

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 9 April 2024**

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

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

*Bills***INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (SECTION 31 OFFENCES)
AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS REGISTRATION (CHILD-RELATED WORK) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (USE OF PASTORAL LAND)
AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Condolence***WEBSTER, MR F.R.**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:19): By leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of Mr Frank Raymond Webster, former member of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his public service and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Today, I rise to offer the condolences of the government and this Legislative Council to the family and friends of former member for Norwood Frank Webster, who passed away on Friday 1 March 2024. Mr Webster lived a life that was full and one that he kept quietly private. I did not know Mr Webster personally, but I wish to make some brief comments about the legacy that he leaves behind.

Mr Webster first stood for the seat of Norwood, now largely the seat of Dunstan, at the March 1979 election after the resignation of then Premier Don Dunstan. He was defeated by Labor candidate Greg Crafter, but a state election later that year would see Mr Webster at that general election go on to win the seat by just 33 votes. A subsequent appeal to the Court of Disputed Returns, the subject of which was an advertisement in an Italian language newspaper, saw the seat vacated after just 14 parliamentary sitting days and the result was then reversed once more, with Greg Crafter winning that by-election held in February 1980.

Following his exit from parliament, Mr Webster went on to great success in his legal career, establishing his law firm in what we know today as the prominent firm Websters Lawyers. He was

also a founding board member of the South Australian Foundation of Otorhinolaryngology Head and Neck Surgery, having himself experienced throat cancer. It was a position he held until his passing.

The Law Society, in marking Mr Webster's passing, noted that there would be no formal public funeral service, given that Mr Webster was of the view that funerals are, and I will quote, 'the most overrated form of entertainment, closely followed by weddings', with his family instead inviting friends to enjoy a bottle of red in his honour.

On behalf of the government, and on behalf of this chamber, we send our condolences and best wishes to Mr Webster's family and recognise his service to the parliament, the legal sector and the people of South Australia.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I rise today on behalf of the opposition to extend our condolences to the family and friends of Francis Raymond Webster, elected representative of the former seat of Norwood, who passed away on 1 March this year. Mr Webster is remembered as a tenacious candidate, politician and lawyer. He will also be remembered for his tenacity in his fight against cancer. Although Mr Webster's tenure in parliament was brief, his dedication to the South Australian community was unwavering throughout his lifetime.

Elected in 1979 at the age of 33, whilst practising as a barrister and serving on the Queen Victoria Hospital board, Mr Webster's victory in the Norwood seat by a mere 34 votes played a pivotal role in David Tonkin's ascension to the Premiership, becoming South Australia's 38th Premier.

With a legal career spanning over three decades, Mr Webster was admitted to practice in 1972 and continued until his retirement in 2004. He was affiliated with various legal firms, including Martin Webster and Lovell from 1979 to 1983, Webster Braes and Co. from 1983 until 1986, and later Frank Webster and Associates from 1993 to 1984, which eventually rebranded as Websters Lawyers, a legacy that endures today.

I wish to note, though, that the most poignant and lasting legacy he leaves is as a noted founder of the SA ENT Foundation, or the South Australian Foundation of Otorhinolaryngology Head and Neck Surgery. The foundation was established to procure necessary equipment for head and neck cancer patients that the hospital did not supply. Initially, the fund received contributions from surgeons at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Proceeds from a joint clinic with speech pathologists continue to bolster the foundation's funds to this day.

Substantial donations have empowered the foundation to support various research endeavours. These include investigations into the applications of laser and robotic surgery as well as ongoing research into laryngeal transplantation. Moreover, the foundation has sponsored training opportunities for junior medical, allied health and nursing staff.

The foundation continues to expand its focus beyond the aforementioned initiatives. It is committed to addressing head and neck cancer, Aboriginal health disparities, paediatric treatment and research, and conditions related to nasal, sinus, ear and throat cancers.

Notably, the recent National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey highlighted the disproportionate prevalence of long-term ear and hearing issues among Indigenous Australians, underscoring the urgency of addressing these disparities and emphasising just how important this foundation's work continues to be for Australians.

Prior to Mr Webster's passing he noted that he did not want a formal funeral service but instead directed through his last wishes that friends enjoy a bottle of red in his memory. Our team raises a glass of South Australia's best red in his honour. On behalf of the Liberal Party in South Australia, I want to extend my thanks to Mr Webster for his service to our community and also recognise, of course, his broader contributions. Vale Frank Raymond Webster.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:26 to 14:35.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge in the gallery the presence of the former President of the Legislative Council the Hon. John Dawkins.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

The Annual Water Security Update 2024

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

Reports, 2022-23—

Murray Darling Basin Authority

South Australian—Victorian Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee

Regulations under Acts—

Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004—

Mandatory Notification Courses

Rules of Court—

First Nations Voice Act 2023—First Nations Voice Court of Disputed Returns

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

District Council By-laws—

Tatiara—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Moveable Signs

No. 3—Roads

No. 4—Local Government Land

No. 5—Dogs

No. 6—Cats

No. 7—Domestic Bird Management

Fees Notice under Act—

Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016

Regulations under Acts—

Harbors and Navigation Act 1993—Port Adelaide

*Parliamentary Committees***SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:35): I bring up the report of the committee on Amendments to the National Health and Medical Research Council Ethical Guidelines on the use of Assisted Reproductive Technology in Clinical Practice and Research.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I bring up the report of the committee on Petition No. 96 of 2021: Funding for children and students with additional learning needs in public schools and preschools.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Ministerial Statement***FESTIVAL PLAZA**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:38): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to a new tower for Festival Plaza made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

*Question Time***RIVERLAND WINE INDUSTRY BLUEPRINT**

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about the Riverland Wine blueprint and the synopsis of the blueprint.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On 4 April, Riverland Wine released their blueprint implementation plan 2024—synopsis, which detailed priority activities in 2024 to address the Riverland Wine Industry Blueprint Implementation Plan, a plan which the minister and her department endorsed with statements made at the time, such as:

This Blueprint is our roadmap to safeguard the Riverland's economic vitality and cultural identity for generations to come.

Interestingly, on 8 April an updated version of the blueprint implementation plan 2024—synopsis was rereleased, with the only difference being a removal of the partnering body logos on the document, being the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, the Australian government through Wine Australia and the Wine Grape Council. I seek leave to table both versions of this document.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Therefore, my questions to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development are:

1. Did the minister or anyone from her office or department direct Riverland Wine to remove government logos from the Riverland Wine Industry Blueprint Implementation Plan 2024—Synopsis?
2. Does the minister stand by the Riverland Wine blueprint that she signed off on in November last year?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am very pleased to have the opportunity raised by this question to provide the clarification that is needed. The honourable member is correct in that last year we released the Riverland Wine blueprint. I have been advised that the organisation Riverland Wine (the industry association) produced a synopsis of requests—requests, not items that have been endorsed in any way by government or by stakeholders.

That synopsis document, called the synopsis, included the use of logos from funding partners for the blueprint. That distinction is important. The logos of the South Australian government were included because the South Australian government is a funding partner for the development and implementation of the blueprint. The funding partners are supporting the development and implementation of the Riverland wine industry blueprint.

The implementation of the blueprint is separate to industry requests developed by the organisation Riverland Wine. To this end, it is important for industry bodies to ensure that information presented in their communication materials, especially those sent to their members and other partners, is both accurate and clear. It is fair to say from the feedback I received over the weekend that growers interpreted the synopsis document as one that had been endorsed by government. As I have explained, that is not the situation and therefore it was appropriate that the synopsis document be rereleased without logos of funding partners.

RIVERLAND WINE INDUSTRY BLUEPRINT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries a question regarding the Riverland Wine Industry Blueprint Implementation Plan 2024—Synopsis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I wrote to the minister on 10 July 2023, suggesting a plan to enable growers wishing to exit the wine sector to do so with dignity and suggesting ways that might support growers wishing to continue and diversify into other crops. I also wrote to the minister on 11 September last year, encouraging direct discussions with growers to accurately gauge the impact of the current wine sector downturn, as I had heard many growers state the urgent need for an immediate package to ensure their viability.

The Riverland Wine Industry Blueprint Implementation Plan 2024—Synopsis states the need to deliver immediate and short-term adjustment and support in the way of: one, exit packages of \$4,000 per hectare to remove vines—up to 3,000 hectares across the region; two, EPAs or council to facilitate temporary storage of posts while Wine Australia completes disposal project; and, three, support for both crop diversification and efficient land management practices, alongside facilitating the subdivision of house blocks into smaller allotments to enable land to remain in agricultural production. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development are:

1. What plans does the government have in facilitating the transition of willing growers to alternate sustainable crops?
2. Will she commit in this house to funding an exit package of \$4,000 per hectare to facilitate growers wishing to exit the wine sector, as asked for in the Riverland Wine Industry Blueprint Implementation Plan 2024—Synopsis?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for her question, particularly the very last part of the sentence where she included the word 'synopsis' to indicate that the document she is referring to was the synopsis document that has not necessarily been endorsed by broad stakeholders.

In terms of the overall issue, I think what needs to be very well appreciated and I think is appreciated by many is that the response to this wine industry crisis is multifaceted. We have talked on a number of occasions about the fact that there is a global oversupply of red wine.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Mr President, the members opposite clearly don't want to hear an answer, because I am only probably 30 seconds in and they are yelling out. I ask that, if they want an answer, they listen in silence.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I will try to give you as much protection—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will try to give you protection. Members will listen in silence. Minister, complete your answer, please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, Mr President. It is good to have the opportunity to commence it. As I mentioned, there is a global oversupply issue. This is something that has been building for a long time, exacerbated of course by the very difficult issues that proceeded from the imposition of Chinese tariffs.

Following some excellent work from the Albanese federal government, and visits by the Prime Minister last year, by our Premier in September last year and then of course I myself was able to visit last month, we are very pleased that the tariffs on bottled wine from Australia have now been lifted. This is a particularly important part of stabilising the industry. It is only one part, but it is a very significant part.

I have been asked on a number of occasions: how will this benefit the industry and the Riverland in particular? How soon will these matters be resolved? I think I have been very, very frank, including on Riverland radio just this week, in saying that the multifaceted nature of the problem means that there is a multifaceted nature of response. It is absolutely very good news in regard to the lifting of the tariffs. It is very significant for all of our wine industry across the state, including the Riverland. However, it won't solve all of the problems overnight, and indeed it won't solve all of the problems.

What we do need to do is make sure that we maximise the benefits that do come from that. In that regard, the state government has announced a \$1.85 million China engagement support package for South Australian wine businesses. It was through the concerted efforts of both the federal and state government that the trading relationship with China has been improved. The re-engagement package will be rolled out over the next two years to June 2026. Really important parts of the package include the South Australian wine industry being provided with in-market insights and capability building to effectively re-enter the China market in a risk-controlled manner. The package comprises five key components:

- two-way market activation and immersion;
- promotional marketing and communication campaigns;
- a wine export adviser based in country;
- technical cooperation; and
- exporter capability building.

To support the two-way market activation and immersion, the Department for Trade and Investment and its partners will facilitate opportunities for wine exporters to attend key in-market events in China, both this year and next year, as well as coordinate trade familiarisation visits for leading Chinese wine importers to experience South Australia's wine regions.

Our world-class wine offering will be promoted to trade and high-end consumers in China through multiplatform marketing and communication campaigns aligned to peak consumption periods, including key trade events and celebrations. I can certainly provide additional information on that program as well.

Also, I was very pleased to successfully move at the last national meeting of agriculture ministers—that's all state and territory ministers and the federal agriculture minister—for a national approach to the issue. It should be clear to anyone that if, for example, one region or one jurisdiction was to implement something that would reduce the plantings of red wine grapes, and another jurisdiction was to increase the number of plantings, that sort of activity would be counterproductive. It certainly wouldn't benefit any of the growers. So it was really important that we did have that kind of national approach.

We have established a national working group with South Australia as the lead. They have also already visited the Riverland, the Riverina and Mildura, and they have been able to engage directly with those in the industry, including growers, to be able to present to that working group. That working group is looking at the issue across the nation, including of course across the state. The Riverland is very hard hit, but this is an issue that impacts other wine areas as well.

We have also announced an extension of the vineyard resting trial, the Ethephon trial, which is a rebate that can be accessed by red wine grapegrowers. They can save up to \$2,000 per hectare in input water and management costs in their vineyards through a trial that is being undertaken across South Australia. A further year's extension of that is one more thing that we are able to do and are doing. Over the weekend, I was pleased to meet with a number of growers and other stakeholders within the Riverland region and to talk about these and other programs and the assistance being provided.

In terms of the specifics that the member opposite is suggesting, I think that is where the work needs to be done, on that national working group, to see if there is to be a package and what the nature of that should have that doesn't have unintended consequences and is counterproductive, which of course would not benefit any of our growers.

RIVERLAND WINE INDUSTRY BLUEPRINT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): Supplementary: how was the visit by the working group advertised to grower communities around the Riverland?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00): I am happy to get some extra detail and bring it back to the chamber. My understanding is that there were a number of growers who had been vocal in a number of forums who were invited to attend, as well as through the various industry associations.

RIVERLAND WINE INDUSTRY BLUEPRINT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): Supplementary: is the minister indicating that the working group was via invitation only?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00): As I mentioned, I would have to gain some additional information and bring it back to the chamber, but my understanding is that existing methods of communication channels directly through to growers as well as to associations and industry groups was the main methodology.

RIVERLAND WINE INDUSTRY BLUEPRINT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Final supplementary: when does the minister expect the re-engagement package to filter through to practical improved outcomes for Riverland growers and other growers around South Australian regions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): When I was in China last month the indications were that some of that activity would resume pretty much as soon as the tariffs were lifted. At the time I was there, of course, the interim decision was received and then it took several more weeks before the final decision from the Chinese government came through. I think as soon as exports begin there's going to be the beginning of the impact for all affected wine areas and then that will continue to grow.

An honourable member: You do realise there's a backlog, Clare.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Of course I do.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding the South Australian Aboriginal Voice to Parliament elections. Did the minister cast his democratic right in the South Australian Aboriginal Voice to Parliament elections and, if so, in which region did the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs cast his vote?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for her question. Similarly to, for example, the Governor at state elections not casting a vote in the state elections, as the minister responsible I didn't cast a vote but I very much look forward to when I am not the minister and can cast my vote in these elections.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Supplementary: given the low voter turnout and the minister himself not taking part, can the minister outline what steps he took to encourage eligible South Australians to cast their democratic right to vote?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:02): I took many steps, as anyone who follows my social media or listens to me in the media more generally would have heard.

AFL GATHER ROUND

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Would the minister inform the chamber about the benefits of Gather Round to South Australia's regions?

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 about what was another incredible week for our state that I hope we would all be proud of. South Australia has shone in the national spotlight with an incredible weekend, showcasing the best of our state.

Of course, we know that some of the very best things about our state are our producers and our regions that have, once again, significantly benefited from Gather Round. From lunches, dinners, food and wine festivals, pop-ups, activations and everything in between, South Australian produce was as much a part of the festivities as the football itself. One thing is clear: the many thousands of interstate visitors to our state couldn't get enough of it.

Both games in Mount Barker had crowds of over 9,000 people, an incredible turnout. I think the sight of the rolling hills around the ground was a stunning backdrop to the excitement on the field. The food and beverage area highlighting local produce, the Terrace, proved to be a huge success and provided a party-like atmosphere, truly unique to Gather Round. The Adelaide Hills were abuzz and with so many businesses and community groups holding their own events around the festivities, it really was just fantastic to see so many people enjoying what the region has to offer.

With the announcement of a game in the Barossa next year during Gather Round, it's another incredible opportunity to shine a spotlight on our premier wine and produce regions. Certainly, the Adelaide Hills have represented our regions extraordinarily well in the way that they have hosted AFL games over the past two years.

As we saw last year, it wasn't just Adelaide, Norwood and the Hills that were able to get in on the excitement of Gather Round. With tens of thousands of people making the trip by car from the Eastern States, and in particular Victoria, regions all the way from the border to the city have seen huge influxes of travellers coming through in a great boost to businesses and communities who, no matter their distance from Adelaide Oval, have been able to share in the excitement and benefit to our state that Gather Round brings.

The Gather Round Community Footy Roadshow kicked off again this year, stopping in 30 regional towns across 21 days, covering more than 4,000 kilometres, and included the Riverland, Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Kangaroo Island, Adelaide Hills, Barossa, Whyalla and many more, visiting schools and clubs with four very important pieces of silverware in tow: the AFL men's and women's premiership cups, as well as the SANFL equivalents.

Last year's Gather Round saw more than 25,000 visitor nights generated outside of Adelaide, and the match in Mount Barker injected \$2 million into the Adelaide Hills alone. I look forward to seeing—as I am sure we all do—the figures from this year's event, which are expected to increase upon the phenomenal results of last year.

I can only say, having been both in the South-East and the Riverland within the last week, the buzz that people were reporting, the increases in business, particularly of course hospitality and accommodation businesses, and the real sense of excitement was almost palpable to see. That is just anecdotally some of the excitement associated with Gather Round in the regions.

It truly was an incredible week. One can only hope that after seeing it for themselves twice now, some of the last remaining critics of Gather Round, namely the South Australian Liberal Party, will finally come on board and realise the huge benefit that events like Gather Round have for the whole South Australian community, including local producers and all of our stunning regions.

AFL GATHER ROUND

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:06): Supplementary: will the government commit to a train to the Barossa to ensure that people can access Gather Round in 2025, and what is the minister doing to ensure that that region has access to appropriate public transport in the lead-up to the event?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Simms, you would be surprised to hear me rule that as not a supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Thanks for your encouragement, but no.

WHYALLA STEELWORKS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, representing the Minister for Infrastructure in another place and the Premier, a question about the Whyalla Steelworks.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Recently, GFG Alliance, with the assistance of the South Australian government, received \$63 million in funding from the federal government, ostensibly to upgrade the 70-year-old steelworks, which has not seen much, if any, modernisation in recent years under its owner, Sanjeev Gupta.

Three weeks ago the blast furnace shut down. It is my understanding that, as of today, it is barely operating at nowhere near its capacity and the production of steel has all but ground to a halt. Up to 1,000 workers on day shifts have had their hours reduced to 7.5 hours, in effect a pay cut of around 28 per cent. There is concern that it may not be able to be fully operational while GFG works on establishing its promised electric arc furnace to complement the government's much-touted hydrogen plant, which is still years away.

In the meantime, the price of iron ore has tumbled 14 per cent from a year ago to under \$US100 a tonne, and is tipped to keep falling. China is reducing its steel production because of a surplus, and there are fears cheap steel may soon be dumped here. Once again, the mood in Whyalla is full of uncertainty, if you read all the posts on the Whyalla Facebook page. My questions to the minister and Premier are:

1. While infrastructure minister Tom Koutsantonis was enjoying Mr Gupta's hospitality in GFG's corporate suite at the Gather Round match between Port Adelaide and Essendon on Friday, did Mr Gupta and Mr Koutsantonis discuss the current problems besetting the steelworks?
2. Is the government aware of the operational problems currently being experienced at the steelworks that could lead to job losses in the one-industry town unless rectified?
3. Has the state government handed over the \$50 million it has set aside for the steelworks?
4. Considering the seriousness of the blast furnace problem, can Mr Gupta deliver on his promises?
5. Are the jobs of all steelworkers, including contractors, at the plant as safe as Port Adelaide's highflying coach Ken Hinkley and that deft handballer, the Premier?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:10): I will refer the question to the ministers in the other place and bring back a response.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding the South Australian Aboriginal Voice to Parliament elections.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: It was reported that of approximately 30,000 eligible Aboriginal South Australians less than 10 per cent voted in the South Australian Aboriginal Voice to Parliament elections. My questions to the Attorney-General or the minister are:

1. How many press releases went out under the minister or the Attorney-General's name regarding the Voice vote in 2024?
2. How many media conferences did the minister lead or take part in to promote the Voice vote in 2024?
3. How many community engagement forums and meetings did the minister hold to promote and inform about the Voice to Parliament?

4. What level of engagement activities has the Premier himself undertaken in comparison to those by the minister to promote the Voice election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for her questions. In relation to the first question, I don't have the exact number, but it would be quite a number of media releases post referendum when we concentrated fully on the SA Voice elections. In relation to media conferences, a number of them; I don't remember the exact number, but there were a number of media conferences.

There were even more media interviews if you counted media conferences and media interviews I conducted since October last year on our Voice elections in Adelaide and regional media. I suspect it would likely come to dozens. As I have said before, anyone would just have to look at my social media to see the dozens and dozens and dozens of posts about the Voice elections. Did I do more media about it than the Premier? Yes; I'm the minister.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:12): With the answers given, does the minister have any concerns about the issues of nepotism?

The PRESIDENT: I'm not quite sure how you get to nepotism out of that answer, but the minister can—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:12): I have absolutely no idea what the honourable member is talking about, but I tell you what: if she has anything she wants to raise, I would encourage her to say it and say it outside of this forum. I have seen some of the comments that are made about corruption and nepotism for the Voice, and the only difference between the Voice elections and local council elections is the colour of the skin of the people that are standing. So if you have comments about it, I would encourage you to do so outside of this forum.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:13): Supplementary arising from the original answer: does the minister think that perhaps the voter turnout would have been amplified had there been bipartisan or cross-party support of the opposition and the government for the Voice to Parliament election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for her question. It's possible, but it is perhaps unlikely given the amount of notice many members take of those opposite about issues in South Australia.

STORIES OF THE TANGANEKALD

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council on the launch of the book *Stories of the Tanganekald*?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest generally in the areas of Aboriginal affairs and promoting and uplifting Aboriginal people in this state. I recently had the privilege of attending the book launch of *Stories of the Tanganekald*.

Stories of the Tanganekald is a collection of many ancient stories from the Ngarrindjeri nation and the Lower Lakes and Coorong area. Sadly, the Tanganekald people of the Ngarrindjeri nation were severely disrupted upon European settlement in the region from the mid 19th century.

However, with great foresight many of these stories were composed and recorded by the Ngarrindjeri ancestor Milerum in the 1930s. Milerum was a Tanganekald man steeped in traditional knowledge who saw his culture under threat and therefore decided to make recordings of songs, stories and events that formed his upbringing. Some of these are now well known, such as the exploits of the powerful Ngurunderi who chases Ponde along the River Murray to the lakes and the Coorong region, shaping the landscapes as they go. Others are less well known, including the

vengeful Crow and the evil Prope, an evil sister who preys upon children. There is much to be learnt from reading many of these stories.

Milerum formed a productive relationship and partnership with Norman Tindale from the SA Museum, who created this vast collection of Tanganekald records. Not only are the collection of stories contained in this book special themselves but importantly they are now a resource for rich language and cultural education that is being taken out of the archives and shared back with the community.

At the launch, many Aboriginal people understood the significance of the launch of this book, the significance of the language and the intrinsic connection between language and culture. In particular, Ali Abdullah-Highfold, who is a descendant of Milerum of the Tanganekald people, expressed that:

Projects like this continue the process of getting valuable stories and language back to Ngarrindjeri community. This is all part of the continued sharing of knowledge and dreaming stories that sits at the centre of our sense of belonging and community.

The stories in this book have been powerfully illustrated by the drawings and paintings of Jacob Stengle. Sadly, Jacob passed away before the book was completed. Jacob was a grandson of Milerum. We had the pleasure of hearing from Jacob's niece, Gabrielle, who acknowledged the pride her family felt in the work Jacob had done for the Tanganekald language and stories and in the book being provided for the community to share. I would like to acknowledge the Stengle family, the descendants of Milerum and the Ngarrindjeri Aboriginal Corporation for their support and contributions to this project.

REPATRIATION OF ABORIGINAL REMAINS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:16): I seek to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question about the repatriation of Aboriginal remains.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The South Australian Museum cares for almost 4,000 restricted objects that have significance according to Aboriginal tradition. On 27 March 2024, the SA government's State Aboriginal Heritage Committee wrote to the arts minister, Andrea Michaels, and the museum's chair, Kim Cheater, to express their concern about the impact of a proposed museum restructure of the research and collections division. I know that the minister is aware of this letter as he was carbon copied in. That letter reads in part:

[The SA Museum] has held some 4,600 Aboriginal remains over the past 165 years. SA Museum's role here is unique and cannot be replicated or delegated, including because only [the Museum] is eligible to apply for the commonwealth funding to support the return of ancestral remains from overseas. The proposed restructure appears to resile from this commitment by failing to maintain suitably senior, qualified, experienced personnel to perform the work.

The State Aboriginal Heritage Committee has also expressed their concerns that the repatriation manager has taken a long time to develop significant relationships of trust, carefully built over recent years, but has been told that they will have to reapply for their job. The repatriation of ancestors is a key commitment of the South Australian government and last year it committed a further \$1.5 million of repatriation projects to our state to be delivered by the South Australian Museum.

Indeed, over the last six years, the humanities team has successfully returned more than 700 ancestors, compared with only 49 in the previous 10 years. However, with the loss of expert knowledge and fewer staff positions intended, there are concerns that the museum will no longer appropriately continue these responsibilities. My questions to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs are:

1. Is the minister concerned about the lack of consultation from the SA Museum with the South Australian State Aboriginal Heritage Committee?
2. Is he concerned that the repatriation process, if not continued by the already currently qualified, experienced and trusted repatriation manager—if she is to lose her position—will then take much longer than intended and be done in an inappropriate way?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for her question. Of course, the SA Museum isn't directly in my portfolio area but, as the honourable member has pointed out, the South Australian State Aboriginal Heritage Committee have made a decision to write a letter to the responsible minister, the Hon. Andrea Michaels, and I was cc'd into that letter.

I have had a number of other discussions, as I see community leaders at various events who have talked a little bit about the South Australian Museum. I think there was an answer, perhaps to a parliamentary committee of this place, where, if I remember correctly, the Museum talked about the family history unit as well as the repatriation unit and said that they would maintain the services there.

In relation to the specific question the honourable member had in relation to personnel within the repatriation area of the museum, I would put on the record, too, the good work that has been done in the repatriation effort. I will always acknowledge good work, even if it's not our government, but the Hon. Steven Marshall's government started the good work in Kaurna repatriation. That is certainly continuing and there has been further significant funding we have put there, as a government.

In relation to who is employed to conduct that work, that is obviously not in my portfolio area. Even if it were, it would be up to the heads of those organisations to make those decisions. I would expect those organisations to take into account a whole range of factors, including the work that has been done when they make such decisions.

REPATRIATION OF ABORIGINAL REMAINS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:21): Supplementary: what steps will the minister take to ensure that the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee's views are heard by the Minister for Arts?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for her question. I was cc'd into that correspondence. It was sent directly to the minister responsible, so I am sure it will be taken into account when any considerations are made.

FAMILY VIOLENCE LEGAL SERVICE ABORIGINAL CORPORATION

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing questions to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about the Family Violence Legal Service Aboriginal Corporation of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: There was a news piece recently published in *The Advertiser* with the subheadline, 'Legal service in crisis'. The content of the story refers to the large number of Aboriginal families seeking assistance and the greater demand on the service. My questions to the minister are:

1. What steps has he been taking to ensure that Aboriginal families requiring legal services are actually receiving a service and not being turned away?
2. Can the minister detail the current and projected funding arrangements for this service in light of growing demand?
3. What strategies are in place, particularly for regional areas, and what discussions has he had with his federal counterpart?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for her question in relation to the Aboriginal family violence legal service. In the last few months, I have had the distinct pleasure and opportunity to visit the offices of that particular organisation, both in Port Lincoln and Port Augusta, where I could see firsthand some of the work they do, particularly with Aboriginal women in communities in the Upper Spencer Gulf and Eyre Peninsula.

I know that the federal government has engaged in the review of the National Legal Assistance Partnership (NLAP) funding agreement. I think it's a five-year funding agreement that is due to expire in the middle of next year, and there has been a very significant review into funding of legal assistance at community legal centres, the vast majority of which are, if not mostly, fully funded by the commonwealth government. Similarly, too, when concerns have been raised, on occasion, about some specific areas of funding for the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement SA, I have passed them on to the federal Attorney-General, who is responsible in these areas.

FAMILY VIOLENCE LEGAL SERVICE ABORIGINAL CORPORATION

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:23): Supplementary question arising from the answer: is the minister concerned that clients are being turned away because of increased demand?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for her question. Certainly, in a whole range of areas of community legal services and the provision of legal aid, there are challenges. As I have said, that stems from not just the quantum of funding but the mix of funding from the commonwealth government. Where there are challenges, I know that the commonwealth government has, on occasion, stepped in to help. There have been demand mitigation strategies that community legal centres have been able to put in place. We would like to see as much as possible funded by the commonwealth for South Australians in the community legal sector.

WINE INDUSTRY

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister provide more detail about the state government's support for wine businesses seeking to re-engage with China, following China's decision to remove its duties on Australian bottled wine?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:25): I thank the honourable member for his question and I am very glad that he is keen to have additional detail—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —about this important re-engagement program. As I mentioned earlier—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —China's recent decision to remove all duties on Australian bottled wine is welcome news for South Australia's wine industry. It's a significant development for thousands of South Australians whose livelihoods have been greatly impacted in recent years. We know that the past few years have been challenging for the sector. Multiple impacts, such as market disruption, red wine global oversupply, the COVID-19 pandemic and severe weather events, are being felt throughout the sector and across our state's wine regions.

The removal of tariffs affirms the calm and consistent approach taken by the federal Labor government and closely supported by the state government. Following my visit, together with a delegation of wine businesses, to China last month, which followed on from the Premier's visit to China last year, the state government has continued to advocate strongly for our producers while also seeing firsthand the strength of our relationships and opportunity for mutual benefits with our largest two-way trading partner.

Since 2020, Chinese duties on Australian bottled wine had effectively made it unviable for Australian wine producers to export their bottled product to the Chinese market. While trade diversification remains a key element of both federal and state governments' trade policy approach, the state government is also supporting South Australian wine export re-engagement with China through the \$1.85 million re-engagement package.

I mentioned earlier that there are five key components of the re-engagement package, being two-way market activation and immersion, promotional marketing and communication campaigns, the establishment of a wine export adviser in country, technical cooperation, and exporter capability building.

It is important to note that the China re-engagement package is a cross-government and cross-industry program that will deliver a suite of activities in support of the wine sector re-engaging with the valuable Chinese market. One component of the package that I particularly like to elaborate on includes the work that will be led by PIRSA focused on deepening technical cooperation between South Australia and China, building on a strong history of technical, scientific and research-based exchanges in the wine sector and across primary industries more broadly.

Our previous collaborations have been disrupted in recent years, and during my visit to China I was fortunate to meet with Chinese wine industry stakeholders and research institutes with an interest in the technical knowledge of wine and viticultural science. I was pleased to see that there is strong interest in renewing those important linkages.

A program of exchange activities will be undertaken to strengthen our collaboration with China through this re-engagement program, and this will deliver practical benefits to industry and research organisations in both markets, as well as building goodwill and trust between industries in both countries.

These partnerships, together with other opportunities facilitated by the Department for Trade and Investment and the South Australian Wine Industry Association, will build mutual benefits for our state and for China moving forward, and I look forward to seeing further positive outcomes for our industry in the months and years ahead.

WINE INDUSTRY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:28): Supplementary: can the minister give an indication of how many registered businesses travelled on her recent trade mission to China?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you talked about your entourage.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:28): I can certainly take that on notice.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It is worthwhile noting that the visit was in conjunction with the Taste of South Australia events that were held in Guangzhou and Chengdu. They were opportunities for South Australian businesses to showcase their produce. There was a strong focus on wine, but also on other beverages and on other produce. There was also a wine summit on the Sunday, which involved a great deal of information being provided about the potential methods for re-entry, some of the barriers, and so on.

In terms of the delegation itself, that included the University of Adelaide, a PIRSA representative, my Chief of Staff and myself, and we were also, as I mentioned, doing the visit in conjunction with delegates from the industry.

WINE INDUSTRY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:29): Supplementary: is the minister able to provide any sales projections with respect to what might occur in the upcoming 12, 18 or 24 months as a result of her delegation and the changing arrangement with China with respect to wine sales?

The PRESIDENT: It is not a supplementary arising out of the reply; you can provide an answer, if you wish.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:30): I think it is worth noting that the decision to lift the tariffs had not been taken at the time I was there. There was the interim decision during the time I was

there, but the final decision came after that. I am happy to see what information might be available and, if it is available, bring it back to the chamber.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding the First Nations Voice.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: The first election of members to the South Australian First Nations Voice saw less than 9 per cent of the 30,000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people eligible participate. Ninety-one per cent of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders did not vote in the state's First Nations Voice elections that the Labor government told us was so desperately wanted. Twelve candidates were elected having polled fewer than 20 first preference votes. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Does he agree that the low voter turnout is suggestive of a distrust of the government's First Nations Voice proposal and consultation failure?

2. Would he agree that the money spent campaigning and now establishing the First Nations Voice would be better spent on directly helping all those in need, regardless of race or background, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:31): I thank the honourable member for her question. In relation to her first question, my answer is no, not at all. In relation to her second question, no, I disagree; I think it will pay for itself many times over.

ELECTRONICALLY ASSISTED VOTING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:31): I seek leave to give a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding electronically-assisted voting methods.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: On 21 March, two days before the Dunstan by-election, the Electoral Commissioner determined via the *Gazette* that the prescribed electronically-assisted voting method was not to be used for the Dunstan by-election. Vote assist is a phone voting system used in South Australia by the Electoral Commissioner since the local government election in 2022. The commissioner has previously noted that a total of 744 electors voted using this service in the 2022 local government elections. My question to the Attorney-General is: why were sight-impaired electors not able to use electronically-assisted voting in the Dunstan by-election?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:32): I thank the honourable member for her question. I suspect it is a legislative impediment in our state Electoral Act that applies to state, and therefore by-elections, that doesn't apply to council elections. If that is not the case, I am happy to have a look and bring back a reply.

ELECTRONICALLY ASSISTED VOTING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:33): Supplementary: if there is an issue with the legislation with regard to access for sight-impaired electors, is the Attorney committed to resolving this?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:33): We are always happy to look at ways we can improve access to democracy, and certainly we will in due course have a bill before this parliament that looks at giving effect to recommendations that have been made by the Electoral Commissioner and any other reforms as parliament deems necessary.

ELECTRONICALLY ASSISTED VOTING

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:33): Further supplementary: has the Electoral Commission and the Electoral Commissioner made recommendations to that effect in terms of such legal changes?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. My recollection is that, after the 2018 election, I think recommendations may have been made—whether not directly to that but to a similar effect. Legislation was put forward by the former government that overreached so tremendously that nothing ever passed. I can't remember what the current recommendations are, there are a number of them, but we will no doubt return to this parliament to improve democracy as best we can.

WOMEN LAWYERS ASSOCIATION

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:34): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney please update the chamber on the 25th anniversary event held by the Women Lawyers Association of South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:34): I thank the honourable member for his question, and I would be most pleased to. It was a great pleasure to join the celebration last month with the Women Lawyers Association of South Australia as they celebrated their 25th anniversary. It was a pleasure to be joined by a number of colleagues from this chamber and another place: the Hon. Emily Bourke, the Hon. Katrine Hildyard and Josh Teague, amongst others who attended that event.

The Women Lawyers Association is a tremendous organisation comprised of many women members from all sectors of the legal profession, ranging from law clerks and associates to partners and judges, each with the collective aim of promoting justice and equality for women both within the law and beyond. The association is well recognised for its efforts to improve the experiences and career prospects for women working in law and supporting women as they navigate the profession at all stages.

The 25th anniversary was a poignant time for all to reflect on how far the profession has come but, equally and undoubtedly, how far the profession still needs to move. As the Hon. Connie Bonaros has brought to the attention of this place a number of times, harassment in the legal profession is still a significant issue, and we are engaging in a new survey to update the review that was conducted by the equal opportunity commissioner recently.

I would like to congratulate the Women Lawyers Association on the 25th anniversary of their formation. A special thankyou to the current president of the association, Marissa Mackie, for all the hard work that she does, particularly in reflecting on that celebration of the first 25 years.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney, representing the Treasurer and the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs and Small and Family Business, a question about SkyCity Casino.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just a short while ago, *The Advertiser* reported that SkyCity's Australian chief, David Christian, has resigned ahead of the anticipated resignation date that was first flagged. The news comes ahead of significant money laundering penalties for breaches of anti-money laundering laws and a number of other breaches of regulatory functions by SkyCity Casino. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. What, if any, briefings have been offered to the government regarding this most recent resignation?
2. Is the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner still set to recommence his review of the suitability of SkyCity to hold the state's only casino licence and, if so, when?

3. What progress has been made with respect to the payment of funds back to the state government following a Supreme Court ruling against the Casino in relation to taxation and its loyalty program?

4. If there has been any progress, what is the amount that is to be paid back to the state government in relation to taxation of its loyalty program?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:37): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I will refer those to the relevant ministers in another place and bring back a reply.

PAROLE BREACHES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:38): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding parole breaches in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Anne-Marie Culleton was murdered by Jonathan Peter Bakewell in 1998 in the Northern Territory. Bakewell was sentenced to life imprisonment for his crime, which was reduced to 20 years by the High Court when he was transferred to the South Australian prison system in 2005. Last month, Bakewell was released despite six prior parole breaches, with the SA Parole Board chair stating that, as the man is believed to pose no risk to the community due to his health issues, the board has to comply with legislation.

The victim's sister, Eileen Culleton, I think not surprisingly, took a different view and has called on the Attorney-General to appeal the decision to release Bakewell, stating and I quote:

Women and girls in the community will not be safe if Bakewell is released... How dare the Parole Board put the community at risk once again. This is a disgrace. And how dare the Parole Board put our family through this trauma yet again—it's just cruel.

A government spokesperson has been quoted in *The Advertiser* as saying that the government would seek advice regarding the Parole Board's determination in this particular matter. As some weeks have passed, my questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Has the Attorney now sought that advice concerning this particular case and, if so, what specific advice has been provided?

2. Does the Attorney-General share Eileen Culleton's concerns for the safety of the community following Bakewell's release and his very poor history of parole breaches?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:39): I thank the member for his question. I haven't spoken to her in recent months but certainly over the past couple of years I have had the benefit of speaking to Eileen Culleton, and Ms Culleton is certainly a passionate advocate. I think all of us would have a huge amount of sympathy with what her family has been through—just horrific circumstances.

In relation to breaches of parole, as the honourable member has outlined, the safety of the community is a major factor that the Parole Board takes into account. In relation to an individual person's breaches of parole and whether that warrants the Parole Board making the application to have the person put back into custody, I think the Parole Board is better placed than probably either the Hon. Dennis Hood or I to make those decisions, having all the information in front of them.

It's one reason that, over a number of decades, Frances Nelson KC has been the head of the Parole Board. I think she has made what are very difficult decisions, often in circumstances that are very emotional and deeply and traumatically affect families, based on the principles that are required before legislation. I have a tremendous amount of sympathy, and it's hard not to have that sympathy with Ms Culleton and the situation in relation to this matter, but I think the Parole Board is the one best placed to make those decisions.

PAROLE BREACHES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:41): Supplementary: as a matter of principle, Attorney, should an offender who breaches parole some six times have some sort of restrictions placed on them that don't apply to others?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:41): I thank the honourable member for his question and I understand where he is coming from, but I don't think it's a simple question in relation to the number of times. Of course, there are different sorts of breaches of parole that would dramatically have different impacts upon whether someone poses a risk to the community.

If it's a breach for being minutes late after a curfew as opposed to contacting someone that someone is prohibited from doing—as I say, I don't have in front of me what the breaches were or the nature and effect of those breaches, but the mere number of times probably doesn't describe everything about the safety that person would pose to the community.

WINE GRAPEGROWERS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:42): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister tell the chamber about additional measures to support wine grapegrowers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:42): I thank the honourable member for his question. Notwithstanding the significant and welcome decision by China to lift tariffs on Australian bottled wine, the state government of course understands that wine grapegrowers across the state continue to experience challenges owing to the oversupply of red wine grapes, and the challenge that, as has been mentioned, is both national and global.

This past weekend I met directly with groups of growers in the Riverland, which was continuing my program of meeting directly with growers to hear firsthand about the challenging market conditions and the impact of global consumer trends. These discussions build on the feedback and conversations with wine grapegrowers and industry bodies over many months now, during what has been a difficult period for the industry and the communities that make up part of our wine regions.

I have already outlined today the various facets of assistance and programs that are in place, looking at the national approach, looking at the re-engagement with China, and looking at things such as the Ethephon trial. But to assist on a short-term basis with the ongoing challenging conditions, and to assist individual businesses and red wine grapegrowers to navigate their way through these impacts, the state government is providing additional grant funding to Rural Business Support, funding that will provide direct financial support to impacted red wine grapegrowers.

Through the Rural Business Support relief fund, grants of up to \$1,500 will be made to eligible applicants to accommodate routine costs. This grant will be provided in conjunction with business financial guidance. This support is one measure that aims to alleviate, in a small way, the stress for grapegrowers who have felt the impacts of the significant market disruption in recent years and be able to ensure that they can have the ability to make the decisions about their businesses going forward.

A further \$60,000 in funding is also being provided to Rural Business Support to increase rural financial counselling services for the wine and viticulture industries. These announcements build on other support available to grapegrowers, which includes the commonwealth Farm Household Allowance, Rural Financial Counselling Service and PIRSA's Family and Business Mentors.

I have already mentioned the Ethephon trial and the viticulture and wine sector working group. I think it is important to note that that group is comprised of representatives from the commonwealth, state and territory governments, as well as national grape and wine industry organisations, namely, Wine Australia and Australian Grape and Wine.

Just to provide a little bit of additional information on that group, the viticulture and wine sector working group has now met several times, including in the Riverland, Griffith and Mildura, and

heard from grapegrowers, wine businesses, grape and wine industry organisations and other stakeholders. The working group will report back to agricultural ministers on the situation and potential measures to assist regional wine industries to manage the immediate financial challenges. Actions to support improvement in the sector will be proposed at the next agricultural ministers' meeting.

WINE GRAPEGROWERS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:45): Supplementary: is the minister seriously considering the request by Riverland Wine in their synopsis for assistance for growers to diversify crops, and when can the industry expect a response to that synopsis by the minister?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:46): In terms of more general structural reform, that is clearly something that needs to be addressed and is being considered by the national working group. As I have mentioned before, we need to ensure that any type of initiative isn't counterproductive because it is undermined, perhaps by accident, by an adjoining jurisdiction. The issues are many, and that working group is working on them.

WINE GRAPEGROWERS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:46): Supplementary arising from the original answer: when can the industry expect a response and some decisions by that working group? Because time is running out, Clare.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:46): As I mentioned in my answer—I think I gave the answer to the question that has been asked—I said that the viticulture and wine sector working group has now met several times, including in the Riverland, Griffith and Mildura, where they heard from grapegrowers, wine businesses, grape and wine industry organisations and other stakeholders, and I said that the working group will report back to agricultural ministers on the situation at the next agricultural ministers' meeting.

The agricultural ministers' meetings comprise the ministers for agriculture or their equivalents, depending on their terminology, from each of the states and territories, as well as the federal minister, the Hon. Senator Murray Watt. It is important that we do have input from all of the grapegrowing regions across the country, and that is what this working group has been established to do.

I am very pleased that it is being led by South Australia because the wine oversupply and the issues that arise from that are being felt acutely here in South Australia and even more acutely, I would suggest, in the Riverland, but they are also being felt elsewhere across our state and elsewhere across the country. There is input from all of the states and territories that are affected, and I look forward to being able to see what the recommendations are that come out of that working group and then provide further updates.

Condolence

O'DONOGHUE, DR LOWITJA

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:48): By leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council records its sincere regret at the death on 4 February 2024 of Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue AC CBE DSG and places on record its appreciation of a lifelong commitment to improving the rights, health and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, and it offers its deepest sympathy to her family and community on the loss of a remarkable South Australian.

Today, I rise to speak on the sad passing, and reflect on the significant achievements, of the late Aboriginal leader Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue. I know that many in Aboriginal communities around South Australia and around the nation continue to mourn her passing, and I once again extend my heartfelt condolences to members of her family, particularly today to Deb, Amy, Ruby and Mahalia,

and to her many, many friends and to the Aboriginal community generally that she so relentlessly served over many decades.

Dr O'Donoghue's life was a testament to the power of resilience and the spirit of the human heart. Born in 1932 near Indulkana—Iwantja—on Yankunytjatjara country, she faced unimaginable hardship as a child, including being forcibly removed from her family and placed in the care of missionaries at Colebrook children's home.

The loss of Dr O'Donoghue is a profound moment for the nation and the Aboriginal community. Her passing marks the end of an era, although her legacy will endure in the hearts and minds of all who knew her and in the ongoing struggle for Aboriginal rights and recognition. A very proud Yankunytjatjara woman whose life embodied resilience, fearlessness, tenacity, compassion, generosity and a tireless commitment to advocating for the wellbeing and the rights of her Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, she changed the path of our nation for the better in ways that few people will have the privilege of seeing firsthand.

Despite her forced removal, this traumatic experience did not break her spirit but rather fuelled a determination for justice and equality. The matron of the Colebrook children's home once told her that she would not amount to anything and, as we all know, Dr O'Donoghue went on to become one of the most influential Australians we have seen in the short history of post-colonisation.

It is well known that among Dr O'Donoghue's many groundbreaking achievements she became the first Aboriginal trainee nurse at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, served as the inaugural Chairperson of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, was the first Aboriginal person to address the United Nations General Assembly, played a pivotal role in helping with the drafting of native title legislation that arose from the Mabo decision and also gave counsel and played a role in the apology to the stolen generations. These accomplishments are a testament to her unwavering commitment to advancing the rights and wellbeing of her people. She broke down barriers, shattered glass ceilings and paved the way for future generations.

A recipient of many accolades, including a NAIDOC Lifetime Achievement Award, membership of the Order of Australia, Australian of the Year in 1984, an investiture as a Dame of the Order of St Gregory the Great, a Companion of the Order of Australia, a Commander of the British Empire and being named in 1998 as a National Living Treasure, Dr O'Donoghue's legacy is reflected through institutions like the Lowitja Institute and, of course, the Lowitja O'Donoghue Foundation. Those honours highlight the immense respect and admiration she earned throughout her life, but more importantly they serve as a reminder of the work that still needs to be done to achieve equality and justice for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Beyond her professional accomplishments, Dr O'Donoghue's enduring impact lies not only in inspiring future generations of Aboriginal leaders but quite literally paving the way for others to follow in her footsteps. This sentiment was echoed very loudly at her state funeral on 8 March by many leaders, particularly the Aboriginal women who were present.

I got to know Dr O'Donoghue more than two decades ago, first while working as Chief of Staff to the former and late Aboriginal affairs minister Terry Roberts. Dr O'Donoghue had a reputation as a fearless leader and a tenacious advocate, and I have to say I was petrified when I first met her. It would have been about 2003, when there was a series—there were about a dozen—of suicides of young men on the APY lands, which if you translated them to the population of Adelaide would have equated to thousands of deaths over just a few months.

As the government at the time, the Mike Rann government was looking for circuit breakers in a way that would address some of the issues that led to this, and of course the person the government first turned to and the person who provided that was Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue, who was head of the APY lands task force. She was a perfect person for the role, and of course she would do anything for her people. Whilst in this role I got the privilege to see firsthand her unquestionable drive and commitment to improving the rights of Aboriginal people.

Lowitja herself spoke often about some of the difficulties that had presented in her life. She spoke in a discussion I remember about her experience as a child. Dr O'Donoghue talked often and openly about her removal from her family, her country and her culture. She had a gift, as many

Aboriginal people do, to be able to tell her story in such a way that left a great many in the audience emotionally affected. Dr O'Donoghue and others like Dr O'Donoghue sharing their stories meant that we became and are still becoming a more understanding and compassionate society.

As Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the former Labor government led by Jay Weatherill, I would often be at functions or events where Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue was present and almost inevitably someone would come up and tell me, 'Minister, just so you know, Lowitja is just over there.' I never took this as an invitation, that I had any say in whether I would go and speak to Lowitja O'Donoghue, I took it as a command. I am sure she would not have meant it that way, but I certainly took it that way and whatever I was doing, no matter who I was with, I would go over and see what it was that Lowitja wished to speak to me about.

We start NAIDOC Week most years with an ecumenical service in Adelaide and I would regularly get a call from Lowitja a couple of days before saying, 'Kyam, you are coming, aren't you?' I would go and it would be one of the very few times in any given year that I would see the inside of a church, but I would turn up because Lowitja had asked me to. Even with her health failing in the last few years, when I could have probably got away with it and it might not have got back to her that I was not there, I was still too scared just in case she found out. I suspect it will be a feature of the rest of my life that I will keep going to this service just because somewhere with the ancestors and the Dreamtime Lowitja might just hear that I did not turn up.

It is not just her reputation as a fearsome advocate and someone who was so passionate about her people but her personal generosity that I think shines the most brightly with so many people. I will be forever grateful to Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue. We will mourn her loss as a nation and all who knew her well will mourn her loss, too.

Lowitja, you have done so much over the years for your people and for all Aboriginal people. Now it is time to rest peacefully. Nyuntu waarka palya tjuta palyanu iritinuru Aboriginal munu Anangu tjutaku. Kawari pilunpa ngari nyuntumpa waltja tjutangka.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:56): I rise on behalf of the opposition to speak on the condolence motion for Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue, a woman awarded the Companion of the Order of Australia, a Commander of the Order of the British Empire and Dame of the Order of St Gregory the Great, a papal honour conferred by Pope John Paul in 2006.

An extraordinary individual from South Australia, Dr O'Donoghue's impact on Aboriginal Australians will be everlasting. Dr O'Donoghue was not only a leader but also a tireless advocate for the advancement of Aboriginal rights and wellbeing. Beyond advocacy, she was a catalyst for change, breaking barriers and achieving numerous milestones for Aboriginal Australians and for women in general regardless of their race.

Born in August 1932 on a cattle station in South Australia's APY lands to Lily Woodforde and Thomas O'Donoghue, her early years were marked by the separation from her family and residence at the Colebrook children's home. Despite these challenges, she pursued education, attending various schools before eventually embarking on a nursing career.

Despite barriers, she successfully lobbied for admission to the Royal Adelaide Hospital's nursing program, becoming its first Aboriginal trainee nurse in 1954. This paved the way for women of her time of Aboriginal descent to enter the nursing profession. She dedicated a decade to nursing, rising to the position of charge nurse before leaving the Royal Adelaide Hospital in 1961.

She then gained a placement in India working with Baptist missionaries to further her nursing and upon returning to Australia Dr O'Donoghue continued her advocacy. She co-founded the Council of Aboriginal Women of South Australia and worked as a nurse and welfare officer for the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in various locations across the state and in familiar outback towns such as Coober Pedy and Oodnadatta.

Her efforts were instrumental in the 1967 constitutional referendum that granted recognition to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Throughout her career, she held influential positions, including membership of the National Aboriginal Consultative Committee and as the first Aboriginal person to serve as regional director for the South Australian branch of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

Her significant contributions were recognised with prestigious honours, including being awarded the title and position of Australian of the Year in 1984, as well as being declared an Australian National Living Treasure in 1998.

Dr O'Donoghue continued to shape policy and advocate for Aboriginal rights, serving as the inaugural Chairperson of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and addressing the United Nations General Assembly in 1992. South Australia's current Governor, Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson AC, was in the audience during Dr O'Donoghue's address to the General Assembly. She was a young diplomat at that time and said that Dr O'Donoghue's address was, and I quote:

...deeply moving. It was quite shocking but, as with everything she did, it was done with grace...

In 1993, after the Mabo decision in the federal High Court, Dr O'Donoghue worked directly with then Prime Minister Paul Keating in negotiating native title. Dr O'Donoghue's involvement in the national apology to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in 2008 marked a poignant moment in her advocacy journey. She retired from public life that same year, receiving the NAIDOC Lifetime Achievement Award in 2009.

Her passing, on 4 February this year, marked the end of an era. Throughout her life she challenged stereotypes, championed change and amplified the voices of Aboriginal Australians. Her legacy lives on through the impactful work of the Lowitja Institute, an Indigenous-controlled health research institute that continues to influence policies and initiatives benefiting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. With over 200 research projects, a majority of which are led by Indigenous researchers, and significant investment, Dr O'Donoghue's vision endures. Vale Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue AC CBE DSG.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:01): I rise as, I believe, one of two Greens speakers to offer my condolences to the family and loved ones of Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue AC CBE DSG. Dr O'Donoghue was known not only to South Australians but right across the world. She is an incredibly inspiring household name, known for her staunch advocacy and of course her involvement in the development of First Nations rights for her country, our country.

She was born in 1932 and was a proud Yankunytjatjara woman and a fierce advocate for and leader of the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. At the age of two years, Dr O'Donoghue was removed from her mother and placed with missionaries at Colebrook children's home in Quorn in our state of South Australia. She reunited with her mother only in 1967, more than 30 years later.

In 1954, Dr O'Donoghue became the first Aboriginal person to train as a nurse at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and thus began the start of her journey as one of Australia's most celebrated leaders. She overcame low expectations and immense discrimination. She was always told that she would not be able to do it, and yet she did it.

It is no wonder that she has inspired politicians, not just our own Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs but former Premier Don Dunstan and former Premier Steven Marshall, and former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd and former Prime Minister Paul Keating. They all count Dr O'Donoghue as an inspiration in their lives, with the impact that she had.

It is little wonder that she received many awards. In 1976, she became the first Aboriginal woman to be awarded the Order of Australia. In 1977, she was appointed the foundation Chair of the National Aboriginal Conference and Chair of the Aboriginal Development Committee. In March 1990, she was appointed the founding Chairperson of ATSIC (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission). During this time, she played a key role in drafting the native title legislation that arose from the High Court's historic Mabo decision. Between 1996 and 2003, Dr O'Donoghue became the inaugural Chair of the Cooperative Research Centre for Aboriginal and Tropical Health, which was later renamed the Lowitja Institute in her honour.

She has worked with politicians from right across all sides of politics. Her other numerous awards and accolades include being made a Commander of the British Empire (CBE) in 1983 and Australian of the Year in 1984, during which time she became the first Aboriginal person to address the United Nations General Assembly. She also won the Advance Australia Award in 1982. She was

made a National Living Treasure in 1998, was awarded a Companion of the Order of Australia (AC) in 1999 and was named a Dame of the Order of Saint Gregory the Great (DSG), a papal award, in 2005—quite an extraordinary achievement.

In that address in 1992 in New York, as part of the International Year for the World's Indigenous People, Lowitja O'Donoghue, who spoke as an Aboriginal woman, was the first Aboriginal woman to address the United Nations General Assembly. She, along with Torres Strait Islander leader George Mye, a lifelong friend of Eddie Mabo, addressed that assembly. I gather it was sparsely filled and no heads of government attended. Indeed, it was on the same day as the Redfern speech of former Prime Minister Paul Keating. That speech that she delivered to the UN went thus:

It took the Indigenous people of Australia until 1967 to be recognised as Australians under the Australian Constitution. This year we celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of that Constitutional recognition. We were also given cause to celebrate this year as a result of a decision by the High Court of Australia in what is now known as the Mabo case. Mabo, a Torres Strait Islander, pursued indigenous rights unrelentingly. As a result, the highest court in the land overturned the doctrine of terra nullius. After 204 years Australian law has finally recognised that indigenous people did own their land at the time of European settlement in 1788. This recognition is greatly welcome. Indeed, it is more than two centuries overdue. But it remains to be seen what its practical effects will be. Our land and our culture are the two things in this world that we cherish above all else. We have been dispossessed and dispersed. Our culture has been threatened as a result of colonisation. Many of our languages have been lost. Our spiritual beliefs have been ridiculed. We have become marginalised in our own country. In this International Year for the World's Indigenous People we proudly celebrate one thing—our survival. But our survival has been against overwhelming odds.

Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue lived a life, I think, that prevailed against extraordinary odds. She was removed from a loving relationship as a child. She was not loved as a child is something that is reflected in the biography that I have read of her life. I just want to put on record that she is loved, not just by the South Australian people but by so many right across this nation. She is very loved, she is very respected and she will not be forgotten.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:07): I rise to support this motion and to recognise the remarkable life and contribution of a truly great South Australian, Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue, and pay tribute to her remarkable legacy. I also join with my parliamentary colleagues in extending my sympathy to her friends and family.

Dr O'Donoghue was born in 1932, and her life and commitment to social justice was shaped by her experiences as a young child. At just two years of age, missionaries acting on behalf of the Aboriginal Protection Board took Dr O'Donoghue from her mother and placed her in the Colebrook children's home in Quorn. There, her given name, Lowitja, was changed to Lois, she was prohibited from speaking her own language and she did not see her mother again for more than 30 years. In a media release back in 2001, Dr O'Donoghue said:

I know that my Aboriginal mother would have had no legal recourse, nor any moral support, in resisting our removal...her grief was unbearable.

Dr O'Donoghue's experience mirrored that of tens of thousands of other members of the stolen generation, and her courage in speaking up and sharing her experiences has helped in our nation's journey towards reconciliation.

She said that the seeds of her commitment to human rights and social justice were sown in her childhood and, as has been noted in this place, the matron of the Colebrook children's home said that she would not amount to anything. We know how wrong that was. Dr O'Donoghue grew up to become one of the nation's most influential people.

At age 16, Dr O'Donoghue was encouraged to work as a nursing aide at the local Victor Harbor Hospital. When she later applied to complete her nursing training at the Royal Adelaide Hospital she was refused the opportunity because of her Aboriginal heritage. In 1994, she said of that discrimination:

I'd resolved that one of the fights was to actually open the door to Aboriginal women to take up the nursing profession and also for those young men to get into apprenticeships.

This was a fight that Dr O'Donoghue took on with great commitment and great passion. She joined the Aborigines Advancement League, which had taken up the fight to allow Aboriginal women to enter the nursing profession and this experience, I understand, provided the opportunity to meet Aboriginal rights activists from across the country and led to a lifetime commitment to politics.

In 1954, after a long struggle to gain admission, including a personal appeal to the then premier of the day, Sir Thomas Playford, Dr O'Donoghue was finally admitted and worked hard as a trainee to overcome the negative expectations of staff and discrimination, going on to become the hospital's first Aboriginal nurse—a significant achievement. This was one of many barriers that Dr O'Donoghue broke down in her life. She remained there for 10 years, being promoted first to a charge sister, despite confronting those ongoing experiences of racism.

In the 1960s, Dr O'Donoghue travelled to northern India and worked as a nurse with the Baptist overseas mission. When she returned to Australia in 1962, she worked as an Aboriginal liaison officer with the South Australian government Department of Education and later transferred to the SA Department of Aboriginal Affairs and was employed as a welfare officer, based mainly in Coober Pedy.

It was during her 10 years in this work that she built a reputation for her ability to advocate for justice for Aboriginal people, and this ability shone through in her campaigning on the 1967 referendum—a turning point in the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians. In 1967, she joined the newly established Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and from 1970 to 1972 she was a member of the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. In 1977, she became the founding Chairperson of the National Aboriginal Conference.

At age 47, Dr O'Donoghue met Gordon Smart, a medical orderly from the Adelaide Repatriation Hospital, whom she married in 1979. In 1990, Dr O'Donoghue was appointed the inaugural Chairperson of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC), where she won universal admiration for her leadership, her tenacity and her integrity. A highlight was her pivotal role in that tense and complex negotiation period that enabled the creation and passing of Prime Minister Keating's native title legislation, which of course arose from the High Court's historic Mabo decision.

As has been noted by my colleagues, Dr O'Donoghue was the first Aboriginal person to address the United Nations General Assembly in 1992. She also campaigned in 1993 for the Australian republic. She was somebody who made an absolutely fundamental contribution not only to South Australia but to our nation.

Our country is a better place because of the leadership of Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue. I know that her remarkable story will continue to inspire future generations of South Australians and Australians. I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathy to her friends and family. I thank the Attorney-General for putting forward this motion today.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:14): I, too, rise, very briefly, to offer my condolences and, like others, pay my respects to Dr O'Donoghue's family and friends, to echo the sentiments expressed by other honourable members in this place today and, of course, to thank Dr O'Donoghue for her lifelong leadership.

When I read the words of Dr O'Donoghue's family in saying that, 'Our Aunty and Nana was the Matriarch of our family, whom we have loved and looked up to our entire lives,' I was instantly reminded of those other wonderful words, 'Because of her, I did,' which I know ring true to many of us in this place for all sorts of reasons.

When I read the family's words about Dr O'Donoghue's lifetime of work for the rights and health and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, the message that I convey to her family is, like you, and in standing side-by-side with you, we, too, in this place thank and honour Dr O'Donoghue for all that she has done and, in your words, 'for all the pathways she created, for all the doors she opened, for all the issues she tackled head-on, for all the tables she sat at and for all the arguments she fought and won.'

We very much look forward to you carrying on the legacy of your aunty and nana for generations to come and for the betterment not just of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people but of course the rest of us whose lives have also been so enriched by Dr O'Donoghue.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (16:16): I rise to add my voice to the tributes honouring Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue AC CBE DSG, and to offer my sincere condolences to her family, members of Aboriginal

communities and all those close to her. Dr O'Donoghue lived an extraordinary life with many impressive achievements, many of which have been articulated by the Prime Minister, the Premier, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and colleagues here in this place and others.

Most of us understand the many barriers faced by women in Australia as they fought for equality throughout the 20th century. We need to reflect, however, on how much greater those barriers were for women of Aboriginal heritage. Dr O'Donoghue's ability to overcome those barriers and achieve so many firsts in her life was truly remarkable.

This included joining an organisation known as the Aborigines Advancement League, which in the early 1950s had made one of its main causes the fight to allow Aboriginal women to enter the nursing profession. Dr O'Donoghue won her first battle for equality in 1954 when she successfully lobbied Premier Sir Thomas Playford for the right to train as a nurse at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. She remained at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for 10 years and achieved promotion to the position of charge sister.

She was the first Aboriginal woman to be inducted into the Order of Australia in 1976 for service to the Aboriginal community, and she was the first chairperson of ATSIC in 1990. In 1992, she was the first Aboriginal person to address the United Nations General Assembly, as has been mentioned, and she played a pivotal role in developing native title legislation following the ruling of the High Court in the Mabo case in the same year.

Her achievements for Aboriginal people are extraordinarily well-known and rightly so. It is worth noting that she was a trailblazer not only for Aboriginal women but for women more broadly. For example, she joined the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in 1967. Three years later, when she was appointed regional director of the organisation's Adelaide office, she was the first woman of any heritage to become a regional director of an Australian federal department.

As we know, Dr O'Donoghue spent a significant part of her life in regional South Australia, having been born in the remote north-west of the state. Sadly, she was removed from her mother at the age of two and raised in a church mission home in Quorn in the Flinders Ranges. She also worked as a nursing aide in Victor Harbor and later accepted a position as a nurse in Coober Pedy, which I understand led to her being reunited with her mother, who was at that time living in Oodnadatta. At her state funeral, Bishop Chris noted that Dr O'Donoghue was a leader of many but also a servant of many, and that her faith carried and supported her throughout her entire life.

According to the NAIDOC website, she was with the Mother Teresa program in India in 1961. She gained a broader perspective on Indigenous cultures, and that strengthened her desire to fight for the rights of Indigenous peoples. We all owe a debt of gratitude to Dr O'Donoghue for her leadership and for her tireless efforts in fighting with passion and with grace for the better Australia that we enjoy today. There is still, of course, much to be done.

Dr O'Donoghue was an inspiration to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, to people in regional and remote areas, to South Australian and Australian women, and more. That inspiration will always continue. Vale Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue.

Motion carried.

Bills

CONSTITUTION (COUNTERSIGNING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 March 2024.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:20): I rise to make some brief remarks in relation to this particular bill, which the government has stated will enable Executive Council meetings to be held virtually by virtue of no longer requiring a countersignature by a minister of the Crown. The Liberal Party supports facilitating electronic meetings; indeed, they were a necessity during the pandemic period when other arrangements had to be made to facilitate ensuring that we were socially

distancing and the like. Full meetings of Executive Council became quite trimmed down and it was usually the Premier or a representative and an additional minister who provided the countersignature.

I think it was my colleague in the other place the member for Heysen, Mr Josh Teague, who has already placed on the record that we are not fully cognisant of why the countersigning provisions needed to be removed in their entirety. Mr Teague outlined some of the history, that it used to be the chief secretary who was responsible and that was then changed to be a second minister some decades ago.

Notwithstanding that, I note that Mr Teague—just referring to his second reading speech—stated that there is a longstanding practice that there are three signatures obtained in a meeting of Executive Council: a recommendation by a minister of the Crown on behalf of Executive Council, the Governor's signature, and then also the countersignature of the minister of the Crown. With those remarks, I indicate that we will be supporting this legislation.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:22): I rise to speak on the Constitution (Countersigning) Amendment Bill 2023 and to indicate that the Greens are not in a position to support this bill. We have some significant concerns about the implication of this bill, and I do not consider that the government has yet made the case for this change. I think it is fair to say that we have seen an increase in distrust of our democratic institutions over many years now. Indeed, I think that has ramped up since 2015, and that is driven by a range of different factors, but I think part of that is often a lack of faith in or respect for our politicians or our political processes.

We are concerned that this change is being embarked upon without appropriate explanation. Obviously, we will listen to the committee stage, but we are concerned that the case has not been appropriately made. Democracy functions best when there are checks and balances in our system, and this bill aims to remove countersignatures. While this may be a minor thing, it is a check and balance in our system and we believe that it was established as part of our political process in this state for a reason.

It is the current practice that when the Governor makes an order that is for the spending of public money or involving the revocation of an appointment, the minister of the Crown is required to countersign the document. I understand the government claims that COVID-19 precipitated circumstances where that was difficult, and I understand that sometimes the Executive Council may wish to meet virtually. I understand that, and this may well be a sign of things to come, but it is difficult to understand precisely why the government needs to take this approach. This bill removes the countersignature requirement entirely, rather than simply finding another way to ensure that that check and balance is inserted into the system.

The Greens believe that all decisions made by democratic institutions must be accountable, and that includes decisions made on behalf of the Governor, or indeed the Governor acting out their constitutional obligations. I understand, of course, that the Governor—it is our convention—simply acts upon the advice or recommendation of the Executive Council. However, it is important that there is appropriate scrutiny of this process.

You may say it is unlikely that this could lead to unintended consequences, but I refer you to the rather bizarre events in Canberra where we saw former Prime Minister Scott Morrison make himself the minister for everything. He was able to swear himself into numerous portfolios without even telling another minister, and so the option or the requirement of having a countersignature certainly makes sense in that context.

Informing the Greens' position on this bill, we sought the advice of the Law Society, as we often do on these matters. They did recognise, as we do in the Greens, the need for flexibility and the need to meet virtually. However, they did question the approach being taken by the government. In particular, and I will quote from their correspondence to me:

The Society queries the approach being taken in removing entirely the requirement that the Minister is to countersign such documents, rather than making the signing process more flexible and amenable to virtual meetings.

The Law Society suggests an alternative approach, which removes the need for in-person simultaneous signing. Perhaps the government may be open to some form of amendment to address that, but in its current form the Greens do not feel that we are in a position to support it.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (16:27): Section 71 of the Constitution Act 1934 deals with the signature and countersignature of certain orders and warrants. This bill seeks to amend section 71 to remove the requirement that certain decisions of the Governor must be countersigned. Notably, this bill does not seek to change any powers the Governor has to approve the expenditure of public money or to make or revoke appointments or otherwise.

What it does seek to do is to provide for the use of meetings that are held by virtual means, rather than in person, as an option for Executive Council in extenuating circumstances. Pursuant to that change, it allows for the removal of the requirement that a minister of the Crown countersign instruments that are signed by the Governor. It will ensure that, where decisions of the Governor are made, these decisions will not be held to be invalid simply because a meeting has been conducted virtually rather than in person.

In current practice, where a decision is subject to countersigning, three signatures are obtained in a meeting of Executive Council: a recommendation signature by a minister of the Crown on behalf of Executive Council, the Governor's signature and the countersignature of a second minister of the Crown.

While the Legislation Interpretation Act 2021 allows for meetings that would otherwise be required to be held in person to be held via teleconference through audio or audiovisual means, its provisions do not apply when a person must be physically present to witness the signing of documents. In the case of meetings of Executive Council, the second minister of the Crown, under the current provisions, must be physically present to witness the Governor sign the instruments before countersigning. This requirement does not reflect the demands of the circumstances we have occasionally found ourselves in in recent years and perhaps may again.

The bill proposes to remove the requirement that a minister countersign instruments that are signed by the Governor. Our experiences have highlighted the importance of having appropriate measures in place to ensure that the business of government and of Executive Council may still be carried out amid extenuating circumstances that prohibit or inhibit physical meetings. It is important to have provisions in place to ensure that business can continue to be carried out in the event that it again becomes necessary, for one reason or another, that certain decisions of the Governor need to be able to be taken without the requirement of being countersigned in a physical meeting of the Executive Council.

The modest change proposed is a reasonable extension of current practices and is in line with community expectations and responsive to an occasional necessity that may arise. I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:30): I thank the honourable members who have contributed and look forward to answering questions during the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am keen to understand what options the government explored in terms of addressing the desire to meet virtually before deciding to remove the countersignature requirement entirely.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that on a thorough examination of the options presented the advice was that in order to hold virtual meetings there would be a requirement to remove that countersignature provision.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: What were the options that were explored?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: To do nothing or to do what we are doing. The honourable member I think in his second reading contribution talked about, 'Couldn't you just keep everything the same but have virtual meetings?'—I think was essentially what he was saying. My advice is that that was

considered but the advice was that in order to do virtual meetings you would have to remove the countersignature option.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the Attorney-General confirm the existing requirements for the Governor to liaise with Executive Council if they make an order in contradiction with a recommendation from Executive Council? Is there a process that needs to be followed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think this answers the honourable member's question, but I am sure he will let me know if it does not: my advice is that nothing alters the existing provisions or conventions in terms of the process of Executive Council giving the Governor advice and what the Governor does with that advice.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (2) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

AYERS HOUSE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March 2024.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:35): I rise on behalf of the opposition in support of this bill, which has come across to this chamber after considerable debate in the other place. Ayers House holds immense significance for South Australia, being a state heritage-listed establishment with a rich historical background and what could be a high degree of community activation. Throughout its existence, Ayers House has offered the community glimpses of its grandeur through museum exhibitions, as a special venue for hire and even the occasional recital has been performed within its walls.

Situated on North Terrace amidst esteemed cultural institutions like the Art Gallery of South Australia, the South Australian Museum and the State Library of South Australia, Ayers House occupies an important position in our central business district. It is imperative to not only safeguard Ayers House but also to cherish it as a cultural emblem.

With its commitment to heritage, the Liberal Party of South Australia has consistently advocated for measures to protect and rejuvenate Ayers House. Under the previous Liberal government, substantial investment was directed towards Lot Fourteen, presenting an opportunity to reimagine the future of Ayers House within this evolving cultural landscape at the eastern end of North Terrace. Our vision aimed to elevate Ayers House into a premier cultural institution and tangible steps were taken, including a significant allocation of funds, that being \$6.6 million, in the 2021-22 state budget for its restoration and enhancement. The restoration efforts were aligned with established conservation principles, ensuring the preservation of Ayers House's heritage value.

During the tenure of the previous Liberal government, Ayers House served as a venue for various events, alongside housing the National Trust's office and collections; however, the expiration of the National Trust's lease provided an opportunity to reconsider the property's utilisation and potential. The Liberal Party envisaged that Ayers House could be opened up further for public use and a variety of events and activations. Our vision was not only planned out but funded adequately to make that plan a reality.

Unfortunately, the new government sought to grind that plan of activation to a halt and for two years Ayers House has stood underutilised on North Terrace. Hopefully, today we can work

together to turn that around somewhat. The current bill proposes that 'care, control and management of Ayers House vests in the National Trust', with the minister retaining ownership of the title certificate. This arrangement allows the National Trust to generate revenue for its upkeep, while assuming responsibility for Ayers House related liabilities.

Despite that sounding fair on paper, there is a notable absence that persists in this bill before us: a clear vision and resourcing from this Labor government regarding Ayers House's future in perpetuity. Yet again, we see another example of short-term legislation. They are consistent in writing legislation with current boards or current bureaucrats in mind but not, it would seem, with the thought of legislating for perpetuity.

While the opposition, largely through my esteemed colleague the member for Bragg in the other place, has engaged extensively with the National Trust, discussions with the minister or insights into the government's plan have been lacking. I sincerely hope the National Trust's aspirations for Ayers House materialise successfully. Nevertheless, there is a concern that this handover might signify the government's abdication of responsibility, rather than a genuine effort to preserve and promote Ayers House's cultural significance.

The lack of a coherent plan into perpetuity from the current government is concerning, particularly given their track record regarding heritage preservation. Actions do speak louder than words, and the government's decision-making regarding heritage properties, such as the Thebarton Police Barracks, has raised serious doubts about their commitment. Moreover, in multiple areas across Adelaide and South Australia, in a wider scope, local heritage protection is in limbo, awaiting the release of the Planning System Implementation Review, which the Minister for Planning has been sitting on for a year.

In conclusion, Ayers House deserves more respect than it has seen over the past two years from this state Labor government. It warrants preservation, celebration and active engagement by the community. While the National Trust's involvement is promising, it should not serve as a pretext for the government to evade its responsibilities towards heritage conservation. Let us ensure Ayers House's legacy endures for generations to come, cherished and enjoyed by all South Australians.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:41): I rise very briefly to speak in support of the Ayers House Bill 2023. I am very pleased that we are on the brink of welcoming back the National Trust of South Australia as the rightful gatekeepers of Ayers House. For many it was a dark day indeed when, in June 2021, the former government served an eviction notice to the trust after 50 years of dedicated service to Ayers House. It did shake many in the community, whilst igniting a fierce determination to protect our heritage.

I note that there have been issues in here that we have agreed to and disagreed on when it comes to that particular issue, but it has been the tireless advocacy of people like our good friend, Professor Warren Jones, that has kept the flame of heritage preservation alive on so many fronts, but in particular on this one. I know there are many South Australians who are eagerly awaiting the sound of the doors of Ayers House reopening, hopefully very soon.

I note also and take on board some of the comments just made by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the long-term plans around Ayers House and future changes. I actually reflect on a discussion that I had at Martindale Hall in the last couple of weeks.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: Don't remind us of that.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Yes. While I was visiting the other week, discussions took place around what would or could happen with Martindale Hall. In fact, the locals whom I spoke to there all commented on the fierce opposition of the community and the turnout in numbers they had when there were very similar discussions taking place about the change of use of and future of Martindale Hall. On behalf of the wonderful people at Martindale Hall, I do acknowledge the efforts that they have gone to.

I remind the government, when they are looking at these sorts of future changes, that in the community Martindale Hall is a unique and amazing tourist attraction. It is a destination point, and Martindale Hall is one of the places that you will inevitably go to visit when you go to the Clare Valley—along with the Riesling Trail, probably.

The words that were echoed to me were: if only we could have a little bit more input from the government we could truly make this a destination point. There are beautiful big sweeping gardens around Martindale Hall, and if only there was a bit more investment we could make it so much more of a gem in the Clare Valley region than it already is. I do not think that should be lost on any of us when we are contemplating the future of these historic and iconic places, Ayers House and Martindale Hall included.

With those words, I look forward to hearing more about the long-term plans, as the Leader of the Opposition has highlighted. I look forward to hearing about the reopening of Ayers House. On behalf of all those community members who have advocated so tirelessly, I hope—and this may have been a direct request—that there will be a public function to celebrate the outcome of this bill.

In fact, on their behalf I will be asking the Attorney whether they can expect a public announcement and a function of some sort to celebrate this occasion. That is certainly something that they would love to see, I have also been told, by the end of the year. Attorney, there are some hints for you in those comments. I guess that is what those people who have campaigned so tirelessly to bring us to this point would love to hear from this government. With those words, I indicate my support for the bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:46): I rise to support this bill on behalf of the Greens. In so doing, I recognise that this was an election commitment from the Malinauskas government and, indeed, an election commitment of the Greens. We indicated that if the government were to move to legislate this we would support this change. We welcome the government taking this action.

Ayers House is one of Adelaide's most treasured historical landmarks. This 19th century mansion has long been under the stewardship of the National Trust of South Australia, an organisation that is dedicated to protecting our state's rich cultural heritage. It is important that we take all necessary steps to ensure that the National Trust can continue maintaining and operating out of Ayers House for the benefit of the South Australian community. South Australia's natural and built cultural heritage is a precious asset and a resource to be respected and protected for current and future generations.

As we know, the future of the National Trust's stewardship over Ayers House was threatened by the Liberal government in 2021. I want to refer to a media release from the Hon. David Speirs in April of that year, when he stated:

Iconic properties such as Ayers House and Martindale Hall will be the initial focus of our attention for possible investment and activation.

I think many members of the community, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros has alluded to, became very concerned about the potential activation of Martindale Hall, indeed the commercialisation, potentially, of Martindale Hall. If my memory serves me correctly, the Liberal government did intend to open up the prospect for that. They had a bill that was put before this place, which they abandoned because it became clear that there was not the support in the parliament to progress that.

I welcome the fact that they have abandoned that approach to our heritage buildings. I hope that we do not ever see future governments, Labor or Liberal, going down that path, because, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros has stated, what we should be doing is actually putting public money into supporting these buildings and ensuring that they are owned by the people of South Australia in common, to ensure that they are enjoyed by the whole South Australian community, not sending them on the path to privatisation, private ownership. We have seen what can happen when we do that. One only needs to walk down North Terrace and look at a beautiful building like Edmund Wright House, which has been allowed to fall into disrepair, to see some of the dangers of that approach. I hope we do not see that happen again.

Under the Marshall government, the National Trust was given a 30-day eviction notice and there was a plan to give the building to the History Trust for their offices. I should disclose that Greg Mackie of the History Trust is a friend and former colleague of mine. I have no criticism at all of the History Trust; they do good work. It was a shame that the former government pitted these two organisations against each other. That was really regrettable.

The National Trust of course is an independent organisation. There were 4,000 signatures, gathered in just three weeks, calling for the National Trust to stay at Ayers House. I recognise that the then Labor opposition committed to that campaign and, as I indicated from the outset, the Greens also supported that campaign. So we support this legislation, consistent with the commitment we made during the election.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:50): I rise briefly in support of this bill, which aims to solidify the National Trust of South Australia's role in managing Ayers House, a significant heritage property, and grants the trust ongoing rights to use and manage Ayers House. This will allow the trust to generate income through commercial activities, like restaurants or shops, to support heritage preservation efforts. It will shift the responsibility and liability for Ayers House's care to the trust and, importantly, ensure continued public access to Ayers House.

The bill does not transfer ownership of Ayers House, which remains with the government. The trust takes on the day-to-day care, control and management of Ayers House and can lease or licence parts of Ayers House for commercial activities to generate revenue. The trust is responsible for maintaining Ayers House according to any standards set by the minister and becomes liable for any claims arising from Ayers House's use. The government, and therefore the taxpayer, are absolved from such liability.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:51): I rise today to speak in support of the Ayers House Bill 2023, a bill that will reverse the previous state Liberal government's decision to remove the National Trust of South Australia from Ayers House. This Labor Malinauskas government is committed to ensuring the National Trust of South Australia has ongoing rights to Ayers House.

The bill will maintain the minister as the registered owner of Ayers House, preventing a future minister from evicting the National Trust from the property again. SA's National Trust will have permanent care, control and management of the building. Importantly, the bill allows opportunities for the National Trust to generate income to support its operation through leases, licences and other events and activities at Ayers House. This will inspire greater confidence to take on more projects that will help preserve and protect South Australia's heritage.

The South Australian National Trust, now known as the National Trust of South Australia, was formed in 1955. However, during the 1960s and 1970s there was a widespread desire for modernisation, often resulting in older buildings being demolished to make way for new developments. At this time the value of historic architecture and cultural heritage was not recognised in the way it is today.

Urban renewal projects, economic pressures and a lack of legal protection for historic sites resulted in the loss of many fine buildings, including important examples of early colonial South Australia. Unlike today, heritage legislation was either non-existent or less comprehensive, making it easier for developers to obtain permits for demolition. However, the demolition of these structures also served as a catalyst for increased awareness and advocacy for heritage conservation. This led to establishing stronger preservation laws to protect our state's remaining built heritage.

During the 1970s the then Premier, Don Dunstan, invited the National Trust to restore Ayers House and bring it to a standard to be shared with the wider community. This action and visionary thinking helped create a shift, and more people began to value our heritage buildings and South Australia's history.

Over the years, the National Trust's registered volunteers and members have contributed to the equivalent of millions of dollars for work supporting conservation and heritage education. The fact is if people do not value heritage and historic buildings then organisations and government agencies will struggle to successfully preserve and protect them. A successful means of protecting our heritage is to embrace it within our current lives and activities.

We can look to Italy and other parts of Europe and see that the historic architecture is a symbol of national identity and pride in today's world. Italy and other parts of Europe have deep historical roots with castles, cathedrals and cobblestone streets telling stories of past generations. When wandering the streets of Rome, the remnants of Roman, Greek and medieval civilisations are

evident. The Renaissance and baroque influences in Europe's architecture, arts and culture shaped the heritage of these regions, merging the present with the past.

Compared with Europe's cities, Australia is certainly the new frontier. However, Adelaide is home to many significant buildings and historic houses, each with its own unique architectural style and cultural significance. Before I speak about Ayers House, I want to name just a few other significant historic houses that also serve as tangible links to the past, reflecting the values, traditions and craftsmanship of previous generations.

Kingston House, also known as Sturt's Cottage, located in the Adelaide suburb of Marion, was the former residence of Sir George Strickland Kingston, a prominent South Australian architect, surveyor and politician who played a significant role in the development of Adelaide and its surroundings. The house offers insights into the architectural and social history of early colonial South Australia.

Urrbrae House, a Victorian mansion dating back to the 1890s, on the grounds of the University of Adelaide's Waite campus, tells us about South Australia's agricultural history and heritage, and Carrick Hill, located in the Adelaide foothills, is a grand English manor-style house built in the 1930s for the owners of Adelaide's former iconic John Martin's department store. Today, South Australians enjoy its exquisite gardens, fine art collections and stunning views of the surrounding landscape.

This bill brings our focus to Ayers House, another significant historic house with a rich history. It was built in 1846 for Sir Henry Ayers, a prominent South Australian businessman and politician who later became Premier of South Australia. The house was designed by architect George Strickland Kingston in the Regency style. It is characterised by elegance and symmetry, drawing inspiration from ancient Greek and Roman architecture.

In the mid-20th century, Ayers House was threatened with demolition due to urban development plans. Fortunately, this building was saved from destruction and eventually acquired by the South Australian government in the seventies. It was restored and opened to the public as a museum and cultural venue, showcasing its historical significance and preserving its architectural heritage. Today, Ayers House stands as an important landmark in Adelaide, offering guided tours, exhibitions and events that celebrate its past by contributing to the cultural life of Adelaide in the here and now.

The National Trust of Australia plays a significant role in conserving and protecting our nation's cultural and natural heritage. Here in South Australia, our built heritage started with colonial settlement in 1836. Protecting South Australia's heritage, especially the heritage and significant cultural sites of our First Nations people, is crucial in preserving Australia's history so that we can ensure the continuation of shared human stories and value the knowledge, traditions and expertise of previous generations.

The Labor Malinauskas government wants to ensure that the National Trust of South Australia remains as the custodian of Ayers House and that the historic buildings, landscapes and cultural sites in our state are protected. I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:59): Today, I join others in supporting the Ayers House Bill 2023. Prior to the election, as many have stated, the Malinauskas Labor government committed to introducing the legislation that is before us today to grant ongoing rights in relation to Ayers House to the National Trust of South Australia, including its use for commercial operations to generate revenue for the National Trust. This bill means we are delivering on just that.

For those who do not know, the National Trust has worked tirelessly to protect and promote heritage in South Australia since 1955. The National Trust has over 1,000 registered volunteers and over 5,000 members. Over its 65 years, the National Trust and its volunteers have contributed the equivalent of millions of dollars for work supporting heritage conservation and heritage education, making sure that the history of our great state is remembered for generations to come.

It may come as no surprise that it was the state's formidable former Premier Don Dunstan who, in 1970, invited the National Trust to contribute to this plan to restore, furnish and present Ayers

House to the public as a museum, restaurant and function centre. In 1971, the National Trust was first asked to formally assist in managing Ayers House before becoming the official caretaker in 1971.

Ayers House had been their home until they received the shocking news in 2021 from the former minister and now Liberal opposition leader from the other place, the Hon. David Speirs, who many have said presented them with an eviction notice. I have to say that when I entered the room and heard the opposition talking about giving respect to this organisation, I thought I must have been walking into the debate of the wrong bill. Thankfully, the Malinauskas Labor government took to the last election a mandate to return the National Trust to Ayers House.

This act expands upon the vision of Don Dunstan by granting Ayers House to the National Trust as a permanent home. The Ayers House Act will ensure that this location is safe from former ministers—I wish we could go back and stop those people from doing these things—from future ministers evicting the National Trust on a whim.

Most notably, the Ayers House Act will maintain the minister as the registered owner of Ayers House on a certificate of title and give the National Trust permanent care, control and management of Ayers House, allowing the National Trust to generate income to support its operations through leases, licences and other activities within Ayers House, and ensure public access to Ayers House. I support the bill in coming back to this parliament to make sure that we can protect this institution.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:02): I thank all members for their contributions on this important piece of legislation and look forward to the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (WHOLESALE MARKET MONITORING) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 March 2024.)

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (17:05): This bill, the Statutes Amendment (National Energy Laws) (Wholesale Market Monitoring) Bill, seeks to grant the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) new powers for monitoring gas and electricity contracts. This issue really came to the forefront out of the winter of 2022 when there was extensive pressure on the Australian energy system, with twin pinchers of higher prices and price volatility in the wholesale energy market. Also in winter 2022, we experienced high prices in the national gas market—prices not seen before.

Pushing for this change are a number of reports, including the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission's 'Inquiry into the National Energy Market' report, which sought to expand the AER's wholesale market monitoring functions to gas wholesale markets, as well as electricity and gas contract markets. Following those recommendations, energy ministers agreed to legislative change and, as the lead legislator, it is now progressing through our parliament.

With these powers, the AER would have the information and visibility to understand both the wholesale electricity market and the wholesale gas market. This continues the trend, as noted by my colleague in the other place the member for Morphett, to increase powers to market bodies. Today,

it is the Australian Energy Regulator (AER), but we have also seen powers to the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) and the Australian Energy Market Commission expanded. These expanded powers and visibility are important at a time when we have a cost-of-living crisis, and businesses and families are reliant on keeping their lights on and are currently paying through the nose for electricity with no relief in sight.

Many South Australian households were on default market offers and were forced to absorb some of the highest increases in electricity in the nation as of 1 July 2023. There was a whopping \$1,310 jump for some small businesses that were on the default market offers, and for families the hit was some \$512. These were massive increases for households that equated to anything up to 23.9 per cent for residential customers and a 28.9 per cent increase for small businesses.

We know from a report by the Australian Energy Regulator that some 60 per cent of South Australian families are on hardship payments for their electricity bill, without receiving any concessions from the government. That percentage is the highest in the country. Sixty per cent of those South Australian families who are on hardship payments for their electricity bills are not receiving any concessions from their government. This is at a time when South Australian families have the highest average energy debt in the electricity market at \$1,256.

We know that South Australian families are more than \$20,000 worse off, when compared to the last election two years ago. Many others have spoken about the cost-of-living crisis, but similarly I have met with many small businesses which are facing the same challenges, all dealing with rising costs across a number of fronts, including labour costs, water and, of course, power. It all adds to the burden for these people who are keen to be able to do their business well. This is no doubt a major factor in the increased number of businesses failing in our state. They have been smothered by the number of cost increases, and energy is a major impost on these businesses.

As this is the national energy law, it is well supported and will pass the parliament as per convention. I will conclude my remarks and in closing hope that this bill achieves greater transparency and that the market operators can better anticipate and react to future crises with their expanded powers and visibility as well as assist in informing future policy decisions to be put forward to make sure that energy prices decrease.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:10): The winter of 2022 in Australia exposed the risks of a poorly functioning energy market. A lack of competition in the electricity market and limited information on the gas market made the situation worse. To address these issues this bill proposes to extend the Australian Energy Regulator's monitoring and reporting functions to include the electricity contract market and the wholesale gas market. This will allow the Australian Energy Regulator to gain insight into competition and market power in these markets. One Nation supports open and competitive markets where improved efficiencies translate to lower energy prices for consumers, and on that basis I support the bill.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:10): It was Sir Thomas Playford who in 1946 took decisive action to wrest control of South Australia's electricity supply from a profit driven monopoly—the Adelaide Electric Supply Company—with the creation of the state-owned Electricity Trust of South Australia. Playford's approach to economic policy was a uniquely pragmatic one. He was focused on delivering favourable outcomes for the South Australian community. He recognised a good idea when he saw one; it did not matter which side of politics typically espoused it. In InDaily Nigel Carney wrote in 2017 that:

The Playford solution was bold and radical and remains a template for public asset management that is of critical relevance today, as South Australia reels from the negative impacts of perhaps the most contentious and foolish political decision in the state's history.

Mr Carney refers, of course, to the decision of the Olsen government and its Treasurer, and I quote:

...vandalized the legacy of the Playford era, carving up the Electricity Trust of South Australia...and serving it cheaply to an eager private energy market most pleased to profit from the mismanagement of the state.

The particular criticism that the Olsen government's decision amounted to vandalism of Playford's vision for a South Australia that enjoyed a specific kind of energy security could be written off as politically motivated mudslinging if it were not objectively accurate. When that woefully short-sighted

decision was taken it was not a matter of times having changed. Little, in fact, may ever change about the way wealth and profit consolidate under monopolies.

The circumstances post State Bank were both unusual and challenging. That point cannot be argued. A decision was made on the basis of what could be said to be erroneous assumptions about the anticipated effect of privatisation or perhaps made on the basis of very correct but unstated assumptions about the anticipated effect of privatisation. That decision has cost and continues to cost South Australians very far beyond the point that this privatisation could successfully be argued to have served the public interest.

Competition in the electricity market was meant to drive prices down. That was a major selling point offered up to South Australians. Broadly speaking, of course, competition often does exactly that, but something must have gone awry in this case because we have seen a total failure of that effect eventuating in South Australian energy prices today. Prices have instead increased, and I doubt anyone would attempt to argue that this is because the fundamental underlying principle is flawed.

The Malinauskas government is acutely conscious of the pressures that electricity and gas prices are creating for South Australian households at a time of very significant cost-of-living stress. Energy costs since privatisation have created a very significantly rising impost on household budgets, particularly for those on lower incomes.

The intent of the bill before the chamber is to strengthen the capabilities and add to the responsibilities of the Australian Energy Regulator to support its crucial role of ensuring that our energy markets are performing in a competitive manner. The bill provides for the Australian Energy Regulator to be able to access information on electricity contract markets and requires the AER to monitor and report on competition in the wholesale gas markets.

Under the current arrangements, the AER can readily monitor prices on the spot market, which is run by the Australian Energy Market Operator, and the futures market, which is run by the Australian Securities Exchange. The AER relies on the information it gleans which is publicly available, but much of the trading, especially in the electricity market, is conducted through private, bespoke, over-the-counter contracts between generators, finance intermediaries and retailers. These contracts are instrumental in setting the cost of wholesale energy to retailers and therefore significant in their impact on the bills paid by households and businesses.

The lack of transparency around these contracts means the Australian Energy Regulator has great difficulty in the task of accurately estimating what retailers are paying to buy the energy which they then sell on to South Australian households and businesses at retail prices. The bill before us proposes to empower the AER to inspect these contracts to enable them to better ascertain what goes on in energy market transactions.

These reforms are substantially in the public interest to pursue. Labor governments take what actions are available to them to mitigate profiteering at the expense of South Australian consumers. It is worth mentioning that these reforms enjoy broad support and approval, for example from the ACCC, Energy Consumers Australia and the Public Interest Advocacy Centre to name but a few.

A reasonable measure of transparency is necessary for South Australians to ascertain whether or not they are getting a fair deal from their retailers. Amid today's privatised energy landscape, wherein market volatility and commercial decision-making can have such a dramatic impact on retail energy prices, the levers a government can pull are limited. This bill proposes reforms that are entirely in line with our responsibility to the South Australian community to take what steps we can to strengthen transparency in this area. I commend the bill to the chamber and call upon all members to support it.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:16): I rise to speak in favour of the Statutes Amendment (National Energy Laws) (Wholesale Market Monitoring) Bill 2023. This bill improves the transparency of energy contracts between energy wholesalers and retailers by giving the Australian Energy Regulator monitoring powers to analyse the efficacy of competition and to identify features of contracts that are detrimental to energy supply or cost.

The sale of ETSA back in the 1990s was a major blow to South Australia, exposing the vulnerability in our electricity systems. Now we are in a situation as a result of that appalling decision where we are relying on privatised wholesale and retail markets to provide efficient and affordable energy supply. What we are seeing in energy prices is an increase over time, even though renewable energy has dramatically reduced the cost of producing energy in our state. These increased costs are placing a huge burden on household budgets and putting the viability of small businesses at risk. This is simply not a sustainable situation.

It is for this reason that the Greens have been calling for the re-establishment of a new ETSA to bring power back into public hands and address the ongoing issues of our privatised energy market. Indeed, back in 2022 the Labor Party promised during the election that they would establish a commission of inquiry into bringing back public ownership of our trains and trams. They have not needed to proceed with that inquiry, and I recognise the work of the transport minister in that regard, but we could use that same model to examine the issues associated with our energy network, look at what it would take to bring back ETSA and give South Australians control of our electricity once again.

Local government is starting to take the power back into its own hands. Indeed, the City of Mitcham has become a leader in the energy industry, creating a community renewables program that gives local communities agency and control over their power. I understand that over 760 households have signed up to receive solar panels or batteries and their next step is to establish a virtual power plant. For those who may not be aware, a virtual power plant, also known as a VPP, shares renewable energy generated at individual properties across a local network. It helps prevent blackouts, reduces electricity costs and addresses climate change. As more people move towards models like this, we will see a total shift in our energy market. It is the democratisation of energy generation and distribution.

This bill is necessary for the Australian Energy Regulator to address the lack of transparency in contracts with the big retailers and the big wholesalers. If we were to bring back publicly owned electricity to South Australia and establish more local power networks, as could be achieved through virtual power plants, we could entirely change the energy landscape and entirely remove the need for the types of measures included in this bill. The problem here is not simply transparency; the problem is that the Liberals sold off ETSA to private providers who are more interested in making a buck than serving the public good. We need to see that reversed and we need to put the power back into public hands.

I do want to take this opportunity to caution the Liberal Party against ever going down the privatisation path again. I do welcome the fact that the Malinauskas government has worked with the Greens to support a bill that will make it very difficult to sell off key public assets in the future without appropriate parliamentary scrutiny. That is a really good step, and I think it will ensure that this parliament does not repeat the folly of the Liberals in the future.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:20): Everyone loves a good national energy laws bill, do they not? I rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (National Energy Laws) (Wholesale Market Monitoring) Bill 2023. In doing so, I think it is great that we can all agree here that we are debating a bill that has come about because of a specific failure. That specific failure relates to privatisation. Energy privatisation has, in this instance here, failed. As this side of the council has always said, the privatisation of an essential utility, such as electricity, will not deliver optimal outcomes for consumers. Rather, as then Labor leader Mike Rann said when opposing the privatisation of ETSA:

Privatisation is a policy that will expose South Australians to more and more risk, more and more liability. That is the [then] government's policy: privatise the profits; socialise the risk.

What this bill aims to do is uncover some of the excesses that a privatised system allows to occur—the excesses that ultimately consumers pay for through their electricity bills. If the government still ran the power system, as the Hon. Mr Simms might like us to do, consumers would only be paying for the costs of generating, storing, transmitting and distributing electricity. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Consumers must also pay for private owners and operators to make profits, and pay for speculators—this is a pretty key feature here—who trade financial derivatives of the energy market, not the physical units of energy. This bill will help expose the money trails in those transactions.

It is the role of the Australian Energy Regulator to:

...ensure energy consumers have access to a reliable and secure market and that they pay no more than necessary for energy to their homes and businesses.

That is on the AER website. To do this, the AER must achieve a balancing act of sorts. It needs to ensure that the market is competitive so that small players can enter the market, if you like, and apply innovation against established retailers, and it needs to ensure consumers are receiving as fair a deal as possible.

One of the key functions in this objective is through the AER setting what is called the annual default market offer, or, as some members here have already referred to, the DMO. The DMO is a price cap or a safety net for consumers on basic contracts, which are called standing offers, and it acts as the reference point for all other contracts for households and small businesses, which are called market offers.

In setting the DMO, the AER breaks down an electricity bill into its components: the wholesale cost of electricity supplied by generators, the network costs of transmission and distribution, a small amount for government schemes like an environmental levy or some such, the cost to a retailer of operating a consumer-facing business and, of course, a profit on top for the retailer. Wholesale and network costs are the major components, together comprising about 80 per cent of a retail bill. Network providers are monopolies, and their revenue, including return on any capital and profits, is separately determined by the AER. These costs are therefore well defined in the AER calculation.

Wholesale costs are a lot more volatile and far less transparent. In calling for the reforms in this bill, the AER said:

The proposed changes will greatly enhance the AER's ability to assess performance, competition and efficiency in the wholesale energy markets and ensure consumers are not unduly impacted by high energy prices due to an uncompetitive market.

To ensure consumers and policy makers have confidence in our energy system, it is vital to understand the drivers and impact of participant behaviour and subsequent market outcomes.

In electricity for example, participant behaviour can be influenced by a variety of factors, including their portfolio of technologies, prevailing market conditions, weather, fuel availability, and particularly their risk management strategies and positions.

Every megawatt hour of electricity is treated multiple times in the secondary markets, and the cumulative value of this trade is worth many multiples of the settled spot market price.

Participants also use a range of additional contract products to manage wholesale market risk such as fuel contracts, power purchase agreements, weather derivatives, and carbon abatement contracts.

Currently, the AER can readily monitor prices on the spot market, which is run by the Australian Energy Market Operator and the futures market run by the Australian Securities Exchange, but these markets are only part of the picture. A large volume of trade takes place on the over-the-counter contracts or—another anagram—OTC contracts. Whereas both AEMO and ASX markets have a central clearing house—a pool, if you like, which sellers trade into and buyers trade out of—OTC contracts are privately negotiated arrangements between generators, financial institutions and, critically, retailers.

These OTC contracts are critical to the final cost to retailers of wholesale energy and therefore the final amount paid by households and businesses. This bill before the council gives the AER the power to inspect these contracts to get a more accurate picture of the money flow, to follow the money, if you like. Without these powers, it is pretty much impossible for the AER to do its job.

The importance of wholesale costs in the DMO can be shown in considering the big retail price rises, spoken about by some other members, in the 2022-23 DMO and the current 2023-24 DMO against the draft DMO for 2024-25, which was published last month. I know we all hung out for that one.

In setting the 2022-23 DMO, the regulator said increases in the wholesale costs were accelerating because of the global gas price shock from Russia's invasion in Ukraine, extreme weather in New South Wales and Queensland which disrupted coal supplies, and breakdowns at

ageing coal-fired generator plants. These wholesale increases were the principal driver that led to the AER setting a 7.2 per cent increase in the average household bill in South Australia that financial year.

Then, for the 2023-24 period the regulator said wholesale prices had gone even higher. This was because futures contracts had been struck before the Australian government applied price caps on coal and gas. The price of coal and gas had risen, and coal-fired power stations had become even less reliable.

These factors caused the AER to announce extraordinarily large increases for the regions in the National Electricity Market where a DMO applies, that is, South Australia, New South Wales, ACT and south-east Queensland. These increases were above 20 per cent across the board. Nor were those regions the only ones to see steep price rises. Indeed, they were exceeded by a 29 per cent increase in regional Queensland, where the tariff is set by the Queensland Competition Authority instead of the AER.

Then we come to the draft DMO for the next financial year, 2024-25. In some good news for consumers, the AER expects to cut the DMO for average households by 2.5 per cent and by 8.2 per cent for small businesses—something I know a lot of consumers are really looking forward to. Put simply, there is a lot more work to be done to bring down prices, and it is obvious to say it, but it is tremendously encouraging to see them trending down and not up for the coming year. The draft DMO is the forerunner to a final decision to be made in late May, which will apply from 1 July this year.

In announcing its intention to cut prices, the AER said wholesale markets had fallen and stabilised significantly. It notes, to quote them:

For example, as at February 2024, base futures' contract prices have fallen by between 44 per cent and 51 per cent compared with their respective highs in October last year.

In applying this decrease, the AER tempered the fall to 19 per cent, rather than about 50 per cent, in the wholesale component of its draft DMO—with an average residential bill cut from \$998 to \$809—\$189 less on my base maths.

The reason for not applying the full decrease in the spot price is that retailers buy futures-based contracts on the derivatives markets up to four years ahead, and these future prices are still more elevated than the spot market because of a lingering effect of price spikes from the years 2022 and 2023.

Retailers that are not vertically integrated, that is, which do not have a generation fleet of their own, can only buy energy through the spot market, moderated by their trade in derivatives. Because of the volatility in the spot market, they need to be cautious in ensuring the derivatives they purchase shield them from any spikes—how ironic! Unfortunately, because it is a private market, spikes can occur quite legally for business reasons and not for operational reasons.

This process was described by Professor Allan Fels, a former chair of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, in a report published earlier in February. The report, labelled 'Inquiry into price gouging and unfair pricing practices', was commissioned by the Australian Council of Trade Unions because, as Professor Fels says, the union movement is concerned about 'the impact of prices on the costs of living of ordinary Australians'—very wise words. Professor Fels chaired the inquiry, which looked in detail at specific sectors of the economy, including of course the electricity sector.

The Fels report says that the electricity wholesale market has a bidding process, which is intended to encourage efficiency and reflect the true cost of supplying electricity at different levels of demand. The process is that generators submit bids to AEMO, which then creates a merit order for dispatch, starting with the lowest price bids and ending with the final bid, under which the aggregate supply will meet the expected total demand during that period of time, if you like. Then, all dispatch generators are paid at the rate bid by the final generator, even if their bids at the start were a lower price. The Fels report states:

...complexities arise in this system. For example, generators can rebid their capacity at different times of dispatch. This flexibility is meant to account for changing conditions, like unexpected plant outages or demand surges.

Yet, it can also be used strategically by generators, especially those with significant market power to influence market prices. This has led to concerns about the potential for price manipulation or gaming.

Price manipulation or gaming in our energy market.

The report noted the work of University of Sydney's Professor Lynne Chester that 'this rebidding can take place right up until a few minutes before generators are actually required to supply electricity, and that the incentive to gouge is enormous'—the incentive to gouge is enormous.

So how does this work in practice? Let's consider a few examples. The Australian Energy Regulator is required to issue a report when spot prices exceed \$5,000 per megawatt hour. In the AER's January to March 2023 report, it notes a particular event which occurred in Queensland on 31 January 2023. It recorded rebids by generators operated by Alinta Energy and Genuity, including Genuity rebidding from minus \$1,000 per megawatt hour to \$15,500 per megawatt hour with less than an hour's notice. What did the AER say of these rebids? The AER said:

The short-term strategic rebidding to capitalise on market conditions had the effect of exacerbating high prices in Queensland. While this behaviour may not be a breach of the rules, the ability of these participants to increase price through these rebidding strategies highlights the market power that participants may be able to exercise at certain times.

In the AER's report on October to December, one of the high-price events occurred right here in South Australia on 9 November. On that day, AGL Energy, at 6.39 in the afternoon, changed its bid to supply 125 megawatts of power at 6.45pm, and in the immediate subsequent five-minute trading intervals. So with six minutes of warning, it lifted its bid from a price of less than \$176 per megawatt hour to \$16,600 per megawatt hour—in six minutes.

How crazy is privatisation? A company says it is quite happy to supply a product at a certain price and then, just moments before that product is needed, it dramatically skyrockets the price. What is the practical effect of that? Instead of making \$22,000 for five minutes of providing power, the company makes more than \$2 million.

Nor are these companies alone. The AER high-price reports cite numerous companies rebidding in the various high-price events in many different states. The volatility is why the hedging contracts are needed and why they play such an important role in the final prices regular households pay in their electricity bills, and that is why the AER needs the extra powers that we are considering here today. The cost-of-living crisis before us is affected by energy. We have to do something about it, and that is why I commend this bill to the council.

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

At 17:37 the council adjourned until Wednesday 10 April 2024 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL**

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (13 June 2023).

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

The Women's and Children's Hospital (WCH) currently holds accreditation across all areas of healthcare services and always aims to meet the expected standards for safety and quality.

As part of the 2023-24 state budget, the government committed \$20.1 million to expand the existing WCH PICU and I confirm stage 1 of these works are now complete which has made a significant improvement already. Stage 2 is focused on enhancing bed capacity. Stage 3 will be the move to the new WCH site.

Rebecca Graham, as the interim Chief Executive Officer of the Women's and Children's Health Network, is working with hospital staff to maintain accreditation and continue the highest standards of care for SA's sickest and most vulnerable babies, children and young people.

The Malinauskas Labor government has already committed to 48 additional doctors and 12 specialty nurses to boost capacity and relieve pressures on the hardworking staff at the WCH.

ELECTORAL COMMISSIONER

In reply to **the Hon. D.G.E. HOOD** (7 February 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I undertook to provide a reply to some of the specific questions that the honourable member asked about Electoral Commission staff concerns or complaints. The Electoral Commissioner has provided me with the following information:

- The South Australian state election is one of the largest and most complex logistical events in South Australia. 6,128 persons were engaged to deliver the 2022 state election. 32 were full-time Electoral Commission staff and remaining 6,096 were temporary election workforce many of which only worked on polling day.
- Of the 6,128 persons that were engaged to deliver the state election, one person lodged a formal complaint and WorkCover claim. This person was provided with psychological support and subsequently withdrew their claim.
- Anonymous feedback provided in 2022 post-election staff surveys particularly referenced long hours worked. In consideration of this feedback, in recent elections the Electoral Commission has limited the hours staff work per day and the number of consecutive days worked.
- Additional measures to prevent fatigue will be in place for the 2026 South Australian state election. The Electoral Commission has a comprehensive fatigue management plan to ensure the health and welfare of full-time staff and polling officials.

I acknowledge the important work the Electoral Commission has undertaken in recent years especially during the challenges of the COVID pandemic. Over the last two years the Electoral Commission has delivered elections for the state, local government and the First Nations Voice to Parliament and I thank all the staff of the Electoral Commission for their hard work, professionalism and dedication.

CONVERSION PRACTICES

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (7 February 2024).

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

1. This is an election commitment which, like all other election commitments falls within the remit of the Premier's Delivery Unit.
2. The Premier has met with numerous stakeholders and interested persons about this topic.
3. The government is fundamentally opposed to the practice of conversion practices which tries to change someone's sexual orientation or gender identity.

There are already several laws that protect LGBTIQ+ South Australians from conversion practices, in particular under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010, which regulates health professions, and the federal Competition and Consumer Act 2010, which prohibits misleading and deceptive conduct in trade or commerce.

In line with the government's commitment to ensure conversion practices do not occur in South Australia, the government is currently considering the models in place in various jurisdictions.

As committed to prior to the election, the government has also established an LGBTIQ+ Ministerial Advisory Committee, who provide important advice to the government about issues facing this community.

APY ART CENTRE COLLECTIVE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (20 February 2024).

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

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

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

PROTON THERAPY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (21 February 2024).

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

1. In 2017, as part of its process to procure a proton therapy system for the Australian Bragg Centre for Proton Therapy and Research, SAHMRI, through its procurement advisor Commercial & General, engaged accounting firm KPMG to undertake due diligence on ProTom International's capacity to deliver its proton therapy system.

2. As I previously advised parliament on 21 February 2024, the former Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas agreed to provide several forms of security to Commercial & General to support its private interests in the Australian Bragg Centre. This includes:

- sharing of construction and financing cost risk associated with building the Australian Bragg Centre building, and
- step in obligations to complete the proton therapy unit should the Australian Bragg Centre for Proton Therapy and Research be unable to complete the project.

The details of those arrangements are commercially sensitive and confidential. However, I can advise that cost to the state of meeting security obligations could be many millions of dollars contingent upon the final cost of the delivering the building.

3. The total cost of the building is met primarily by private financiers, and that cost is confidential information. As noted at 2 above, the state's shares in cost and financial risk in constructing the building, which includes a provision for the builder to support installation of the proton therapy system. I can advise that the state's exposure through that cost sharing is several millions of dollars.

4. SAHMRI has the main contract with ProTom International to supply the proton therapy system. Within that contract, SAHMRI has various rights to recover funds from ProTom and its suppliers. The specific details of this contract are confidential between SAHMRI and ProTom International. The state is continuing to work with SAHMRI, which includes identifying funds available to return to governments.

5. SAHMRI has paid less than two-thirds of \$68 million provided by the commonwealth government to pay ProTom International and its subcontractors at this stage. The remaining balance is currently held by the state.

GOVERNMENT APOLOGIES

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (22 February 2024).

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

1. Mr Meekins was provided with the first draft version of the written response on 8 March 2023. There were extensive discussions in relation to the content of the letter. A letter considered by the Department for Child Protection to be the final written apology letter has been signed and available to Mr Meekins since September 2023. A number of additional words in relation to the existing content were included in February 2024 and the letter was resigned.

The letter meets the department's obligations under the National Redress Scheme and contains an apology for the child sexual abuse suffered by Mr Meekins, for which the department was found responsible.

2. All survivors who are engaged in a direct personal response (DPR) process with a government agency choose how they wish to engage with the process. Survivors can choose to engage directly with the department at any point in the DPR process.

In this matter, the executive with responsibility for the DPR process, returned Mr Meekins' call after he left a message requesting that his call be responded to directly.

3. The government acknowledges the importance of survivors receiving a DPR in a timely manner. Where a face-to-face DPR takes place, the Department for Child Protection endeavors to provide survivors who also seek a written response, with an apology letter within three weeks of the completion of the face-to-face DPR.

Mr Meekins' face-to-face DPR took place on 17 February 2023. He was provided with the first draft version of the written response on 8 March 2023. There were extensive discussions in relation to the content of the letter. A letter considered by the department to be the final written DPR letter has been signed and is available to Mr Meekins.

4. The department has offered to convene a meeting for the purpose of providing Mr Meekins with the signed letter.

APY ART CENTRE COLLECTIVE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (22 February 2024).

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

I attended the APY Arts Centre Collective Adelaide Studio for an event hosted in partnership with the National Gallery of Australia and the APY Art Centre Collective to present the works of Ngura Pulka.

DENTAL HEALTH CARE

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (22 February 2024).

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

SA Dental monitor the waiting list for dental treatment under general anaesthetic in the public dental service.

SA Dental provide public dental services for all South Australian children under 18 years who live or go to school in South Australia, there are no waiting lists for general dental services at SA Dental clinics.

As of 31 January 2024, the public waiting time was 7.5 months with 220 South Australian children under 18 years waiting for dental treatment under general anaesthetic in the public dental service. This does not account for dental treatment under general anaesthetic provided in the private sector.

Dental caries are preventable and hospitalisation for dental treatment under general anaesthetic contributes to the high number of potentially preventable hospital admissions in South Australia.

SA Dental delivers health promotion and screening programs to promote good oral health behaviour and encourage uptake of dental service from an early age.

SA Dental is implementing a joint promotion campaign with the Australian Dental Association to address low utilisation of the commonwealth funded Child Dental Benefit Schedule; as of 2019 the Child Dental Benefit Schedule utilisation for South Australia was 46.3 per cent.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (5 March 2024).

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

An individual on parole or release ordered home detention is able to apply for an ABN unless it's contrary to the conditions of their order.

Matters related to the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) are the responsibility for the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA).

MOTOR SPORT ACT COMPLIANCE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (21 March 2024).

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

The report of the VALLO Adelaide 500 was tabled in both houses on Tuesday, 19 March 2024.