support the ongoing operations of the First Nations Voice to Parliament. A further \$4.2 million is allocated to conduct the first two elections for members of the First Nations Voice to Parliament. These local Voice members will be paid an annual stipend of \$3,000 while the two presiding members of the six Local Voices will be for the 12-member State Voice. Their total stipend will be \$10,500, while the two presiding officers of the state will receive a total stipend of \$18,000 as well as travel, accommodation and meal allowances. In addition, there will be 55 members on four committees, separate from the elected members.

According to the handbook for candidates of the Voice, an elected member of the Voice will receive an annual base payment for service, an annual fee, meeting attendance fees and sitting fees. Reasonable travel and accommodation costs may also be covered for members to attend meetings. The annual fee is in recognition of the work that will likely occur outside of the official local Voice scheduled meetings. As a member of the State Voice, they will receive additional annual and sitting fees.

All members elected to a Local Voice body will receive an annual base payment of \$3,000—that is a total of \$3,000. State Voice members, two from each Local Voice body, and the 12 State Voice members—that is, the two joint presiding members from each of the Local Voice—will receive an additional payment on top of the base payment. So you have \$3,000 and \$7,500, making a total of \$10,500. The two joint presiding members of the State Voice will receive an additional payment on top of the base payment and State Voice payment.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: Yes, I remember this from the debate, but we hadn't voted on this.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Well, \$3,000, \$7,500, \$7,500: a total of \$18,000. Please note that the SA First Nations Voice annual payment summary does not include sitting fees, which will be paid at a standard rate per meeting. Reasonable travel and accommodation costs will be paid on a case-by-case basis, and further information on sitting fees and travel costs will be provided to the members of the Voice once elected. Here is the extraordinary legislation. It is extraordinary in that we did not democratically elect them but they can address parliament as if they were elected members. Let's have a look at entitlements in the act that was passed, beginning with section 40:

40—State First Nations Voice entitled to address Parliament in relation to Bills

- (1) The State First Nations Voice is, by force of this section, entitled to address, through 1 of the joint presiding members of the State First Nations Voice, either House of Parliament (but not both) in relation to any Bill that has been introduced into the relevant House.
- (2) The State First Nations Voice must give to the presiding officer of the relevant House at least 7 days' written notice of the intention of the State First Nations Voice to address the House.
- (3) However, the State First Nations Voice need not give notice in accordance with subsection (2) if, in the case where a Bill is to be debated or otherwise progressed urgently through the relevant House, it is not reasonably practicable to do so.
- (4) For the purposes of this section, 1 of the joint presiding members of the State First Nations Voice may—
 - (a) be admitted to the floor of the relevant House; and
 - (b) address the relevant House on behalf of the State First Nations Voice in relation to the relevant Bill.

- (5) To avoid doubt, only 1 address may be made, and only 1 House addressed, under subsection (4) in relation to each Bill.
- (6) Nothing in this section prevents the State First Nations Voice or the joint presiding members of the State First Nations Voice from doing any other thing with the permission of the relevant House.
- (7) Nothing in this section prevents the relevant House from conducting its business (including, to avoid doubt, the consideration or passing of Bills about which the State First Nations Voice wishes to address the House) prior to being addressed by the State First Nations Voice under this section.

41—State First Nations Voice may present report to Parliament

- (1) Without limiting any other provision of this Act, the State First Nations Voice may provide to the Parliament a report on any matter that is, in the opinion of the State First Nations Voice, a matter of interest to First Nations people...
- (4) The Minister must, as soon as is reasonably practicable after receiving the report (but in any event not later than 6 months after receiving the report)—

Sitting extended beyond 18:30 on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I will resume where I was—quoting section 41:

- (a) provide a copy of the report to each Minister responsible for an area identified in the report as requiring action; and
- (b) prepare a report setting out—
 - (i) each Minister's response to any part of the report that falls within that Minister's responsibility; and
 - (ii) if any action has been taken, or is proposed to be taken, (whether by a Minister, a public sector agency or any other person or body) in response to the report or a part of the report—details of that action or proposed action; and
 - (iii) if no action is to be taken (whether by a Minister, a public sector agency or any other person or body) in response to the report or a part of the report—the reasons for not taking action; and
 - (iv) any other information required by the regulations.
- (5) The Minister must, within 6 sitting days after preparing a report under subsection (4), cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Part 6 covers administration and resources, and section 47 covers the secretariat:

There will be a secretariat for the Local First Nations Voices and the State First Nations Voice, consisting of such Public Service employees as may be assigned to the secretariat.

Section 48—Resources:

Before determining the resources to be provided to Local First Nations Voices and the State First Nations Voice for the purposes of this Act, the Minister must consult with each such body and then, having regard to any submissions made during that consultation, determine the resourcing that, in the Minister's opinion, each body reasonably needs to carry out its functions under this Act.

That is in addition to the \$10.3 million. Section 49—Use of Staff etc of Public Service:

A Local First Nations Voice and the State First Nations Voice may, by agreement with the Minister responsible for an administrative unit of the Public Service, make use of the services of the staff, equipment or facilities of that administrative unit.

It is not just the department of Aboriginal affairs. In theory, they could use every single department. So they allocated \$10.5 million over four years, but a whole lot of administration and support is from the Public Service, which does not seem to be costed in that.

There is now all this talk of state-based treaties being drawn up. There is one in the works here. What consultation will the Malinauskas government have with the wider South Australian community before it moves to adopt it? What will be in it? How will it affect us? How will it affect

native title rights? All these questions should have been put to South Australians during the last election.

I do have some amendments to the honourable member's motion. Allow me to move them and explain them here. I move:

After paragraph 2 insert new paragraphs as follows:

3. Notes that the federal Aboriginal and Torres Strait Voice referendum held on 14 October 2023 resulted in an overwhelming no vote against establishing a Federal Voice, and that in response the federal government has announced it will not establish a Voice;
4. Acknowledges that the people of South Australia have never been informed of or democratically agreed the cost of establishing and resourcing a South Australian Voice;
5. Notes that the federal government is not providing South Australia with any funding or resourcing to administer the SA Voice;
6. Notes that the South Australian government will have to meet the new and additional cost of the State Voice, estimated to be \$10.3 million over four years (excluding stipends, travel allowances and sitting fees);
7. Notes that the South Australian government does not have funding for a state truth-telling commission or a state Treaty group.

In relation to new paragraph 3, the fact is that 60.06 per cent of Australian voters voted no and 39.94 per cent voted yes. All states, including South Australia, voted no, as did the Northern Territory. In relation to new paragraph 4, as I have explained, there is \$10.3 million in the budget, but \$2 million of this is for the actual election, and all the extras are not costed in this. In relation to new paragraph 5, I cannot find anywhere where the federal government are funding this, so it appears to be great cost shifting.

In relation to new paragraph 6, I have already outlined allowances and also where they can use the whole Public Service; plus, there is also a full-time Voice commissioner already appointed. In relation to new paragraph 7, the government and the minister have tried to keep a lid on these two topics at the federal and state level, but we now know, through comments made by the Prime Minister, that they will come next and are not funded but will be in future budgets.

The act that was passed here amends the Constitution Act 1934 to recognise the importance of the Voice of the First Nations people and the intention for those voices to be heard through the Constitution Act. The South Australian Constitution Act is an act of parliament and unlike the commonwealth, does not, subject to several exceptions, require a referendum to be amended. Did South Australians know this? I doubt it.

In closing, there was much ado about the workings and costings of our Voice that was not explained—just take the word of the government that it is all going to be hunky-dory. But as the Premier himself succinctly put it on his recent whistlestop self-promotional tour for his state prosperity projects, nine out of ten times the words that spill from the mouths of politicians are, and if I can quote him accurately in this place, 'bull' expletive.

In finalising my comments, I am not going to be here and throw mud at other members in this place who are entitled to make their views known without being subjected to comments that are derogatory to those members. If you have a view, you are entitled to express it without being hit with insults and offences.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:36): I rise very briefly to indicate that I will not be supporting this motion. I do not intend to recanvass the debate we already had in this parliament. Suffice to say, it culminated in a proud and historic day in this place that I and others were humbled and proud to be a part of. I stand by that position, a position democratically arrived at with overwhelming support of members of this parliament.

In so doing, I applaud and commend our Attorney-General and, indeed, Mr Agius for their work on this issue, and also the Attorney for his tenacity to withstand criticisms levelled at him in this place throughout the course of these debates.

I spoke earlier today on the committee on committees inquiry and it was remiss of me not to mention at the time, and I will do so now, that in response to some of today's commentary one of the single criticisms that was levelled at South Australia throughout the course of that inquiry was indeed the lack of a First Nations Voice in our lawmaking processes, not just by First Nations people but by experts and academics alike. That should not be lost amongst any of us, as it is at the heart of the bill that I and others in this place supported.

For the record, I note that I will be supporting amendments to this motion to be proposed by the Hon. Tammy Franks and thank her and the Greens for proposing those amendments and putting them forward. I will not be supporting any other amendments. In closing, I say only Voice, Treaty, Truth-telling. They are the three pillars of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, all canvassed during the original debate, all pillars I stand by wholeheartedly and resolutely.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:38): I rise to speak to this motion. The Greens will not be supporting the motion without amendment and so, therefore, I move to amend the motion as follows:

Paragraph 1.

Leave out all words after 'Voice' and insert 'was one of the first election commitments made by the now government, and was legislated by this parliament on 26 March 2023; and'

Paragraph 2.

Leave out all words after 'Recognises that the' and insert 'South Australian First Nations Voice is designed to give First Nations people the ability to have a say on the matters that affect their lives.'

The Uluru Statement from the Heart is what brings us here and has been debated many a time, and is debated again today. The Uluru Statement from the Heart is a short, incredibly powerful piece of prose. It reads:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We call for the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the Constitution.

Makkarrata is the culmination of our agenda: the coming together after a struggle. It captures our aspirations for a fair and truthful relationship with the people of Australia and a better future for our children based on justice and self-determination.

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

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

That is the Uluru Statement from the Heart. I am proud that the Greens were the first party to accept the Uluru Statement from the Heart in full and I commend the work of then Senator Rachel Siewert

in her leadership on that matter. Indeed, she is not the only leader in a parliament to have embraced the Uluru Statement from the Heart, and I note the fine words that I shall share with the council right now:

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

They are not my words. They are fine words and I agree with them. They are the words of then Premier Steven Marshall when he introduced the Liberal Party government bill for a Voice to Parliament in October 2021. I share some more words from that particular bill:

The bill establishes formal legal requirements for the exchange of information and communication of advice between the [Aboriginal Representative Body] and both the parliament and the government. The aim is to ensure that policy developments and initiatives that may affect Aboriginal South Australians have regard for their concerns and perspectives.

It was not a new idea when the Malinauskas government then in 2019 announced that they, from opposition, were committed as a government to having a Voice to Parliament: Voice, Treaty, Truth. Indeed, this parliament has previously had a Treaty commissioner in a previous government. It has had Treaty conversations before, but part of the conversation about Voice, Treaty, Truth is what comes first.

There are disputes about what comes first out of Voice, Treaty, Truth, but in the model that this state has embraced as a legislature through our parliament, which has primacy over our laws—we do not have any impact on the federal laws and the federal parliament has limited impact on our laws—we have here in this parliament an act, the First Nations Voice to Parliament, which implements part of the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Not only does it establish the parameters and premises for a Voice, which this council and the other place have already voted on, debated in full and accepted, it also makes mention of both truth-telling and Treaty, and recognises that a voice, a structured voice of Aboriginal people, of First Nations People, is a very good start if you want to start some truth-telling and some treaty-making. It only makes common sense.

But there is a lacking of common sense in this debate because here we are debating a motion about a federal referendum yet again, when we have an act of parliament that is seeing elections currently underway for a First Nations Voice to our parliament, our South Australian parliament—not to the commonwealth parliament, not to the Tasmanian parliament, not to the Victorian parliament or the ACT parliament, but to the South Australian parliament—that the South Australian parliament has debated, has consulted on and has voted on. I recognise that not everyone in this parliament voted in support of a First Nations Voice and not everyone in this parliament necessarily does support a First Nations Voice, but we have had a vote on it and the numbers have not changed.

I note that in the third reading contribution of the Hon. Dennis Hood, while his party and he had voted against a First Nations Voice, he actually committed to listen to the First Nations Voice, but I do not see a lot of listening going on here as we literally have an election of First Nations people to elect their very first First Nations Voice to Parliament in this state, and we are having a debate from a One Nation motion, that the Liberal Party is wholeheartedly the cheer squad for, to revisit old ground.

While I will not go to the content of a piece of legislation that is before this place to be debated, I note that that piece of legislation sits there on the *Notice Paper* with the mover having full knowledge that it does not have the numbers to pass this place or the other place. It will not become law. The First Nations Voice will not be repealed in this parliament unless you have a few more by-elections and you change the numbers of this parliament substantially.

What I will note, though, is that the voters of Dunstan, when they went to the polls in 2022, had a choice of Steven Marshall, the then premier, who supported a First Nations Voice to Parliament. They had a choice of a Labor candidate with a Labor leader, now Premier Malinauskas, then opposition leader, who supported a First Nations Voice to Parliament. They had a choice of a

Greens candidate, who supported a First Nations Voice to Parliament. Indeed, a First Nations Voice to Parliament was not even a contentious issue during the last state election.

One Nation opposed a First Nations Voice to Parliament at the last state election, but we did not even know who the candidate was, and it took some weeks to establish that. Their policies were not given proper scrutiny, they were not part of the debate, and all of the main players, certainly those vying for the government of this state, the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, both had a bipartisan approach that they both supported the Uluru Statement from the Heart and a First Nations Voice to Parliament.

So much so that even though the Marshall government was not returned, and the Malinauskas government—and I note on election night their very first statement, the very first statement of the newly elected Premier, Peter Malinauskas, was to talk about the fact that he was going to implement a First Nations Voice to Parliament.

I remember that, along with acknowledging Ryan, the candidate for Unley, in my watching of the television coverage of that night. It was the very first thing that was said on election night. It was promised by the Labor opposition back in 2019. It was not front page news, because it had bipartisan and cross-party support and it was not seen as contentious. I still fail to see what is contentious about listening to First Nations people about the issues that impact them, particularly things like child protection, incarceration and inequality.

Given we had a referendum before that was needed to recognise First Nations people as human beings of value and worth back in 1967, I think some people have very short memories indeed about why we find ourselves in the position we currently are. If people were serious about addressing racism in this state and in this parliament, they would be campaigning right now to remove the race power from our constitution in section 51. I have not heard a peep from those who talked about this being a divisive debate about removing the race power from section 51. I look forward to that campaign and people putting their efforts into that campaign instead of pointless motions coming before this council.

We are here debating yet again a piece of legislation that has already passed this parliament. I have to scratch my head and wonder why members of this parliament do not know how to parliament, because parliament is about having votes. You have an election, you take it to the people of South Australia, you get voted in or you do not. Then you come here and the numbers line up, as they do.

Those who have the most numbers and can get the confidence of a leader to take to the Governor across the road in the lower house get to have the government of the day and the Premier. That is how this works, that is democracy, that is parliament. If you do not democracy and you do not parliament, I do not know what you are doing here. You are wasting our time, you are dog whistling and you are preparing for your next appearance on *Sky News* would be my guess, but I have become very cynical in this place.

I look forward to the election of the First Nations Voice to the South Australian parliament. I look forward to this parliament hopefully listening to those voices, hearing their concerns and listening to their solutions and finally having First Nations people treated not as the problem but as the solution to the problems.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (18:52): It will come as no surprise to members of this place that I rise today to support this motion. My opposition to a Voice to Parliament, whether it be constitutionally enshrined or whether it be legislated, has been consistent. It remains my view that a Voice to Parliament seeks to create an unfortunate divide in our state, based on race. It remains my view that an important pillar of our democracy is that we are all equal: one person, one vote.

It remains my view that the establishment of a Voice to Parliament undermines the very premise of equal representation, giving greater weight to a vote of one group over another and creating barriers to representation based on race. Generations before us have fought hard and continue to fight for the harmonious ideal that all are equal before the law and that all votes are treated equally. It remains my view that creating an expensive administrative third chamber of parliament for Aboriginal South Australians sends the wrong message. It remains my view that this

wrongly tells South Australians that the parliament is not for all South Australians. Arguably, this wrongly tells Aboriginal South Australians that this parliament in its current form is not for them.

It remains my view that Aboriginal South Australians already have a voice. It is in our local government, it is in our state parliament and it is in our federal parliament. The question really is: why does the government feel that it needs what is essentially an expensive administrative third chamber of parliament to tell them what they should already know? Why not just get on with tackling the issues Indigenous communities are facing, while hearing the input they already receive from the numerous advisory bodies established in this state, which the Voice regrettably seems to ignore? It remains my view that the way in which our parliament legislates and provides funding must be needs based and not race based.

When the First Nations Voice Bill was before this parliament, I stated, and I will state it again, that I cannot stand here in this place, particularly in this chamber which represents and reviews the laws of the land for over 1.7 million South Australians equally, and support any bill that aims to legislate for the creation of a third chamber based on race at our highest level, the South Australian parliament.

It remains my view that we are a nation that must strive to be a fair and tolerant society and that the parliament must be a place for all South Australians, whether from Indigenous communities or otherwise. At the time the parliament debated the First Nations Voice Bill, I highlighted that it would have been beneficial for members of this place to see the results from the federal referendum into a constitutionally enshrined Voice to Parliament where the views and opinions of the public, in particular the South Australian electorate, were respectfully engaged before legislation was brought to this place on such an important topic.

Notwithstanding there was a federal referendum on foot, the Malinauskas Labor government arrogantly pushed ahead with this legislation for a Voice to Parliament, disregarding the then upcoming referendum and the views of South Australians. When the resounding results from the referendum came back showing that over 64 per cent of South Australians voted no, the Malinauskas government should have acknowledged that they got it wrong. Instead, we see a government that is pushing ahead with the First Nations Voice elections this month and a government that will not rule out the payment of reparations and compensation to Indigenous communities. The question really is: how much will this cost South Australian taxpayers?

It is my view that the attitude to push ahead with the State Voice to Parliament despite such a resounding result at the federal level, particularly here in South Australia, is disrespectful to the will of the South Australian people. The Attorney-General said that the referendum and the State Voice are two very separate issues and that the referendum was about constitutional change. Respectfully, I think that is just semantics.

When the Labor government sought to pass their First Nations Voice Bill, in doing so they made an amendment to our state constitution. Yes, our state constitution is an act of parliament and does not require a referendum to make changes comprised in the State Voice, but the principle behind it in changing what is essentially our state's rule book, in which our democracy and system of government rest, is the same principle. Our state constitution has been changed.

The government will say that they had a mandate to introduce a Voice to Parliament as this formed one of their long list of election commitments at the 2022 state election. I believe the Attorney-General said it was the very first policy the then Labor opposition announced at NAIDOC Week in 2019. But I put it to the chamber that most South Australians were likely unaware of this commitment when they went to the ballot box in March 2022. I query where the sea of confluents for a Voice to Parliament were in amongst the confluents about the ramping crisis—and by the way, in case you missed the memo: ramping is now worse than when you formed government.

I think many South Australians were probably more focused on the chalked ambulances and the scare campaign that was run by the Labor Party and the Ambulance Employees Association about ramping. The slogan 'Vote Labor like your life depends on it because it just might' tends to have that effect. I put it to this chamber that the results of the 2023 referendum would be a clearer indication of the level of support for a Voice to Parliament, with around 64 per cent of South Australians voting with a resounding no, than the 2022 state election was on this issue.

I commend the Hon. Sarah Game for bringing this motion to the chamber, which I indicate I will be supporting today. I also indicate that I will be supporting the amendments in the names of the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the Hon. Ms Centofanti. I indicate as well, on behalf of the opposition, as we received late amendments from the Hon. Ms Franks, that we will not be supporting her amendments as they substantially change the intent of the motion. I also indicate that, ultimately, should her amendments succeed, the opposition will not be supporting the amended motion.

While I am cautious not to anticipate debate on another matter on the *Notice Paper*, I draw to the chamber's attention the Hon. Ms Game's bill to repeal the First Nations Voice, a bill that has sat on the *Notice Paper* for months that would rectify the issue this motion seeks to address, a bill that has been well ventilated in the media by the honourable member but remains idle on the *Notice Paper* for action to be taken.

I would have thought that it would have perhaps been more timely for this bill to be taken to a vote before the nominations for the First Nations Voice election opened, and it is now just weeks away until the elections. However, I look forward to when the Hon. Ms Game does bring this bill to a vote. As has already been indicated, the Liberal Party will be supporting the bill.

The result from the federal referendum was clear, it was decisive. The government should have waited for that result before pushing ahead with a state-based Voice to Parliament. Following these resounding results the government should have acknowledged that they got it wrong, that the State Voice, or any Voice, seeks to divide us rather than unite us. Instead, the government has doubled down and will not rule out the payment of reparations or compensation in the future.

To conclude, I will share with the chamber some of the comments I have received following my second reading contribution to the First Nations Voice. One individual says:

The Voice is supposed to be decided by all Australians. In a referendum. What happened to the referendum in South Australia? You are railroading the voice idea government. Stop it. We all have a say.

Another person said, 'Not happy, Jan.'

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: I find it quite interesting that the Attorney-General finds that quite comical, that South Australians are not happy. Another person says:

Doing this act by passing such a bill many people believe will cause a division within the nation, especially when you don't ask people in your state what they believe of this bill, has been passed by government is a slap in the face to each person they are supposed to be representing.

Another person said:

This has to be the people's vote and not just a government decision. They were never given a mandate to make this decision on behalf of all SA residents.

Another person said:

This voice is normalising and embracing systemic racism throughout our country.

Another person says, 'Vote no. We are all Australians.' Another says:

The most important principle is equality before the law and to appreciate this one must consider the opposite alternative. How wrong would it be to exclude a group from voting in general elections. You do not increase inclusion and participation through exclusion and deception. The lack of community knowledge and communication on model and impacts is incredibly deceptive and shows the hubris of this Labor government.

Another person says, 'Why weren't we asked? Isn't the government meant to be serving all Australians?' Another said:

Funny how the ambulance union has gone very quiet. Malinauskas likes to control lots of aspects of politics but things are starting to blow up in his face somewhat.

Another person said, 'Are SA government entitled to dictate without asking the people first?'. Another person has said, 'Labor arrogance.' Another person:

This Voice will be an endless money pit with no accountability, transparency or results-based integrity. The people of South Australia should have the right to vote on this state-based decision. It is our money being used on yet another race-based organisation.

Another person says, 'This country does not need racism at its core. This voice is designed as a racist entity.' Another person says, 'Don't vote for racism. It's pretty simple.'

In concluding, I will just draw from my second reading contribution when I say that, like I think all South Australians, my firm belief is that Indigenous communities in South Australia deserve a seat around the table to talk about the issues impacting their communities, often disproportionately in matters that are of great significance.

Where I differ in my belief is that the table should not be pushed off the side and relegated to some third chamber funded on a discretionary basis by the executive government of the day and burdened by bureaucracy and symbolism. The Voice for these communities is and should be here in this parliament as representative of all South Australians and their communities at large, within the existing framework of our great democracy that treats every vote equally no matter who you are or what your race is. I commend the motion to the council.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (19:03): I will not speak to the substance of this motion particularly but I will speak briefly in pointing out some of the inaccuracies that are perpetrated both by what is in the motion and what is in the amendments.

Regarding the substance of it, I have spoken at length numerous times in this chamber about why I think there is a very firm need to have Aboriginal people have more of a say in the decisions that affect their lives. One statistic, that a man born on the APY lands has an average life expectancy of 48 years today, shows that we are getting it wrong and that we need to do something different in terms of how we provide services to Aboriginal people.

It is almost seven years since the Uluru Statement was handed down, and I know that there are many Aboriginal people, activists and leaders for whom the statement is a daily part of who they are, and I include myself as one of those. I will not go into the need for this. I think it is self-evident and I think many people also think that.

The motion and some of the amendments make very odd claims about what the nature of democracy is or is not and how it works, and seem to insinuate or propose that this is a policy idea that was hidden from the people of South Australia. Nothing could be further from the truth. As even the opposition has admitted, this was the very first policy that Labor released, way back in 2019. It was written about in local and national media. The policy documents were published, they were printed, they were handed out and they were found on the internet.

I have to say, if you want to hide something, here is the classic way not to do it: do not talk about it in the major policy debate that happens before an election. If you want to hide something you would not want to do that. In the SA Press Club debate between the then opposition leader Peter Malinauskas and Steven Marshall, the very first thing that the then opposition leader Peter Malinauskas said—and I will read it exactly—was:

Well, thank you very much, Stacey. Thank you, Premier to Mike and the Press Club, ladies and gentlemen. I, too, would like to acknowledge that we get together today on the lands of the Kurna people and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Of course, the best way we can pay our respects is through our deeds rather than our words. And that's why I'm very determined that a Labor government I lead does act on the Uluru Statement from the Heart and delivers an Aboriginal voice to Parliament in our first four years.

That is the first thing that was said at the Press Club debate on 10 March 2022—hiding in plain sight, hiding where everyone could hear it, and hiding where anyone who was interested in policy debates would hear it as the very first thing that was said. Do you know what, just to hide it even further, to hide it even further to make sure no-one knew about it, the then Premier Steven Marshall was asked during the Press Club debate, in a question, what he liked about Labor's policies.

Do you know what the then Premier of the Liberal Party said at the Press Club debate, the major policy forum to inform South Australians of what the policies of the respective parties are? What Steven Marshall, the former Premier, said was that he supported Labor's platform of introducing an Aboriginal Voice to State Parliament within four years, as reported by the ABC.

I have to say, if this was trying to be hidden from the people of South Australia, it did a bloody poor job in doing so—having it as the lead thing in the Press Club debate on 10 March, less than two

weeks before the state election. It is just a ridiculous, demeaning and unintelligent proposition to suggest that this was in any way hidden from the people of South Australia when in the Press Club debate you lead with that as the first thing you say.

There has been discussion about what the cost of the Voice to Parliament might be. I think the Hon. Frank Pangallo has an amendment that talks about the cost being \$10.3 million over four years, excluding stipends, travel allowances and sitting fees. That is just wrong. It is either made up or it is falsely misleading this parliament. I have said during the committee stage of the debate, I have said in answers to questions and I have said in the media that the cost of this includes these things. It is \$10.3 million, including the administration, including any resources that are needed to provide for the Voice, including the election that happened, and including stipends, travel allowances and sitting fees. It is just not correct, the words that are written on the paper, in what has been budgeted for.

I cannot support something that is so fundamentally at odds with what I believe is good and needed for Aboriginal people. Even further, I cannot support something that is so riddled with mistakes and inaccuracies in what is put forward that it makes no sense.

As a couple of people have spoken about, I am really pleased that this is being brought to a vote right now. We are only a couple of weeks away from a by-election in the seat of Dunstan, a seat where, on referendum day, every single polling booth returned a yes vote. I have done a bit of doorknocking in Dunstan, and I am amazed: I do not think you can go four or five houses without a yes sticker and without a yes poster.

I want to thank the opposition, and I particularly want to thank the speakers from the opposition, because I am now extraordinarily motivated to get out on this long weekend, and to get everyone I can out, and particularly go to those houses with those stickers on them and let them know what the opposition has said about the Voice to Parliament.

I will let them know, because there will be Labor supporters who will have it reinforced and there will be Greens supporters who will have it reinforced, but there will be Liberal supporters who I think will vote on the basis of the strident opposition that the opposition has put to this. I cannot wait to get out and tell people, after the by-election, in seats like Heysen. You cannot walk around Stirling or Aldgate without bumping into houses that still proudly display a yes poster.

I want to thank the opposition. I know they think in year 9 style debating points. It is all very clever to talk about what mandates are because they heard it once in the year 8 politics class that they took in high school. 'You don't have a mandate,' notwithstanding that is exactly what happens when you are voted in in an election. I cannot wait to be able to use the words that the people have chosen to put on the record in the Dunstan campaign and in campaigns in the lead-up to the next state election.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (19:10): I rise briefly. I firstly want to point out something that I think is fairly confusing, and I think deliberately so. We are talking about the Voice legislation. This is not about debating whether Aboriginal people should have a voice. Everybody in this parliament wants the Aboriginal people to have a voice. Everyone in this parliament wants better outcomes for Aboriginal people. This has been instigated by misleading, confusing naming of a piece of legislation called 'the Voice', not about debating whether we want a voice for Aboriginal people.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order: the member is misleading the parliament. There is no legislation called 'the Voice'.

The PRESIDENT: Can you just continue so we can conclude the debate.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: Thank you, Mr President. When we are talking about South Australians supporting the Voice, or the notion of the Voice, as we have just heard from the Attorney-General, it is my belief that what they are saying is we want better outcomes for Aboriginal people and we want Aboriginal people to have a voice. It does not mean that they have understood this piece of legislation and thrown their support behind it.

I want to thank the honourable members for their contributions, particularly the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Hon. Ben Hood and the Hon. Laura Henderson for their support both for

the legislation that I have on the table, the motion that we are currently debating and the amendment that they put forward. Also, thank you to the Hon. Frank Pangallo for his support and the amendments that he has put forward. He outlined clearly the structure of the Voice as proposed by the legislation, so I will not dwell too much on that, other than to reiterate that it is \$10.3 million to establish, with over 100 members and the potential for more members by extrapolating the number of committees. That is \$10.3 million that could be put towards people, regardless of race or heritage, who are currently in a cost-of-living crisis.

In regard to the contributions from the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Tammy Franks, I just want to make clear and put on the record that what I am supporting is support based on need, not race or ancestry. That obviously includes supporting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who are in fact in need. It is really hard to understand how that is twisted to be a racist statement or how, in fact, anyone can argue against supporting people based on their need rather than their race or ancestry.

It has also been asked why we would bring this motion forward. We bring this motion forward now because we are paid by the taxpayer to represent the community, and it has been very clearly expressed to me by the community that they do not want the Voice that is being established in this state. They do not want it, for the same reasons they did not want the Federal Voice. It would be beneficial for the government to properly delve—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.L. GAME: —into why the community did not want the Federal Voice, because they are the same reasons they do not want the State Voice, and that has to do with more bureaucracy, wastage of money and division within the community.

I just want to state also that I have been specifically contacted by Aboriginal groups and members of the Aboriginal community, and I am really proud of the growing relationship I have with different members of the Aboriginal community. We have had Kerry White, a Narungga elder, actually run as a One Nation candidate in the past. As a result of my position on the State Voice, I have had other Aboriginal members contact me, asking about and expressing interest in the One Nation party, because they feel so strongly against what is happening in this state for their community. In particular, they are deeply upset about other members speaking for different groups. It is my understanding that that has been deeply upsetting.

In closing, I just want to make it clear that my position is I support a true voice for South Australians in this state, and that includes Aboriginal people. What I do not support is the establishment of more bureaucracy and wastage of money. Actually, I have been contacted by Aboriginal people who had supported this Voice, who actually now just wish this government would get on with the cost-of-living crisis that everybody is facing, rather than establishing this bureaucracy.

The PRESIDENT: There are a number of amendments, so you are going to have to work with me as we work through this. The first question I am going to put is that the words in paragraph 1 proposed to be struck out by the Hon. T.A. Franks stand as part of the motion. If you are supporting the Hon. Ms Game and the Liberal opposition you will vote aye, and if you are supporting the Hon. Ms Franks you will vote no.

The council divided on the question:

Ayes8
Noes..... 11
Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.
Lensink, J.M.A.

Game, S.L. (teller)
Hood, D.G.E.
Pangallo, F.

Henderson, L.A.
Lee, J.S.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Franks, T.A. (teller)
Martin, R.B.
Simms, R.A.

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.

El Dannawi, M.
Maher, K.J.
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Girolamo, H.M.

Hunter, I.K.

Question thus resolved in the negative.

The PRESIDENT: The next question I am going to put is that the words proposed to be inserted in paragraph 1 by the Hon. T.A. Franks be so inserted. If you are supporting the Hon. Ms Franks you will say aye.

Question agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: The next question is going to be that the amendment moved by the Hon. T.A. Franks to paragraph 2 be agreed to, so if you are supporting the Hon. Ms Franks you are going to vote aye.

Question agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: The next question that new paragraphs 3 to 7 as proposed to be inserted by the Hon. Mr Pangallo be so inserted, so if you are supporting the Hon. Mr Pangallo you are going to vote aye, and if you are not you are going to vote no.

The council divided on the question:

Ayes8
Noes.....11
Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.
Lensink, J.M.A.

Game, S.L.
Hood, D.G.E.
Pangallo, F. (teller)

Henderson, L.A.
Lee, J.S.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Franks, T.A.
Martin, R.B.
Simms, R.A.

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.

El Dannawi, M.
Maher, K.J. (teller)
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Girolamo, H.M.

Hunter, I.K.

Question thus resolved in the negative.

The council divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes11
Noes.....8
Majority3

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Franks, T.A. (teller)
Martin, R.B.
Simms, R.A.

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.

El Dannawi, M.
Maher, K.J.
Scriven, C.M.

NOES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.
Lensink, J.M.A.

Game, S.L. (teller)
Hood, D.G.E.
Pangallo, F.

Henderson, L.A.
Lee, J.S.

PAIRS

Hunter, I.K.

Girolamo, H.M.

Motion as amended thus carried.

*Bills***SECOND-HAND VEHICLE DEALERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

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

CONSTITUTION (COUNTERSIGNING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 19:28 the council adjourned until Thursday 7 March 2024 at 14:15.