

Part 1—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

1—Amendment of section 20AA—Causing harm to, or assaulting, certain emergency workers etc

2—Repeal of Part 3C

Part 2—Amendment of *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*

3—Amendment of section 59D—Power to destroy dogs

4—Amendment of section 60—Power to seize and detain dogs

5—Amendment of section 63—Power to destroy cats

6—Amendment of section 64D—Notification to owner of dog or cat destroyed etc under Part

These Parts make related amendments to the Acts specified consequential to the enactment of the measure.

Part 3—Amendment of *Sentencing Act 2017*

7—Insertion of section 26A

This clause inserts new section 26A into the *Sentencing Act 2017* as follows:

26A—Additional orders for offences involving animals

A court may, on finding a person guilty of an offence involving animals or on sentencing a person for an offence involving animals, make any order it thinks fit under section 51 of the proposed *Animal Welfare Act 2024*.

Part 4—Amendment of *Veterinary Services Act 2023*

8—Amendment of section 50—Veterinary services must be provided at registered premises

9—Amendment of section 51—Offence to carry on certain businesses other than at registered premises

These clauses make related amendments to the *Veterinary Services Act 2023* consequential to the enactment of the measure.

Part 5—Repeal of *Animal Welfare Act 1985*

10—Repeal of Act and regulations

This clause repeals the *Animal Welfare Act 1985* and all regulations under that Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Cowdrey.

CONVERSION PRACTICES PROHIBITION BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (16:12): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to recognise and prevent the harm caused by practices directed at changing or suppressing the sexual orientation or gender identity of individuals, to make related amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (16:13): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the bill to pass through all stages without delay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority not present, please ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (16:14): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am proud to rise today to introduce the Conversion Practices Prohibition Bill 2024 into this parliament. This bill fundamentally seeks to send a clear message to every South Australian that this government recognises, condemns and seeks to prevent the harm caused by conversion practices directed towards the LGBTQIA+ community. The term 'conversion practices' refers to practices that are directed to an individual and are intended to cause a change to that individual's sexual orientation or gender identity.

This bill arises out of an election commitment made by the Labor Party to work to ensure that conversion practices do not occur in South Australia. The objects of the legislation, as laid out in the bill, are to recognise and prevent the harm caused by conversion practices and to promote respectful and open discussions regarding sexuality and gender. The bill presents an opportunity through legislative intervention to make it clear that sexual orientation and gender identity does not constitute a disorder, disease, illness, deficiency or shortcoming. There is nothing broken or wrong with a person that needs fixing if they identify as part of the LGBTQIA+ community.

In order to fulfil these objects, the bill creates several new criminal offences and also creates a civil cause of action. The bill is closely modelled on the New South Wales Conversion Practices Ban Act 2024 (the NSW act) that passed the New South Wales parliament in March, but with some differences to reflect the South Australian context. The NSW act was drafted based on extensive public and stakeholder consultation. The SA bill defines a conversion practice to mean a practice, treatment or sustained effort that consists of more than one event or occurs on more than one occasion and that is:

- directed to an individual on the basis of the individual's sexual orientation or gender identity; and
- directed to changing or suppressing the individual's sexual orientation or gender identity.

Sexual orientation is defined in the bill to mean an individual's orientation towards individuals of the same sex or different sex and includes having a lack of sexual attraction to any sex, otherwise known as asexuality. The bill provides that a conversion practice does not include:

- clinically appropriate health services or treatments—for example, assisting an individual with therapeutic identity exploration or advising an individual about potential impacts of gender-affirming medical treatment;
- genuinely facilitating an individual's coping skills, development or identity exploration to meet the individual's needs, including by providing acceptance, support or understanding to the individual;
- the use by a person, without more, of expressions—in particular, expressions of a belief or principle, including a religious belief or principle and in prayer; and
- expressions that a belief or principle ought to be followed or applied.

This provision makes it clear that a general expression about a religious belief or system of beliefs is not prohibited. This could be made to a group or to an individual. It could be through a sermon or a simple one on one conversation that does not seek to target the individual or change their sexual or gender orientation. This goes to the heart of freedom of expression, religious freedom of expression and the freedom to speak one's mind when it comes to particular beliefs.

I want to further make it clear that a conversion practice does not include religious teachings or prayers presented to a general audience, as this is not directed at an individual on the basis of the individual's sexual orientation or gender identity. For clarity, the bill also contains a list of examples of behaviour that do not constitute a conversion practice. These include:

- stating what relevant religious teachings are or what a religion says about a specific topic;
- general requirements in relation to religious orders or membership or leadership of a religious community;
- general rules in education institutions; and
- parents discussing or providing guidance on matters relating to sexual orientation, gender identity, sexual activity or religion with their children.

In relation to the last example, it should be made very clear that parents are not prevented from being able to have challenging discussions or provide guidance about these matters with their children. Such parent to child discussions are not captured by the bill. This exception is there to make this very clear.

As defined in the bill, a parent of a child includes a step-parent or a person who stands in loco parentis to the child. This is a Latin term that means 'in the place of a parent'. The definition is drawn from the existing definition in the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Regulations 2019. It will be an offence to perform a conversion practice on a person with the intention of changing or suppressing the person's sexual orientation or gender identity that causes serious harm to the person. The maximum penalty for this offence will be five years' imprisonment.

Harm is defined to mean physical or mental harm whether temporary or permanent. Mental harm means psychological harm, and includes mental illness, nervous shock, distress, anxiety or fear that is more than trivial. Serious harm is harm that endangers a person's life or is substantial. As defined in the bill, serious harm may be caused by a combination of conversion practices, and must be assessed by considering the totality of those practices.

It will also be an offence to take a person from the state or arrange for person to be taken from the state with the intention that a conversion practice is to be performed on the person outside of the state, or engage a person from outside the state to provide or deliver a conversion practice in the state. For each of these offences the maximum penalty will be three years' imprisonment or \$15,000 or both of those penalties.

These criminal offences, separate from the civil scheme, will apply regardless of whether harm was or could have been caused by the conversion practice. Further, all the bill's offences apply whether or not consent to the performance of the conversion practice is given by either the individual or, if the individual lacks capacity, a parent, guardian or other person who has decision-making authority. Consent is not a defence in any circumstance.

The bill will also create a civil response scheme to support survivors and facilitate appropriate resolutions between parties. A further amendment will be made to the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to insert a new provision into part 6 to provide that it is unlawful to perform a conversion practice on any person or to arrange for a conversion practice to be performed on any other person.

Importantly, the bill makes it clear that the existing functions of the Equal Opportunity Commissioner under section 11 of the Equal Opportunity Act will also operate in relation to conversion practices, which includes the commissioner's research, data collection and education functions.

A complaint regarding a conversion practice may first be brought as a complaint to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. It can then be subject to conciliation and, if not resolved by agreement, may be brought to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) for a resolution. This operation reflects how the existing victimisation and sexual harassment provisions operate in the Equal Opportunity Act.

Under the Equal Opportunity Act a complaint must be brought by the person purporting to have suffered discrimination or, under this bill, a conversion practice. We have heard from survivors of conversion practices that they see it as important that others are able to make complaints on behalf of the victim, who may not be in a position to do so. This is something the Attorney-General is considering, although it is outside the scope of this bill.

Consistent with the current operation of the Equal Opportunity Act in other areas, a complaint regarding conversion practices must be lodged within 12 months of the date on which the contravention is alleged to have been committed or, if a series of acts are alleged, within 12 months of the last of those acts. However, it should be made clear that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has discretion to extend the time for lodging a complaint, even if the 12-month time limit has expired, so long as they are satisfied that there is good reason for the complaint being made outside this time frame and that it is just and equitable to do so.

This is an important existing discretion of the commissioner to highlight, considering that in many cases of conversion practice it is common for targeted individuals to take years, even decades, to realise that what happened to them was a conversion practice, let alone to then have the courage to come forward and make a complaint.

This context will be an important consideration for the commissioner when assessing whether to exercise their discretion in waiving this time limit for the civil complaint scheme, and it is anticipated that this discretion to consider waiving the time limit will be exercised in most circumstances, based on feedback from survivors.

If a complaint alleges a contravention by a registered health practitioner in the course of practising a health profession, pursuant to the definitions in the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law, the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity must refer that complaint to the relevant health complaints entity. The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity is prevented from then proceeding or otherwise dealing with that complaint under the Equal Opportunity Act.

I will note that here currently in South Australia, there is some existing legislation that restricts certain conversion practices, mainly in the space of health practitioners. The combination of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law, the federal Australian Consumer Law and, specific to South Australia, the Health and Community Services Complaints Act 2004 combine to effectively prohibit conversion practices across various health and community service settings, and in trade and commerce.

This bill prescribes that a review of the legislation must occur as soon as possible after a three-year period from commencement, with a report to be tabled in parliament within four years after commencement. This will ensure that the effectiveness of the bill can be appropriately reviewed.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the many groups and individuals who have made this important reform possible. Thank you to the Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher in the other place, for his work in bringing this legislation to life, to the Hon. Nat Cook, Minister for Human Services, and the LGBTIQ+ Minister's Advisory Council for being such a strong voice for this community.

Thank you to Equality Australia and the South Australian Rainbow Advocacy Alliance (SARAA) for all your years of advocacy, and for providing a safe community for people to speak out, be vulnerable, and to feel heard. And, most importantly, a sincere thank you to all of the incredibly brave survivors of conversion practices, both those who have been able to share their story publicly and also those survivors who have not been able to come forward.

I was grateful to meet with some people this week, and I was deeply moved to hear their lived experience before introducing this legislation. I would now like to briefly share the experiences of two of these brave survivors who have generously allowed me to tell their story of conversion practices.

Jace Reh is 24, and a proud trans and queer Gamilaroi person who was subjected to conversion practices as recently as nine years ago. Jace grew up in a small country town isolated from the city. Jace has said:

My experiences were surrounded by a fear of who I wanted to be and who I felt I had to be. I would spend every week, prayed over multiple times a week, reminded how I needed to maintain the image of a godly woman, that I had to be with a man and that I was the housewife.

I was told that my true and authentic self was something to be afraid of and that I was being called by the devil to do awful things.

This has damaged my ability to maintain relationships, my ability to form connections and my ability to succeed in my own life.

I spent the ages of 8 to 15 in conversion practices and many years after that in psychiatric institutions as I tried to recover.

We need this ban or people like me will continue to hate themselves and feel like there is something wrong with them. But we have a chance now to make a difference.

Another powerful testimony came from brave survivor Megan Barnes, 37 years old:

I'm a victim-survivor of conversion therapy, suppression and practices in South Australia.

I was subjected to a belief system that enforced there was something wrong with me. I was told that it is unacceptable to be who I am.

When others around me were pursuing life, I was left in a suicidal state, in and out of programs, disguised as healing and support groups.

I was given a brochure and referred to attend a live in program for 'troubled' girls run by a religious institution. At this point in my life, I was helpless and I believed everything I was told by people in positions of power and authority over me.

I thought it would be a safe place for me, but it was an abuse of power. The program left me permanently traumatised.

In my life experience, conversion practices not only occur within programs, but within the medical system, religious based schools and facilitated by people who I should have been able to trust.

I am unable to describe the psychological and emotional harm caused. I questioned my reality and had no agency over my thoughts.

I'm committed to rebuilding my life and gaining a sense of autonomy and agency for the first time.

An absence of legislated prohibition will allow the abuse of vulnerable people to continue. My liberty was taken away from me. This should not be up for debate.

This bill could provide an opportunity for peace of mind, not just for me, but for the many others who have also suffered at the hands of conversion practices.

I thank Jace and Megan for allowing me to share their stories to highlight just how important this bill is. We are sorry that you had to go through these traumatic experiences in order for this issue to be brought to life. May this reform be an important and validating step forward.

It is also appropriate that we acknowledge those who have undergone conversion practices who are sadly no longer with us today. This bill is for them. Today, the government makes it clear through this bill that conversion practices are not tolerated in the South Australian community and that LGBT people deserve to live freely and safely, true to who they are and protected from these harmful practices. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure.

4—Meaning of conversion practice

This clause defines a conversion practice as a practice, treatment or sustained effort that consists of more than 1 event or occurs on more than 1 occasion, and that is directed to an individual on the basis of their sexual orientation or gender identity and is directed to changing or suppressing that sexual orientation or gender identity.

5—Objects

This clause outlines the objects of the measure.

Part 2—Offences in relation to conversion practices

6—Offence to engage in conversion practice that causes mental or physical harm

A person who provides or delivers a conversion practice to an individual intending to change or suppress the individual's sexual orientation or gender identity and who causes serious harm to the individual is guilty of an offence punishable by 5 years imprisonment.

7—Offence to take individual from SA, or engage person outside SA, for conversion practices

A person who takes an individual from SA, or arranges for the individual to be taken from SA, intending that a conversion practice be delivered or provided to the individual outside SA or who engages a person outside SA to provide or deliver a conversion practice to an individual in SA, is guilty of an offence punishable by imprisonment for 3 years or a fine of \$15,000, or both.

Part 3—Miscellaneous

8—Review of Act

A review of the Act must be conducted after 3 years.

9—Regulations

This is a regulation making power.

Schedule 1—Related amendment of *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*

1—Insertion of section 86A

Proposed section 86A provides that it is unlawful for a person to provide or deliver a conversion practice to an individual or to arrange for a person to provide or deliver a conversion practice to an individual.

2—Amendment of section 93—Making of complaints

If a complaint alleges a contravention of section 86A by a registered health practitioner in the course of their practice, the Commissioner must refer the complaint to the relevant health complaints entity (and the Commissioner may not proceed to investigate or otherwise deal with the complaint under the *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*).

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:30): First of all, can I say thank you so much to the Deputy Premier for her really important words and explanation of this incredibly important bill and also, Deputy Premier, for the sheer compassion that you have brought as you introduced this bill and that you bring to everything that you do in this house and indeed everything that you do in our community.

I also want to thank the Attorney-General and his team for their incredible work towards this bill that is being introduced today, as well as the Minister for Human Services and her team and the ministerial advisory group that I know has worked towards this moment for such a very long time. I also want to honour and say thank you to everybody who is with us in the gallery today. Thank you so much for staying the course towards this incredibly important moment today and thank you for your enduring advocacy. I know so many of you have so incredibly and bravely shared your stories that have helped us get to this moment today. Thank you so much for being here and for your voices.

We often say that our state prides itself on being a welcoming, inclusive community. These laws speak to that. They will ensure that we are rightly protecting members of our community, especially children, from harm. Through this bill I hope that our South Australian government sends a really clear message to our LGBTIQ community that you are loved, you are seen and you are always accepted just the way you are.

As the Deputy Premier articulated, this damaging practice that this bill rightly deals with is a form of abuse that seeks to force members of community to abandon who they are under the guise of saving or helping them. This bill absolutely ensures that this practice is rightly outlawed. Perpetrators who cause serious harm to the person subjected to this abhorrent practice will face up to five years in jail. Individuals who either try to take or arrange to have someone taken from the state for this purpose will face up to three years in jail, or a fine, or both. This proposed law also allows those subject to these practices to bring a complaint to the equal opportunity commissioner, with enforceable remedies ultimately available through the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

As the Deputy Premier outlined, this bill really clearly deals with a terribly harmful practice, and rightly so, but it also does so very much more. I am deeply passionate about representing our community, about amplifying the voices of community and particularly the voices of those who sometimes go unheard. There are many things that guide me when we consider issues in this place that impact people across our state, like this one before us today. Again, the voices of people who need us to listen absolutely guides me.

I am also guided by my faith and what my faith tells me is that in everything we do in this place, in everything that we do in our community, love and acceptance of all people must always be paramount and that is, I think, absolutely what this bill privileges.

I thank all those who have advocated for this bill for such a very long time: SARAA, Equality Australia, Rainbow Labor, Pride of the South in our local southern community and so many individuals and other organisations joining together right across state borders as well. As the Deputy Premier said: this bill is for you. This bill is for those we have tragically lost after an experience of being subject to these horrific practices. At the core of this bill is love and acceptance for everyone in our community and I commend it to the house.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (16:36): I, too, rise in support of this bill. I want to open my remarks to echo to every member of the LGBTIQA+ community the words of our Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC, in the other place when he said, 'You are loved just the way you are.'

As the member for Adelaide and as the co-founder of the Parliamentary Friends of the LGBTIQA+ Community, which I established with the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place, I want to express how proud and pleased I am to speak on this legislation today. It is being delivered on the cusp of the 49th anniversary of the Dunstan Labor government's decriminalisation of homosexuality. This bill is about stopping the harm caused by damaging conversion practices which seek to change or suppress a person's sexual orientation or gender identity.

During the summer I was proud to stand with my Rainbow Labor colleagues at their stall at Feast Picnic in the Park, encouraging people to sign a petition to support the ban of conversion practices. Only a few months ago I proudly attended the Rainbow Advocacy Alliance's IDAHOBIT event, the International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia Intersexphobia and Transphobia, with my colleagues Catherine Hutchesson and the Hon. Nat Cook.

We came together at Palace Nova to watch the film *Prayers for Bobby*. I challenge anyone to go and watch this film and not be impacted by the themes in this film. It is based on the true story of Mary Griffith who, due to her religious intolerances, lost her gay son through death by suicide. It was an incredibly emotional evening, but a reminder that, together, we need to continue to fight for the rights of the LGBTIQA+ community.

This bill delivers on our election commitment and will bring South Australia in line with other jurisdictions, including New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT, which have introduced similar laws. This bill is modelled closely on the New South Wales laws which passed into law earlier this year. It is commonsense reform that protects members of the LGBTIQA+ community, especially children, from harm caused by the false idea that the way they identify can be changed.

As a mother of two young children, who I love with all my heart, I want them to grow up in a world knowing that they are loved just the way they are—that all of you are loved just the way you are. I want to thank all of you for being here in the gallery today. I know you live such busy lives but by being here and supporting the introduction of this bill means so much to us. Just you being here means very much to us.

I want to thank the Rainbow Advocacy Alliance, Equality Australia, Rainbow Labor—Tamsin Anspach is here; thank you—and all our parliamentary colleagues, Nat, Katrine, Susan and Kyam, for your support. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (16:39): I am absolutely delighted to stand here today and support this bill. I will just speak from the heart and thank all of you for sharing the powerful stories that you have shared with me.

This has been not just a journey of recent days, weeks or even years. If we reflect on the historical journey of South Australia and, indeed, Australia, we can look at many milestones that mean something to the LGBTIQ+ community in many different ways. This will become one of those milestones. This will become one of those times in history where we in South Australia can reflect with pride, with true liberation of our thoughts and ideas, that we are saying everybody is equal, and nobody should be pressured to feel, to believe, to act or to do anything that they do not innately feel is right.

I am so proud to have worked not just now but for many years with so many members of our community to make love be equal for all of us. There is nothing that I can reflect on that makes me feel more pride than I do today.

I have been able to contribute to a few things along with colleagues over a number of years now. I reflect back quickly to ensuring that PrEP was available, ensuring that we provided pre-exposure prophylaxis to the homosexual community. I reflect on times when I, as a healthcare worker before entering this place, would deal with many sensitive matters for people who were hiding a reality in their life because they were ashamed, but mostly because they were afraid.

This is a time when we, together, as a community, say no more—no more having to be afraid, no more feeling like somebody is going to be able to, within the law, pressure you to be different than what you are.

I am afraid I will miss thanking somebody, but there are a couple of particular groups that I want to really thank: Equality Australia, of course, and our beautiful comrades in Rainbow Labor, who keep the pressure up constantly and remind us as elected members that we are elected to represent you and your values and beliefs. To do that is something that is a great tribute to you.

About six years ago, I made it very clear that I would do everything I could to ensure that we legislatively banned conversion practice. I have worked very hard, but no harder than the rest of you, to ensure the language is right, that we do not use the word 'therapy'. There is nothing therapeutic about conversion practice. I have worked very hard to try to represent truly what is needed here, and I could not have done it without all the support, help and advice from our rainbow community and particularly SARAA. It is a body that I work very closely with, which I am so pleased is connected with the Department of Human Services to help us meet that inclusive agenda across our state.

I think what we see now as well is a culmination of us being able to bring together members of parliament that really do represent a diverse community in its thinking and a strong community that is absolutely uncompromising in what we think and how we are able to advocate on your behalf.

The Deputy Premier, Susan Close, is a great warrior for social justice issues. I do not think we would have come this far without Susan and also the Attorney-General, Mr Kyam Maher, in the other place helping us to bring together this thinking and this organised way of being able to demonstrate that we can do these brave and bold policy ideas.

My friend, Katrine Hildyard, member for Reynell, has been an absolute warrior for diverse communities and particularly the LGBTIQ+ community since coming into parliament and before. All these excellent people around me have all believed that a voice is important and a voice directly to us is so vital, so my ministerial advisory council that we established determined to make sure we had the right information coming directly to us. You need to know that this has happened because of you.

On behalf of all the other advocacy groups in our community, you have pulled back together and those powerful stories, I know, have helped to inform that. Thank you so much. Thank you on behalf of my community that I represent as well. I know that they will be very pleased to see that this is coming to fruition. I cannot wait to see it pass here and in the other place.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (16:45): I stand in support of the bill. It is, from what I can recall, the first bill to expand rights for the LGBTIQ+ community put to this parliament by Labor since Michael Atkinson brought the domestic partners bill, which was considered as a joke at the time because it had the effect of simply—

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The minister is saying that we did this together.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We didn't even know about this until it was in the media yesterday and—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Unley, can you resume your seat for a second. Members on my right, I think we will have some decorum. Given the seriousness of the matter we are discussing, I would appreciate we give it the dignity it deserves and don't interrupt. You can disagree civilly during the debate.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you for your protection, sir. This is an important issue. It is important to me, it is important to the people in the gallery and it is important to so many other people who are aware of the struggles that people from the LGBTIQA+ community have suffered for multiple generations—for the history of mankind in many societies.

Getting back to what I was saying before, this is the first bill for this community since the domestic partners bill. I just want to remind people that this was in the mid/early 2000s—I think it was about 2008 when the domestic partners bill came to the parliament. There was a lot of pressure at the time to recognise same-sex relationships. What the conservative former Attorney-General at the time did, Michael Atkinson, was equate the relationship of two siblings living together with that of two lovers of the same sex living together. It was an appalling bill. It was all that was available for the community at the time. They took it, of course, but it was all that was available at the time.

It was not until 12 years later that Vickie Chapman brought in a bill here so that South Australia would no longer be the last state that still allowed people to get a lesser sentence under the gay defence. If you assaulted somebody or you killed somebody because they were of the same sex and they made a proposition to you and you were so offended by that it was a justification for killing them and they got a lesser defence. That is no longer a law in South Australia, thanks to Vickie Chapman, the former Liberal Attorney-General.

I know that this was a promise that was made three years ago by the Labor Party and it is here now, not two years ago, not one year ago, here now, and the Labor Party, the government will not even allow a week for members of parliament to receive the bill. The bill was only given to me after it was tabled by the minister about half an hour ago.

I have had a quick look at it, and I will want to go into committee to ask some questions because I am particularly curious about some of the examples that are given under the religious exemptions where certain actions under a religious banner are not seen as conversion therapy. Particularly in the biggest Christian country in the world, the United States of America, we see some extreme views of the Christian religion and we see the hell that gay children go through by organisations that say that they care for them and love them. Conversion therapy is also known as—

The Hon. N.F. Cook: Practice.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Conversion therapy is a practice, yes.

The Hon. N.F. Cook: It's offensive to call it conversion therapy.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: If you do not mind, I sat here and listened to you.

The Hon. N.F. Cook: I didn't try to rewrite history, mate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister on my right, I have asked politely that we try to maintain the decorum. I will now put you on notice, minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: You are so tiny, aren't you? So tiny.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: This is a big issue, and you are worried about the nuances. You are so tiny. It is also known as reparative therapy. It is a set of practices aimed at changing an individual's sexual orientation or gender identity. It is based on a misguided belief that being LGBTIQA+ is a disorder that can be cured; however, it is neither scientifically valid nor ethically justifiable. The harmful consequences of these practices are well documented and today I share why conversion therapy is dangerous and why it should be banned.

Firstly, conversion therapy is rooted in a false premise. The major medical and psychological organisations, including the American Psychological Association, the Australian Psychological Society and the World Health Organization, all unequivocally condemn conversion therapy. They recognise that sexual orientation and gender identity are intrinsic aspects of who we are and that attempting to change them is both ineffective and harmful.

The danger of conversion therapy lies not only in its ineffectiveness but also in its profound psychological harm. Individuals subjected to conversion therapy often experience increased levels of depression, anxiety and suicidal thoughts. Studies have shown that those who undergo conversion therapy are significantly more likely to suffer from mental health issues compared to their peers who are accepted and supported for who they are.

Let me share some examples of why conversion therapy is particularly harmful with a focus on reports from Australia. In Australia, there have been several disturbing accounts of the effects of conversion therapy. For instance, the Brisbane Youth Service reports a case where a young person was subjected to conversion practices by a religious organisation. This individual, who had been confident and self-assured before the therapy, developed severe depression and self-harming behaviours during and after the therapy. The therapy not only failed to change the person's sexual orientation—duh—but also aggravated their mental health issues.

Another example comes from Victoria, where a former participant of conversion practice spoke out about their experience. The individual was subjected to intense psychological pressure to change their sexual orientation, which included humiliation and shaming tactics. The emotional trauma inflicted with these practices led to a prolonged struggle with self-worth and identity, resulting in long-term psychological scars.

These cases are not isolated. They reflect a broader pattern of harm associated with conversion therapy. It is important to recognise that the suffering is not limited to those who are directly involved. Families are also affected as they witness their loved one's distress and struggle. Sometimes they fall victim to peer pressure, particularly in some religious groups.

Furthermore, conversion therapy contributes to a broader social stigma against the LGBTIQ+ community and individuals. It perpetuates the notion that being LGBTIQ+ is something to be fixed or hidden, rather than celebrated and accepted. This stigma can discourage individuals from seeking support and can lead to a hostile environment where LGBTIQ+ people feel that they must hide who they actually are.

This is a concern that I know many have about the rush of this bill through the parliament today. Not bringing the community with you, not allowing participation and debate and consultation in this bill could set up a sect, if you like, or a sector of people who think there is some conspiracy: what are they hiding, why are they putting this through? Instead, this is something to be celebrated, we should be talking about this for weeks, not trying to ram it through in a day without fully talking about the changes and the benefits, and the what ifs. We need to have the discussion of the what ifs, making sure we are picking them up.

In the discussions I have had with the South Australian Rainbow Advocacy Alliance, they were surprised, as we all were, about this bill being rushed through the parliament today. They wanted consultation. As a matter of fact I got an email from them today saying that they would like to come in tomorrow to talk to me about the bill. It will be a bit late tomorrow, because of this government.

The normal convention is that a bill lays on the table for a week after it has been introduced and then it is publicly available. It is available for members of parliament and interest groups to look at the bill, go through it and give feedback to members of parliament, to the government, to the minister. This community was denied that by this government. I do not know why. Why did that happen? Why has this community been discriminated against when it comes to the standard process that is afforded every other interest group or South Australian citizen when it comes to debating bills in this place. They are invited to be involved in a consultation. I have been told that the South Australian Rainbow Advocacy Alliance are not happy that this bill has not been open for consultation.

Getting back to the conversion practice, given the evidence of harm, the ethical implications of subjecting individuals to practices that have been discredited and condemned and the broader impact on societal acceptance are clear that conversion therapy must be banned. Legislation should reflect the scientific consensus and the moral imperative to protect individuals from practices that are not only ineffective but also deeply damaging.

In Australia, some states and territories have already moved to ban conversion therapy. I am pleased that this move is now being made in South Australia. I want to make it clear that I support this bill. This bill will do the job, although I am sure it could be improved, but we do not know that because we have not had a chance to go out and ask you what is missing. What did the government miss?

In Victoria and Queensland, they have implemented laws to prohibit such practices. However, there is still much work to be done to ensure that these protections are uniform across the country and that those who continue such conversion therapy are stopped and held accountable if they break the law. I think that is an important measure. What a broad consultation process of the bill would do, of course, is help meet that goal of ensuring that we have uniform or as close to uniform legislation throughout the country.

We certainly do not want a situation in Australia that you see in the United States of America where, depending on what your state's restrictions are on abortion or on other social issues, you have to move to another state to have your health care dealt with because the state that you live in does not allow that type of health care. We see that particularly with the right to abortion and the ban on abortion in many of the southern states in America.

In conclusion, conversion therapy practice is dangerous and it is harmful. It is a practice based on discredited theories and it causes significant psychological harm to those subjected to it. The experiences of individuals in Australia and around the world underscore the urgent need for a complete and unequivocal ban on conversion therapy. From my reading of the bill so far, I do not think it does this. This is why I am interested in the committee process to try to nut out just what is exempt from conversion therapy.

By standing here today and supporting the bill, we are not only protecting individuals from harm but also affirming their right to live their lives as who they are, without fear. We have come a long way since the domestic partners bill. Before that, we came a long way since the decriminalisation of homosexuality in 1975. Of course, that process started earlier. The Hon. Murray Hill, a Liberal member of the upper house, was the first person in Australia to actually bring a bill to a parliament in Australia to decriminalise homosexuality. That, of course, is what got the process started. I think now we are more mature on these issues and we should be able to get the process right with the very first bill. A consultation would certainly help us do that.

I will give the minister some advance notice of where I am concerned. In clause 4 of the bill, from what I can gather, there are some descriptions about examples of health services or treatments that do not constitute a conversion practice. One of those is 'genuinely advising an individual about the potential impacts of gender affirming medical treatment.' To me, that sounds a bit unclear.

I do not think this will be the sort of problem that you would experience in Texas, for example, but what if that medical practitioner is somebody who wears their religious identity on their sleeve and their advice, impact or information is telling that person that if they go through this process they will go to hell? Is that still exempt under this example that has been given by the minister? Clause 4(4) states:

- (4) To avoid doubt, the following are examples of what does not constitute a conversion practice under this section:
 - (a) stating what relevant religious teachings are or what a religion says about a specific topic;
 - (b) general requirements in relation to religious orders or membership or leadership of a religious community;
 - (c) general rules in educational institutions...

These are very vague. I would like to see assurances from the minister as to exactly what they mean. If you are speaking to a group of people—not specifically one person sitting in a room under a hot

light—and talking about the illness of homosexuality, is that exempt, or is it only a conversion practice if it is a one-on-one practice rather than a group of young people, in particular? Let us face it, these are the victims of conversion practice, young men and women, teenagers and young adults.

I am curious about requirements in relation to religious orders or membership of religious communities, and am trying to think of how that is relevant at all to conversion practice. Either it is an illegal activity under the act or it is not, either it causes harm or it does not. If it is in the name of religion, does that somehow mean it is not doing the same damage as if it were simply because a couple of bigots decided to do it?

We know, from what we have researched and learned about conversion practice, that it is predominantly in religious communities that we see conversion practice. So I will be asking for explanations from the minister when this bill goes into committee.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the community for their advocacy—the LGBTIQ+ community, which has certainly grown in the period I have been politics—and the commonsense approach they take to their advocacy as well. They are a very respectable group of lobbyists and they deserve to be heard. I dream of the day when it is of no interest what somebody's sexual orientation or preference is unless you want to ask them out. Otherwise, what does it matter? What on earth does it have to do with anybody else?

It is something that is learnt, discrimination or feelings of discomfort against people who might be same-sex attracted or who fit within that LGBTIQ+ group of our community. I would like to see the day when it is simply not considered an issue for anybody, and that will only happen when you are successful with your goals.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (17:07): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Conversion Practices Prohibition Bill 2024, and indicate that this is a matter of conscience for the Liberal Party. In those circumstances, our party room would appreciate a briefing on this bill, or at least to have had the opportunity to have read the bill before coming in here today. I understand that as we speak the shadow attorney general is trying to seek that briefing and is working constructively with the Attorney-General's Office on that front. It is our hope that can be received before debate is concluded on the bill.

The circumstances around this bill being introduced are highly irregular and unusual. I do not understand why members of this parliament were only provided with the bill about 30 minutes ago when the minister moved it. I do not understand why we are suspending standing orders to complete debate today, and I do not understand why it has only appeared on the weekly program about a couple of hours ago. That is very disappointing with a bill of such importance.

I do hope we can at least have the opportunity to read the bill before concluding debate today. If we do not, I indicate to the house that I will be supporting this bill, because I support the objects of this bill, which are to recognise and prevent the harm caused by conversion practice and promote respectful and open discussions regarding sexuality and gender. Those are objects I am very happy to support. The rest of the bill I have not had the opportunity to read or understand. I hope I get the opportunity to do so before the conclusion of this debate or that members might have the opportunity to do so between the houses.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (17:10): I am pleased to close debate in order to make progress to get this piece of legislation into law. I am grateful for the contributions, particularly of course from the people on this side of the chamber who always speak so eloquently and emotionally not only from the heart but also from the head about what is right to do.

I am grateful that there has been an indication, at least in principle, of general support for the concept of not having conversion practices in South Australia from the two speakers from the opposition. I note, however, that as it has been declared a conscience vote we will have a variety of views being expressed at some point on this subject.

I have always found that the member for Unley has been a strong ally on issues relating to social justice, in particular those relating to the LGBTIQ+ community, and so I was a little

disappointed that there was a lead-off in trying to make this a party political challenge. It was a little inaccurate as well. I know that my good friend the member for Reynell in a previous incarnation under the Weatherill government was involved in, I think, some four pieces of legislation that were about extending greater rights. I do not say that to try to continue to do pointscore but simply to make sure that the record is aware that there were, particularly on surrogacy and reproduction—

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard: Relationships register.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Relationships register, which of course has beautifully been largely surpassed by marriage. I was also involved in a piece of legislation that enabled adoption to be extended to same-sex. Again, it is not about trying to do the pointscore but simply that it is unfortunate that a party political attack attempt was made in the context of what is such an important and seriously quite beautiful piece of legislation.

I say that recognising that there will be some people, particularly I imagine those who have suffered so badly from the experience or have loved ones who have, who would wish it to be slightly different, who may wish to have seen something more and something slightly different. The art of the democracy in the form that we have it, is that we seek to gain sufficient support in order to carry legislation through. I pay enormous credit to the Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher from the other place, in his capability to push legislation as far as it can go and yet remain a piece of legislation that will gain support. I pay tribute to his capacity to do that on this particular piece of legislation.

We, as the people in the gallery may have noticed, spend a lot of time talking and sharing and comforting each other on this side, and I really appreciate the messages that I have received from those who have not spoken and also particularly from those who have. My other very good friend, the member for Hurtle Vale, Minister for Human Services, I know has carried this particular issue for a number of years, and will sit with me as we go through the committee stage.

There is such a unanimity of strength that we experience in our team and it is the source of keeping all of us going. When one feels a little overemotional, the others will step in and support, so thank you for that and particularly for the support when I was struggling with the second reading speech.

What is most important here is not our experiences but those of the community for whom we are making this change: those who have experienced it, those who have loved people who have experienced it, and those who we now hope will never experience it. I commend this bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Minister, are you prepared to take more than just three questions per clause, considering the shortness of the time?

The CHAIR: It is actually not her say, it is my say.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Are you, sir, prepared to allow additional questions per clause? I am not sure that I will need them but I may.

The CHAIR: I am happy to take it case by case, so I am open to it. If I think the question is quite valid I will allow an additional question. If I think you might be straying a bit then I might say no.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Minister, are you able to advise when you told the SA Rainbow Advocacy Alliance that the bill would be presented to the parliament for the first time today and it would be started and finished within the one sitting?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I personally did not. This is a bill that belongs quite rightly to the Hon. Kyam Maher. I am informed there have been discussions for a considerable amount of time with SARAA about this piece of legislation.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Are you able to advise the house when they were actually advised then? Not when you told them but perhaps when they were advised by the appropriate minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No, I am not in a position to advise on that.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Your advisers do not know? You have different advisers on the floor here than the minister relied on for this bill?

The CHAIR: The minister has indicated that she is not in a position, which would include advice she is given, so we need to move on. I will take that second question you asked as a supplementary so I will give you two more questions.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Can you advise when the work on the bill began?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: This was an election commitment, so it was stated prior to the last election that Labor would be seeking to introduce such a piece of legislation, and I am advised that it has been worked on since coming into government.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: When was the first draft completed?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Given that the process of drafting a bill is a confidential matter that relates to cabinet processes, I do not propose to give all of the timing details. However, the bill expresses the intent that was in the election commitment and since coming into government the Attorney-General has had, as part of his program of work, to prepare such a piece of legislation.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: When did the department start consultation on the bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As it was an election commitment, the consultation, whether departmental or through the aegis of the Attorney-General individually, has taken place since before the election.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr ELLIS: I want to ask specifically about the definition of serious harm. In a briefing, which we were very appreciative to receive recently, it was suggested to us it would set quite a high bar for harm, so I want to confirm that that is the case. And I wonder whether the minister might elaborate on some examples of what would be considered 'substantial', if that is an appropriate thing to do, so specifically serious harm, subclause (b).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I appreciate the intent of the question to better understand at what point there is a trigger between harm and serious harm, given that one is civil and the other is criminal. Obviously the definition that sits here is reasonably useful, particularly in terms of mental harm: psychological harm, including mental illness, nervous shock, distress, anxiety or fear that is more than trivial. The question of the point at which that moves into serious harm is reasonably straightforward when it endangers a person's life. It is something that would be judged by the courts in terms of 'substantial'. While I appreciate it is a reasonable question to ask for examples, my adviser is reluctant to give one specifically that might then shape the way in which the legislation is interpreted. We think we need to let the courts do that.

Clause passed.

Clause 4

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: In my second reading contribution I referred to examples of health services or treatments that do not constitute a conversion practice. Dot point three refers to 'genuinely advising an individual about the impacts'. 'Impacts' is quite a broad term, because there are both positive and negative impacts, of course, when you are using the words 'impacts of gender-affirming medical treatment'. So if a religious belief is impacted, or if a religious belief is that you would go to hell, for example, if you went through this process and the doctor was of the persuasion that he or she believed that and that was part of the process of advising the potential patient of an impact of going through with that process, would that not constitute a conversion practice?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The reading of that dot point in the smaller font as one of the examples needs to be read in the context of the work that is being done under clause 3(a). What would govern that question of whether it is genuine advice being provided on potential impacts has to be read in the context of the health service being offered by a practitioner that is clinically appropriate under reasonable professional judgement and also that there has been compliance with all relevant legal, professional and ethical requirements.

If it sat alone as a separate example, you might well want to know what the line would be about what is acceptable in talking about potential impacts, but read within (i) and (ii) that is then more narrowly constrained by those legal settings about reasonable professional judgement and complying with the legal, professional and ethical requirements. In the end, as with anything, that could only be tested by the court. But in determining whether a case would be taken or what the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner in the case of these services might choose to do, that is the context in which that would be read.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Just to be clear, what if the patient was at a private hospital being run by a church organisation and one of the conditions of employment at that church organisation was that you were aware of church practices—faith practices—and you were expected to apply those? We know that happens, because we saw it happen to the Catholic-run hospital in Canberra when they refused to do abortions. It is now run by the ACT government. What if the religious practice was considered of equal value—or equal status, if you like—to the health practice of a hospital that was run by a religious organisation?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My understanding is that anything that was done on the basis of religious views could not override reasonable professional judgement and legal, professional and ethical requirements of operating as a health practitioner. As I say, that could only ultimately be tested through a court. But when taking a complaint, either by the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner or through the courts, the idea of a religious practice being seen to supersede operating in a way that was clinically appropriate would not be given support through the wording of this legislation. I am just looking at my adviser to make sure I have articulated that sufficiently clearly.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Clause 4(3) goes on to say:

- (b) genuinely facilitating an individual's coping skills, development or identity exploration to meet the individual's needs, including by providing acceptance, support or understanding to the individual; or
- (c) the use by a person, without more, of the following expressions:
 - (i) an expression, including in prayer, of a belief or principle, including a religious belief or principle;
 - (ii) an expression that a belief or principle ought to be followed or applied.

Just to be clear, are you able to perhaps rephrase that in a manner that would clarify as to whether a therapy or a practice of using prayer or scripture or some other religious tool would be exempt from the bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The section of the clause we are talking about, obviously, is about areas not included in an understanding of what conversion practice is. We have addressed the health context and now we are turning to ways in which conversations can occur to genuinely support an individual in their coping skills, their development or identity exploration to meet their needs and, within that context, also saying that a person is able to have an expression of prayer, belief or principle and whether that in fact ought to be followed.

That last qualification of saying what is not a conversion practice, that one I just articulated, turns in part on the clause 'without more,' so the expression of those views 'without more' is not a conversion practice.

The question is essentially what work is 'more' doing in that clause? Without having the wide variety of experiences, it is difficult to fully qualify what 'more' might consist of, but it would be examined in detail in the event of anyone bringing a complaint about their experience of being preyed on in a way that was experienced by that person as an attempt to change their gender identity or

their sexuality. Again, this kind of legislation, given the full diversity of the human experience and interactions, will be tested through its application.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I think that would be quite confusing for the average listener. I am just wondering what guidance a magistrate might get from reading the *Hansard* to try to understand the intent of the parliament, as to what it actually wanted, when it debated this bill.

If the Church of Scientology, for example, was offering services for parents who had children who identified in the LGTIQA+ category and who wanted them to have a different view of the world or a different view of themselves, would they be able to use their religious teachings to, if you like, try to explain their view of the practice that that child may very well be attracted to?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The advice I am receiving is that, if one is to better understand what the 'without more' term means, what is permitted is the expression of a belief or a principle that ought to be followed or not followed and that needs to be read in the context of the first subclause under 4, which indicates what a conversion practice is, which is something that is:

- (a) directed to an individual on the basis of the individual's sexual orientation or gender identity; and
- (b) directed to changing or suppressing the individual's sexual orientation or gender identity.

So there is the distinction between expressing a view and directing to seek to alter the person's identity.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Mr ELLIS: I have a solitary question, I suspect, minister. I have a question about causation. Clearly, in order to make out the elements of this offence in a criminal matter, the Crown will have to prove that the serious harm occurred as a result of the conversion practice. I am not an expert on this front by any stretch, so if I embarrass myself I hope you will forgive me, but my understanding is that people who are confronting quite a few of these challenges in terms of gender identity and sexual orientation can quite often have a long, difficult road through some of these challenges in terms of finding themselves and that sort of thing, and it is reasonably foreseeable that that long winding journey might have a number of adverse events that take place throughout it.

Does the Crown anticipate that there will be any difficulties in establishing that there was causation between the conversion practice and the serious harm and will reasonable doubt possibly be raised that it might have occurred at any number of those other adverse events if they, in fact, occurred?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The member does identify one of the many challenges in this part of the law and in addressing any challenges that people experience, particularly after some time has elapsed. Causation is a well-known concept within the law, and it is one that courts are practised at seeking to determine. That would have to be done on a case-by-case basis that the court was able to identify sufficient proof to identify causation. It will not always be a simple matter, as the member has rightly identified.

Mr ELLIS: I am potentially asking legal questions as opposed to drafting questions, so hopefully you forgive me here. Would it then be the case if there are multiple events in this hypothetical situation that would mitigate the harm and potentially drag it down under the level of serious harm, if that makes sense? If there are a number of events that cause accumulation of harm to build up over that journey, amounting to serious harm at the end, would those events then possibly be spread out over the entirety of those events thus attributing a small amount to each? Does that make sense?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that serious harm can arise from a combination of conversion practices and that it must be assessed by considering the totality of the conversion practices.

Mr ELLIS: Not all those events would be—and this is a wildly hypothetical situation—conversion practices. I do not have a specific example to share but it could be other adverse events that happen that contribute to the harm experienced.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: This is something again where the court will have to do work. It is about that concept of causation, so the court identifying that there has been a causation between the conversion practices experienced as opposed to other challenging experiences, which I think is what the member has been drawing out, that someone may have a series of complexities in their life and end up in this case where you would say this person has suffered serious harm in the course of their life. Not all of it may have directly come from conversion practices. Again, that is the burden of a court to determine whether there is sufficient proof that the conversion practices element rises to the test of serious harm alone.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 9) schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (17:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I appreciate the opposition may well have more questions and matters to put on record in the other place. Given this is an issue that has been a longstanding one that has required being addressed and was also an election commitment, it cannot have been a complete surprise that it might come up at some stage. I am grateful nonetheless for the member for Unley having asked some very serious and thoughtful questions, and of course the member for Narungga has also asked very serious and very thoughtful questions, and I appreciate those. I am grateful to the advisers who I had next to me who try to make up for my deficiencies in legal training. I look forward to seeing this bill not only pass through here but become law and be commenced so that we can address this matter once and for all.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (MOTOR DRIVING INSTRUCTORS AND AUTHORISED EXAMINERS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 August 2024.)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (17:44): I am the lead speaker on this bill. I will try to be as effective as I can.

Mr Odenwalder: We believe in you.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: You weren't here last sitting week, Lee.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The member for Unley will be heard in silence. He has the right to be heard in silence. Member for Unley.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you, sir. The Liberal Party supports this bill. The bill proposes a substantial overhaul of the driver training and licence framework in South Australia, primarily by transferring responsibility for practical driving tests from private authorised examiners to government examiners. Additionally, it mandates higher industry standards, including the introduction of mandatory GPS tracking and cameras in training vehicles. The reform is positioned as a measure to combat widespread corruption and misconduct within the industry as highlighted by past complaints and the findings of the Independent Commission Against Corruption.