

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 14 June 2022

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:02): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers and questions without notice to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

Bills

RETURN TO WORK (PERMANENT IMPAIRMENT ASSESSMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 June 2022.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:03): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (11:03): I would like to put on record that we the Liberal Party do not support the removal of this important return to work legislation. We the Liberal Party are appalled with regard to the handling of this extremely important legislation. Can you imagine what the Labor Party would do to the Liberal Party if we behaved with such contempt of the chamber and its important role?

The Labor Party have constantly displayed absolute arrogance to the parliament and to the people of South Australia. On budget day—budget day nonetheless—the Attorney-General attempted to ram through this important legislation without consultation with the Law Society, key industry bodies or even the very people who sit in this chamber. It is appalling and it must stop. We were only given a briefing on Friday, and our leader is receiving a briefing today as we speak and meeting with key groups. We went out of our way to ensure we were briefed and ready, despite the ridiculously short time frames.

We the Liberal Party value the importance of due process and respect the convention that a sufficient notice period in this chamber must be given. Now that the Labor Party has bowed down to the unions and dropped the business community like a hot potato, we are facing the possibility of being in limbo again—and for how long? Businesses not knowing what their premiums will be and our workers not knowing what the changes to the legislation will be—this is not good enough.

ReturnToWorkSA highlighted on 2 June 2022 that without legislative change a premium increase as high as 25 per cent to 30 per cent would have been realistic, given the magnitude of the cost impacts of the changes in the interpretation of the Return to Work Act 2014. In addition to this, as a party we were planning to move an amendment to this bill to lower the APR target from 2 per cent to 1.8 per cent, signalling our commitment to ensuring that Return to Work is suitable and affordable in the long term.

The change would also have required the ReturnToWorkSA board to report to parliament the need for a rate increase or change earlier and give sufficient time for debate and consideration, rather than ramming through the changes at the eleventh hour. This is not how legislation should be handled. The question many South Australians may be asking is: what have we elected? A government that cannot govern, as we all know where the strings are being pulled—by the unions—and is not looking at what is in the best interests of business and industry.

I would like to put on record that we do not support the withdrawal of this important legislation and would encourage the government to stand up and make the hard decisions and do what is best for South Australians.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:06): I am pleased to see that this bill has been withdrawn. I am pleased to see that it has been withdrawn because what we know—and it is no secret; the government has absolutely copped it on the chin from its own executive, from the unions—is the bill was fundamentally flawed. It was absolutely flawed. It used one case, the Summerfield case, as a response to a fundamentally flawed and broken Return to Work scheme. That is not what we should have been dealing with.

The process in this place was fundamentally flawed as well, and people have worked around the clock in this place to try to come to terms with a bill that we know is flawed, a response that we know is terrible in terms of the way that we have chosen to respond, apparently, to the Summerfield case. But we know that none of this has anything to do with the Summerfield case itself; it has to do with the basket case that is the Return to Work scheme, and that is where our focus should be.

The proof will absolutely be in the pudding now as to whether common sense has prevailed with this government, and we will be waiting eagerly to see what their next move will be in terms of how we address that broken scheme going forward. Attacking vulnerable workers, the lowest hanging fruit, removing their entitlements and their accrued rights to compensation, was not and should not be the answer.

All of us are equally concerned about businesses and their premiums. Nobody wants to indirectly impact them as a result of this, but the response from this government in terms of the process that we have just been through has been fundamentally flawed, and it was not the right move by this government. So I am appealing now to this government to come back with something that is a better approach.

It remains our position that everybody should be supporting a review into the Return to Work scheme. Picking on vulnerable workers, removing their rights to entitlement—the people who can least afford it, and it would have impacted them in their thousands retrospectively, regardless of the spin in the public and in the media—was not and should not be the response that we as a parliament come to on this issue. So it is time we stopped talking about Summerfield, because this has nothing to do with Summerfield and everything to do with a broken system that must be reviewed.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (11:09): I rise to support the withdrawal of this bill. I note that the Liberal opposition has opposed the discharge of a bill that is not their bill, that is a government bill. I note that this bill was not consulted on properly before coming to this place, and I would hope that this will be the last time any legislation from the government has not been properly consulted on in an appropriate manner before it is presented to this place.

If the Liberals wish to pick up an unconsulted, inappropriate bill and run with it, good luck. I would say that they should also be questioning whether or not the lazy politics of this was workers and the unions having the Labor Party do their bidding at the last minute, and that all employers actually had a position of supporting this legislation is one based on fact or simple, lazy, old-school politics, where you have assumed that because the unions say one thing that the bosses will say another. The bosses were not asked about this legislation either.

The self-insurers do just fine under the very same legislation. The ReturnToWorkSA board is culpable here. It is them that have put the Labor government in this position and when the ReturnToWorkSA board next says 'Jump' I hope the Labor Party response will not be, 'How high?', but indeed, 'Why should we jump?' Going back to the basics and doing the proper work that should have been done before this legislation was ever put before this place is now, I believe, what the government will do.

I find it curious that the opposition would simply fall into a: we love this bill, because it was unconsulted and tried to be rushed through the parliament, so now we are going to fight to keep it here. That is the most extraordinary response I have seen from an opposition in a long while. I hope their politics will get a little bit more robust and stringent than to simply believe old cold war politics approaches to this particular complex issue.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

SUPPLY BILL 2022

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I will be very short to allow others to have an opportunity to speak on the Supply Bill. The Supply Bill is necessary until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill receives assent. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Act there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the Appropriation Bill. The amount being sought under this bill is \$6.628 million.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Interpretation

This clause provides a definition of *agency*. An agency is a Minister, an administrative unit, or part of an administrative unit, of the Public Service of the State or any other instrumentality or agency of the Crown.

3—Appropriation

This clause provides for the appropriation of up to \$6.628 million from the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending on 30 June 2023.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (11:12): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill and indicate that the Liberal Party will be supporting it. The Supply Bill is introduced into parliament each year and it provides for the government to have access to an amount of money to keep the Public Service moving until the Appropriation Bill is passed.

It is essentially a means to an end until the Appropriation Bill passes through both houses of parliament. It does not go to fund new projects that have not already been approved through the budget process. It makes sure that the public sector employees are paid and the public sector does not just shut down while the Appropriation Bill is debated. It is important that the wheels of the public sector keep moving while the estimates process and interrogation of the Appropriation Bill occurs.

I would like to take the opportunity to reiterate some of the important things I have spoken on before in this place. Since the budget was released last week, we now have a clearer understanding of how the Labor Party does not consider cost-of-living prices for everyday South Australians to be an issue. For example, following the jump in interest rates last month, and following last fortnight's 0.5 per cent increase in the cash rate, the impact to be felt by South Australians with an average mortgage of \$420,000 is an extra \$136 mortgage payment per month.

We know that the everyday cost of living, our daily household expenses, are only going to get higher in the coming weeks and months as the reality of interest rate rises and the increase in the cash rate sets in. The Malinauskas government is yet to provide that reassurance to everyday South Australians that their future will be supported when it gets more and more expensive to cover bills and put food on the table.

We also know that under the Liberal government we achieved a AA+ long-term credit rating based on a stable economic outlook and the expectation of sustained operating surpluses. This

achievement was only possible due to the brilliant economic management of the Marshall Liberal government, and we can only hope that the reckless spending that comes with a Labor government does not jeopardise this into the future.

When you talk to South Australians, they want to make sure that their home state is the best place to live, work and raise a family. We need to keep the momentum going with job creation, a great economy, a booming trade industry and affordable housing. We cannot allow Labor to overcommit and overspend to the detriment of the economy and our people in South Australia.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:15): I rise to speak to the Supply Bill 2022. The Greens support this bill. We recognise, as has the Hon. Ms Girolamo, that this bill is essential to allow the Public Service to function and the state to continue to function, so we support it in that regard.

I will take this opportunity to make a few preliminary comments on the government's first budget. We commend the government on delivering on their election promises, and the Greens welcome the increased investment in health that has been long overdue. However, the Labor government was elected on the promise that they would solve ramping and hospital overcrowding, add new beds and employ more healthcare workers. The budget does ensure there are more beds available, but getting the healthcare workers is critically important and the challenges the government will face in that regard are well known.

We know there is a significant retention crisis that the government will face in terms of health care as well as a recruitment crisis, and in that regard I have noticed that the governments of Victoria and New South Wales have recently announced a \$3,000 'thank you payment' for their healthcare workers; \$3,000 to recognise the work they have done in terms of carrying the brunt of the first two years of this pandemic but also in anticipation of the significant work and pressures they are going to face over this winter period.

We know there has been a lot of COVID circulating in the community, as well as nasty flus and viruses that have been doing the rounds, so it is really appropriate that these workers are thanked for their contribution. I do wonder why, when Victoria and New South Wales have offered a payment such as this, the new Malinauskas government has failed to offer a similar payment for our healthcare workers in South Australia. That is something the Greens will continue to push in the days ahead.

We also recognise that South Australia is in the middle of a housing crisis. Adelaide is the second least affordable city in Australia when it comes to rental affordability, and there is a vacancy rate of just 0.2 per cent. The budget does not really tackle this. It does provide for just 400 new homes, but 400 new homes when you have 16,000 people on the waiting list is really missing the mark. That is really inadequate.

We commend the significant investment in homelessness services, but not enough work is being done to support people to get a home. I have spoken about this many times in this chamber, and will continue to do so in the hope that the government will finally take some action. Despite the government doubling the Cost of Living Concession, it is disappointing that renters will be receiving \$224.60 while home owners will be receiving \$449. This was a missed opportunity for the government to provide more support.

Just a few weeks ago in this place we saw the declaration of a climate emergency. While many of us thought this was an indication from the government that they intended to roll up their sleeves and get on with the work of dealing with a climate crisis, their budget tells another story. We have the investment in green hydrogen—which of course we welcome—but on the other hand the Home Battery Scheme and the Switch for Solar scheme have been scrapped.

Mr Koutsantonis has referred to the schemes on ABC 891 as being 'immoral'. I consider that language to be really quite inflammatory and over-the-top for a sensible scheme that was designed to help thousands of South Australians make greener choices. Surely, that is the sort of thing we should be doing during this period of climate emergency. To demonise a scheme such as this seems to be really petty politics. Similarly, we have seen the government cut jobs from the environment department, while investing \$70 million over four years in car racing, bringing back gas guzzlers to the Adelaide Parklands and across our state.

COVID, as well, has been devastating for the university sector. Yet, rather than providing a support package to the university sector that has been doing it tough during this pandemic, instead the government is allocating \$1 million to a commission to investigate mergers—more hot air on top of car racing, more hot air. This time it is a commission that we know is not needed, because if you talk to anybody in the university sector they will tell you that we do not need to see mergers. What we need is increased investment.

I am hoping, now that we have a federal Labor government and a Labor government here in South Australia, that the state government will advocate very strongly for the Anthony Albanese government to step up and invest in our university sector. With the Labor Party in government here in South Australia and at a federal level, the buck will well and truly stop with them.

There is also significant investment in this budget for public transport infrastructure. The Greens do support that, but more work is needed to be done in terms of expanding the rollout of public transport into the Adelaide Hills. I look forward to some of the information that will come before the parliamentary inquiry that I initiated that was opposed by the government. I look forward to hearing what some of those ideas are for improving public transport. Of course, we welcome the investment in a commission to investigate the end of train and tram privatisations. Members will be aware of my private member's bill to try to put further safeguards in place against privatisations in the future.

As I stated at the outset, the Greens support this bill and we look forward to continuing to work with the government to ensure that, through future budgets, they address the many challenges that we face here in this state. With that, I conclude my remarks.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (11:22): I obviously rise in support of the government's first Supply Bill.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: What?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I know—shock, right? It is also a very proud moment to be able to stand up and support this bill because it is a bill that delivers on every one of Labor's commitments that we took to the election, and it is a very Labor budget. It is focused on giving dignity to everyone who needs dignity the most. It is an equaliser for those in our community.

It clearly demonstrates that, unlike those on the other side of the chamber, we on this side of the chamber have the right priorities. Unlike those on the other side of the chamber, we are not out of touch with what South Australians were calling for. The budget and the Supply Bill are not just for the current but the next generation of South Australians. We are addressing people's current concerns but, unlike those opposite, when entrusted by the people of South Australia to represent them and to govern for them, we are also thinking about their futures. We are planning for the future of South Australians today, and our plans are for a very bold future.

In health, we listened to South Australians, and it was clear that there was no more significant immediate concern than having a reliable health system. It was an election based on the needs of our health. So we are reversing the \$400 million of the Marshall Liberal government's cuts to health. We have rejected the former Marshall Liberal government's \$662 million basketball stadium and we are investing that money into South Australia's health system. Quite importantly, \$100 million of that will be going into our regional health system as well.

We are funding 350 more paramedics and ambulance officers, new and upgraded ambulance stations, 101 more doctors, 300 more nurses and hundreds more hospital beds. We are committing \$1.5 billion over the next four years to the new Women's and Children's Hospital. We are investing \$294 million to provide better treatment for mental health patients, and we are providing more hospital beds, better expert care and support for the families of those suffering mental ill health. We are investing in regional health, as I said, particularly in communities like Port Pirie, Kangaroo Island, Port Augusta, Mount Gambier and the Keith hospital.

Something that is close to my heart is something that was called for quite often by an organisation called HeartKids. My little niece has congenital heart disease and at age six months was flown to Melbourne for heart surgery. HeartKids has been a great support for our family, so I am

very pleased that, unlike the Marshall Liberal government, who rejected the HeartKids' pleas for help, Labor will step in and deliver \$1 million over four years to invest in this very worthy cause.

Obviously, we need to invest in our kids' future, and we can only do that if we invest in education, because it is the greatest equaliser across our community. The Malinauskas Labor government's education commitments are founded on its belief that every child should have the opportunity to reach their potential and every generation should be able to enjoy the same standards of living as the one before it, if not better.

We recognise that we operate in a global labour market, which means that the quality of education we deliver here is vitally important to making this belief a reality. We are investing in preschools for children from three years of age and we are establishing new technical colleges, five across our state. We are investing in speech pathologists, occupational therapists and psychologists in our schools, to support children and young people with learning difficulties. We are appointing an autism lead teacher in every public primary school in South Australia, something that is warmly welcomed by many families across the state.

Because we recognise the unprecedented challenges that the COVID-19 pandemic created in South Australia, we are investing in local communities, infrastructure and local economies. We are easing cost-of-living pressures and we are boosting our funding to the Fringe Festival and providing a live music industry support package.

We are investing in local communities by delivering on local projects like the YMCA project in Walkerville. That was a community that was calling out for help. When we knocked on doors in that community, people were quick to raise as an issue that this amazing community organisation was going to be shut down because they did not have funding.

I have to say, it was incredibly surprising that the member then was not aware of that local issue, or decided not to support that local community group. It was quite unusual for the Labor Party or a Labor candidate to get any traction in Walkerville, as we have seen previously, but we had an 11 per cent swing in Walkerville because there was a local issue, a local concern, that was going unheard by the former sitting member.

Now there is a commitment to reopen and also expand that centre and bring back a community hub to Walkerville, one that people are calling for, and not just the people who used to use the YMCA but also the surrounding businesses. When you see a community group or organisation like the YMCA, where 6,000 people would go through the front door every month, when you see a facility like that close down in a community, it has a really big impact on the businesses that are across the road.

The local barber, for example, was really upset when those doors closed because they saw a 10 per cent reduction in the number of customers coming through their doors. As we know—a lot of us in this chamber are parents—when you have five minutes to yourself, you do try to utilise it as much as you can. People were dropping the kids off at gymnastics and going across the road, having a coffee, squeezing in their weekly shopping or getting a haircut. We were told that again and again, that once those doors closed those local businesses were impacted.

What was also surprising was that a large amount of money was put in to the footy club across the road by the former government. What was surprising was that what the local football club and netball club were calling for was an expansion of sporting facilities, but what they got was a clubroom. That was not what they were calling for. They were calling for extended sporting facilities. So I am really pleased that the footy club, the netball club and all the groups in that community have now worked together and are going to get a really great outcome with the investment in the YMCA site.

Going back to our bold environment policies, I can appreciate the Hon. Rob Simms' feedback in the chamber today, but it is also important that we deliver on bold policies that will change our state and set our state up for a very strong future, and the investment in our green hydrogen industry will do that. It will unlock billions of dollars in a new industry, one that our state needs to diversify. We have seen that Labor governments do invest in renewable energy. We have seen that with the world's biggest battery in Jamestown. It is a policy and an agenda that this government will be growing.

There are also quite a number of commitments in education, which I touched on before, but none greater than the royal commission into early childhood education. As I said before, it is really important that we are investing in this space. Many in this chamber are parents and we know that when we invest in those early years we will be better off as a state. We will not only see our children thrive but our state thrive as well.

As mentioned, we have made a lot of investments in the arts and in bringing people back into that community. Another community investment is the Adelaide Aquatic Centre. Again, it goes back to the thought of the YMCA and about where we are investing in local community hubs. The Adelaide Aquatic Centre is just another community hub that we will be investing in.

Something that came up again and again on the doors was the need to protect the character and heritage of our streets. I am really proud that this government has taken a bold policy. We took it in as a policy in the lead-up to the election and it is something that we are now delivering on—that is, the review of the Planning and Development Act and also the design code. This is a really important step to be undertaking. As the Hon. Rob Simms would know, he would hear on the streets very regularly that it is not working.

It is very important that we look into this and that there is a review into both the act and the code because people want to be able to feel comfortable in the streets that they call home, even looking at the design of the size of the garage. I am sure that many people in this chamber, if you have knocked on a door, will have heard that cars are not stored in garages, they are stored on the street because not many family cars can fit in the garage any more, so they are stored on the street instead. These are simple things but they need to be looked at because they will have a big impact on those communities.

Another thing I would like to mention is that we are creating chances for the cost of living by investing in free transport for seniors. This is another very important investment because we obviously made a commitment that we would not be privatising our public transport system, unlike those opposite. That was another very out of touch campaign that they put forward—that they would privatise our trams and trains.

On this side of the chamber we quickly realised that people need to have an affordable way to get to work in the morning. If there are just six people on a train in the morning, those six people need to get to work. If you take that resource away from them or their accessibility to it, or think that as a private organisation you might just cut that service because there are only six people on the train, how do those six people get to work? Public transport is there for that reason. It is an equaliser, as I said at the beginning. That is why this is such a great Labor budget.

This is a budget that believes in building stronger communities for our state. On this side of the chamber we believe in investing in our communities not only for today but for the future. I am very proud of the work that has been put into this budget, not only by the Premier and his team but all the staff who have been supporting him through the process as well.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (11:34): I congratulate the Hon. Ms Emily Bourke on her speech. It was a fantastic speech and very thorough. I, too, rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill being debated in this council today and would like to talk a little bit about the budget that was released by the Labor government just last week. It is a budget that confirms and puts funding into all of the election commitments, and there were many—well over 200 election commitments—from the Labor Party. I would like to go back a little bit and talk about how those commitments came to be.

In March 2020, the world changed, Australia changed, South Australia changed, due to COVID and the lockdowns. I will do something unusual. I would like to give some thanks and pay my respects to Steven Marshall (the then Premier), Professor Nicola Spurrier and police commissioner Grant Stevens, who played a fantastic role in setting South Australia up at the beginning to manage COVID. I think Steven Marshall's decision to put Professor Spurrier and Commissioner Grant Stevens in charge of the response and listen to the health advice served South Australians well.

What does not get a lot of credit was the opposition leader, Peter Malinauskas, at the time doing something quite unique in Australian politics, and that was to support the government, to listen

to the health advice, to give suggestions where they were needed, and on occasion the government did take up those suggestions. But it was unique.

What we saw in other states and territories around Australia was oppositions opposing just for opposition's sake. What we saw roll out in elections in that period in Queensland, the Northern Territory and Western Australia was that those oppositions who opposed for opposition's sake remained in opposition, and the governments were able to stay in because they were showing some strength and leadership in managing the COVID crisis. So Peter Malinauskas's decision to support the government was entirely the right thing to do, to allow the government to do what it needed to do to provide as safe an environment as they possibly could for South Australians.

What we saw in the almost exactly two years between the first COVID lockdowns and the state election was that South Australians, by and large, did the right thing and complied with the restrictions, and they did it not for their own safety but for the safety of all South Australians. I think that was a fantastic thing to see. I should not say I was surprised, but it was good to see because not everyone likes to follow the rules, but most people did in this scenario.

In that intervening period with COVID, we saw a government become very popular because it was able to keep the COVID case numbers down, but over time people wanted more. They wanted to have more things taken into account than just the daily case numbers, and they saw that the government of the time was making decisions that were probably out of step with what they thought, particularly around the priorities of the government.

We saw this, within the Labor opposition, as an opportunity to support the health advice but to put in place some policies that we thought were the right priorities for the future of South Australia. This was difficult. Being in opposition, it was very difficult to get the airtime to break through and to get the public's attention, but we knew that we could do that with good, well thought through policy that touched on what the public wanted. It was not a matter of doing what the focus groups told us to do, it was not a matter of just doing what the public wanted to do, it was a matter of doing the right thing for South Australians.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: The state was the focus group, wasn't it?

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN: It was at the end of that two-year period. It was a matter of doing the right thing for South Australians through our policy development. Clearly, with what we have been seeing with COVID around the world, right at the centre of what were the right priorities for South Australia and what the public wanted was someone to take bold leadership when it came to the health system, and that is why last week in our budget a very significant proportion of our budget commitments were based on the health system.

Another big one was hydrogen, on which I had the opportunity to speak and about which I am quite passionate, but today one of the things I would like to talk about is the health system and specifically frontline workers, those paramedics and ambulance officers who do an amazing job in what is a very difficult role. I always find it amazing with first responders that, when something bad happens, the natural instinct of people is to run away from it, but those heroes, those frontline health workers, those police, SES, run to the problem, and I have always found that an amazing thing and something which I admire greatly.

The ambos did it pretty tough in that period. COVID made their life more difficult in managing the fleet and keeping the ambulances clean. More cases and frustration from the public about dramatic increases in ramping made their jobs very difficult. Labor listened to the concerns of the paramedics, the ambulance union, and started developing a suite of policies that we took to the election and that I personally think had a big impact on the result.

At the heart of our commitments is a huge investment in our health system, and particularly to our ambos. The budget crystallises our election commitments and we will, over the next four years, recruit 350 extra ambulance officers, and we will build a brand-new state-of-the-art emergency operations centre, which will also house a CBD ambulance station and state health control centre. This emergency operations centre is long overdue; it will be the new hub for the ambos to respond.

The current place, as we heard in the Budget and Finance Committee, is past its use-by date. It cannot properly fit everybody in there anymore, and it is in dire need of an update. We are

very proud that this Labor government will be building a new emergency operations centre. The budget will also boost ambulance infrastructure by building five new ambulance stations, purchasing 36 new ambulance vehicles, completely rebuilding four ambulance stations and upgrading a further 10 ambulance stations.

It will ensure greater coverage across metropolitan Adelaide by deploying an additional 128 ambulance officers, resulting in eight new 24/7 ambulance crews. We will also support our ambos with an expanded senior leadership program, three more 24/7 emergency support crews and 15 more 000 dispatches, and all that will go a long way to improving the service that those paramedics deliver to the South Australian public.

This investment is not just in metro South Australia, it is also about investing in the health of rural and regional South Australians by recruiting 24 more ambulance officers across the Limestone Coast, deploying an additional 30 ambulance officers across the Upper Spencer Gulf, ensuring 24/7 ambulance coverage across Yorke Peninsula, recruiting 30 additional ambulance officers for the Adelaide Hills, recruiting 18 ambulance officers in the Gawler area and recruiting 24 paramedics across the Fleurieu Peninsula.

In the Budget and Finance Committee meeting that we had last week the head of the SA Ambulance Service was able to tell the committee—and I am happy to tell people today—their plans for increasing the number of paramedics and where they will be placed in regional South Australia. They have put plans in place for more ambos in Whyalla, Port August and Mount Gambier, with a proposed new regional medical transfer crew for Peterborough, and that crew will undertake interhospital transfers and patient movements to relieve the strain on the local volunteer crews. Another great thing about South Australians is that they will volunteer their time to those in great need, and that is a fantastic thing.

This huge investment in our health system and our commitment to ambos means that anyone who calls 000 should feel confident that an ambulance is on the way, regardless of where they live. We hope and expect that these measures that we are putting in place in this budget over the next four years will have an impact, will reduce the wait times for ambulances and will help to fix the ramping crisis of the previous government.

While talking about the ambulance system in general, I would like to take the opportunity to put on the record my personal thanks to two experienced and exceptional paramedics: Ash and Raj. Ash and Raj have been paramedics for a number of years. They were courageous enough to publicly put their heads above the parapet and put on the record their fears for the health system over the past four years. They copped a lot of personal criticism for that, but they, like others in our health system, are heroes who should be thanked and recognised for all the work that they do. They do an amazing job in the toughest of circumstances. As I said earlier, I have nothing but admiration for the work that they do.

Those ambulance officers, those paramedics, those 000 dispatchers, all do a fantastic job and will all play a vital role in fixing the ramping crisis. But it is not just about the ambos; it is also about the greater health system and the number of available beds—the issue of bed block. I am proud that this Labor government is increasing the number of hospital beds right across the network in both metro and regional South Australia, building a new Mount Barker hospital and making the biggest investment in over 10 years in mental health, which I think is so very important, with 98 more mental health beds across the state. All of these measures will go towards working in parallel with the additional resources for the paramedics to fix that ramping crisis.

Also on the topic of mental health, this government is committed to funding 100 specialists in mental health to form a pool that can be drawn on by both primary and secondary schools to assist students who are facing mental health issues, and I think that is a fantastic initiative. There was a lot in this budget for South Australians, but the most important thing and what people should be assured of is that Labor will deliver on what it promised at the election. There were well over 200 election commitments and every one of them is funded in this state budget.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (11:47): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill. The opposition will be supporting this bill, but I would just like to take this opportunity to

make a few comments about one particular area of government funding. It will come as no surprise that this area relates to primary industries.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions, known more commonly as PIRSA, is an incredibly valuable resource. It is important that we ensure this remains so. PIRSA is responsible for the prosperity of the state's primary industries and regions. Despite its key role and importance to our state, the Malinauskas Labor government took an axe to PIRSA in this year's state budget.

The Hon. Mr Martin spoke about the government's priorities in his comments on the Supply Bill, but it is clear that primary industries and the regions are not a priority for the Malinauskas Labor government. This is a shameful disregard for the importance of PIRSA and the importance of our regions, and it demonstrates that Labor is once again ignoring our regions.

PIRSA lost \$15.3 million in funding in the state budget compared with the 2020-21 state budget, on top of a \$15.9 million cut over the forward estimates as operating efficiencies. The government has abandoned the agriculture sector, and shamefully it has abandoned the sector at a time when our primary producers need our support more than ever.

Last week, the Leader of the Opposition and member for Black travelled to my home territory of the Riverland. His time was very well spent, as I joined him and the member for Chaffey, Tim Whetstone, for meetings with local businesses, local councils and community members. The key theme of those meetings was the importance of our region maintaining its pest-free area status. The continuing battle for fruit fly eradication was discussed at length.

The Riverland's Pest Free Area is internationally recognised by our key export markets, including the United States, Thailand, Japan and New Zealand, and we must prioritise the protection of this \$1.3 billion horticultural industry. We must prioritise keeping South Australia fruit fly free, and we must ensure PIRSA will be well resourced to achieve this end.

The Malinauskas Labor government's 2022-23 state budget allocated \$13 million for fruit fly eradication response in 2022-23. This is down from \$33 million last year and there is nothing across the forward estimates. This is at a time when Riverland growers last week lost access to Adelaide markets as fruit fly outbreaks continue. I do hope that Minister Scriven is true to her word that additional fruit fly outbreaks will be funded, given we saw yet another fruit fly outbreak announced late last week in Renmark. It is critical that the state remains committed to eradicating the current outbreaks to ensure South Australia can return to its pest-free area status.

At a time when fruit fly still is ongoing, Japanese encephalitis has been detected and there is a foot-and-mouth outbreak in Indonesia, which has our livestock sector on high alert. It does beggar belief that the Labor government would reduce spending on biosecurity. I encourage the government to look to the example of New South Wales, which last week announced \$164 million in funding to address the growing biosecurity concerns.

I will continue to stand up for our regions and our primary producers, and I call on the minister to do the same.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (11:51): I rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill 2022. I take this opportunity to discuss certain community health initiatives that the government has progressed since I last spoke on them in my response to the address delivered by our Governor when she opened the current session of parliament.

As honourable members will be aware, our election result put this Labor government back in power because the people of South Australia wanted a government that cares about the important things. Health was a critical area of focus of this government. While pursuing economic opportunities and continuing to communicate what our spending priorities are, we are a government delivering on our commitment to improve health services. Providing better health outcomes for South Australians and easier access to services in both our cities and regions is a top priority. The 2022-23 budget includes \$2.4 billion over five years to:

- ensure hospitals are upgraded across the state;
- more doctors, nurses, paramedics and ambulance officers are employed;

- a new ambulance headquarters is built in the CBD;
- four new priority ambulance stations will be built in Norwood, Woodville, Golden Grove and Edwardstown;
- four existing stations will be completely rebuilt and expanded in Campbelltown, Mount Barker, Gawler and Victor Harbor; and
- a further 10 stations will be upgraded.

Health was the mandate that this Malinauskas government campaigned on and it is no surprise that spending in this area is a priority in this Supply Bill: \$837 million will improve our hospital capacity across the state in our cities and in our regional areas.

During the past two years of COVID, media reports have highlighted an increase in people suffering with mental health issues. Mental health is essential to a person's wellbeing, family and personal relationships, and the ability to contribute to society. This government knows how important it is to build better mental health systems so that people with, or at risk of, mental illness can be supported when they need it. The Supply Bill will inject \$3.1 million over four years to increase mental health community teams. This will give more funding to our overstretched people on the ground, who are working hard to deliver the mental health services needed by South Australians.

I am pleased to be a member of a government that is not losing sight of the importance of our community health services. Community health services provide access to general services as well as those targeted services for the most vulnerable groups in our community. These services encourage good health through advising and helping vulnerable individuals with how to improve ill-health.

Through community health services people can get help to manage their existing health conditions and avoid hospitalisation. Community services also enable people to recover from hospital treatment in the comfort of their own home. Our community health professionals also address the high risk of disease in specific communities and help individuals gain access to important resources such as social services, health services and food banks.

This Malinauskas Labor government cares about supporting community health and values all the professionals working in the sector. Over four years, the Supply Bill will deliver \$13.9 million for medic nurses in custodial facilities; \$5.2 million for Nganampa Health Services for Gayle's Law; \$2.4 million for Motor Neurone Disease SA funding; \$1.8 million in pharmacist packages; \$1 million for support for HeartKids; \$900,000 over three years for 24-hour pharmacies; \$800,000 for an independent voice for patients; \$400,000 for Asbestos Disease SA funding; and \$400,000 for the Cancer Council's anti-tobacco strategy.

Living with COVID has shone a light on our community health professionals and the services they provide. COVID has also put an increasing demand on pharmacies and pharmacists to provide services to our local communities. Community pharmacists are the health professionals we interact with the most, whether it is renewing scripts, addressing a cold, or seeking advice on improving our wellbeing. This government knows community pharmacies and pharmacists can do more and want to do more.

A Malinauskas Labor government will invest \$1.75 million over four years to support South Australians and their pharmacies through:

- allowing pharmacists to conduct medication reviews for people with complex health needs and multiple medications. This will reduce the numbers that end up in emergency departments;
- providing mental health first aid training for pharmacists across South Australia, equipping them to better help people with mental ill health warning signs;
- improving access to palliative care medication after hours for carers and patients; and
- supporting pharmacies to improve patient access to help with respiratory illnesses.

For many South Australians, a pharmacy is the first point of access to health care. This means that pharmacists are in a unique position to identify early warning signs of poor mental health that might otherwise go unnoticed and undiagnosed. Labor will invest in mental health training for pharmacists, allowing them to identify and respond to early warning signs of mental ill health. The program will target training for at least 1,000 pharmacists and pharmacy staff, at a cost of \$350,000 over four years.

Labor will support pharmacies to conduct medication reviews for people who often end up in hospital EDs due to medication issues. This will apply to patients who have been prescribed a large number of medications or a high-risk medication or who have a history of re-entering hospital due to medication issues. Labor will roll out medication reviews for patient discharge from the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre, with over 1,000 reviews to be conducted annually through the program, at a cost of \$1 million over four years.

Labor will work with pharmacists and doctors to trial how community pharmacies can help improve patient access to testing and antiviral treatments for respiratory illnesses, such as the flu, and ultimately reduce the pressure on emergency departments. This government will invest a further \$150,000 to fund the cost of a trial to explore better ways that pharmacies can help to keep people healthy and out of hospital, working together with general practice and other health providers.

Labor will expand the availability of palliative care medications in pharmacies, ensuring that the clinicians caring for South Australians who are approaching the end of life can access the treatments they need. More than one in four pharmacies do not stock palliative care medications due to the relatively fast expiration of these medications, and regional pharmacies often buy and then bin the stock before it can be used. A network of at least 30 pharmacies will be supported to provide medication and support palliative care patients, at a cost of \$250,000 over four years.

The Malinauskas Labor government will also provide an additional \$900,000 to support three 24-hour pharmacies across Adelaide. This will enable these pharmacies to provide medication and care when South Australian families most need it and will help reduce pressure on hospitals. The 24-hour pharmacies will provide peace of mind for families and reduce pressure on hospital emergency departments, which are often a last resort for people seeking urgent medication and parents trying to manage their children's high fever.

I use this opportunity to thank the Pharmacy Guild of Australia South Australia Branch for their support in providing these great initiatives over the years, and Labor was happy to adopt most of their policies. I would like to thank especially the branch president, Mr Nick Panayiaris, and the two vice-presidents, Greg Scarlett and Mark Apolloni, with whom I have worked very closely over the last few years in terms of supporting the industry and coming up with these great initiatives.

Getting back to the three pharmacies that will be open for 24 hours, they will be chosen from across the northern suburbs, the southern suburbs and central Adelaide, with funding to support them to stay open after hours. The three pharmacies will be appointed through an open tender process, with geographical location being one of the key priorities. I know many pharmacies are looking forward to entering this process when it is opened.

The government is meeting its election commitments and will continue with getting on with the job of governing this great state. I commend the Supply Bill to the council.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:05): I would like to thank honourable members for their contributions on the Supply Bill this morning. I note the many reflections on the massive increases we have seen to the health system. A number of members particularly reflected on the increases to the Ambulance Service. I note that members talked about being in regional South Australia and the importance of members of parliament visiting the regions.

I would like to agree with those sentiments and inform the chamber that I was very pleased that more than a dozen ministers of the South Australian government attended the first country cabinet in more than four years in Mount Gambier just last week, which was a huge demonstration of the Labor government's commitment to regional South Australia, as opposed to the former government, which scrapped country cabinet. Whilst it is good that two or three members of the Liberal opposition visited a regional area last week, nothing quite substitutes for an entire cabinet or,

as was the case in the last four years, an entire Labor shadow cabinet visiting a regional area to hear firsthand from people in regional South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (12:08): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 12:09 to 14:15.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Fee Notices under Acts—

Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988
 Animal Welfare Act 1985
 Associations Incorporation Act 1985
 Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000
 Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996
 Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978
 Building Work Contractors Act 1995
 Conveyancers Act 1994
 Crown Land Management Act 2009
 Dangerous Substances Act 1979
 Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Dangerous Goods Transport
 Education and Children's Services Act 2019
 Explosives Act 1936
 Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017
 Gaming Machines Act 1992
 Heritage Places Act 1993
 Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981
 Labour Hire Licensing Act 2017
 Land Agents Act 1994
 Land Tax Act 1936
 Liquor Licensing Act 1997
 Marine Parks Act 2007
 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—
 Hunting
 Lease Fees
 Protected Animals—Marine Mammals
 Native Vegetation Act 1991
 Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989
 Petroleum Products Regulation Act 1995
 Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995
 Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982
 Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995
 Security and Investigation Industry Act 1995
 South Australian Skills Act 2008
 Water Industry Act 2012

Work Health and Safety Act 2012
Regulations under Acts—
Environment Protection Act 1993—Fees
Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017—Prescribed Amount
Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 1 of 2022—Official Visitors of Correctional Institutions
Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 1 of 2022—Official Visitors of Correctional Institutions

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

Fee Notices under Acts—
Administration and Probate Act 1919
Burial and Cremation Act 2013
Co-operatives National Law (South Australia) Act 2013
Coroners Act 2003
Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007
District Court Act 1991
Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993
Evidence Act 1929
Freedom of Information Act 1991
Gaming Offences Act 1936
Guardianship and Administration Act 1993 (No. 2)
Magistrates Court Act 1991 (No. 2)
Partnership Act 1891
Public Trustee Act 1995
Relationships Register Act 2016
Sheriff's Act 1978
South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013
State Records Act 1997
Summary Offences Act 1953
Supreme Court Act 1935
Youth Court Act 1993
Regulations under Acts—
Victims of Crime Act 2001—Fund and Levy

Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Fee Notices under Acts—
Employment Agents Registration Act 1993
Fair Work Act 1994—Representation
Regulations under Acts—
Fair Work Act 1994—General—Declared Employer

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

Stony Point Environmental Consultative Group (SPECG): Report, 2020—21
Fee Notices under Acts—
Adoption Act 1988
Aquaculture Act 2001
Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016
Disability Inclusion Act 2018—NDIS Worker Check
Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005
Firearms Act 2015
Fisheries Management Act 2007—Fishery Licence and Boat and Device Registration Application and Annual Fees
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013
Housing Improvement Act 2016

Hydroponics Industry Control Act 2009
 Mining Act 1971
 Motor Vehicles Act 1959
 Opal Mining Act 1995
 Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000
 Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016
 Police Act 1998
 Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992
 Regulations under Acts—
 Expiation of Offences Act 1996—Fees
 Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013—Expiation Fees
 Mining Act 1971—Rental Fees
 Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Expiation Fees
 Private Parking Areas Act 1986—Expiation Fees
 Road Traffic Act 1961—
 Expiation Fees
 Fees

By the Minister for Forest Industries (Hon. C.M. Scriven)—

Fee Notices under Acts—
 Forestry Act 1950

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about fruit fly eradication.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Keeping South Australia fruit fly free must remain a top priority to protect the state's \$1.3 billion horticultural industry. The Malinauskas Labor government's 2022-23 state budget allocated \$13 million for fruit fly eradication response in 2022-23—down from \$33 million last year—and nothing in the remaining out years through to 2025-26.

In an ABC article online on 6 June 2022 titled, 'Riverland growers lose access to Adelaide as fruit fly outbreaks continue', in response to recent outbreaks in the Riverland that have resulted in restricted access to Adelaide markets, and the budget allocated to deal with the pest, the Minister for Primary Industries is quoted as saying, 'If there are further outbreaks then we will access money to address those'.

My question to the minister is: can the minister inform the chamber what funding source will be accessed to provide future fruit fly eradication response once the \$13 million allocated for fruit fly eradication response in the 2022-23 budget is exhausted?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:29): I thank the member for her question. The short answer is that I will use exactly the same funding sources as the previous Liberal government did. The reality is, and I have certainly stated it publicly if not in this place, that as there are further outbreaks that is when further funding is sought. I am advised that the \$13 million that has been allocated in the current state budget is sufficient to address the current outbreaks through till the end of the period.

We are dedicated to trying to eradicate fruit fly in the Riverland and, indeed, in South Australia. The pest-free area is a valuable competitive advantage, particularly for international

markets. The \$1.3 billion horticulture industry is of incredible importance to our state, and that, of course, is why it's very important that, despite the wish to score political points, we don't make fruit fly a political football. It's really important that we have a bipartisan approach to this, and that's certainly the approach that I took when I was in opposition.

It's important to recognise and acknowledge the importance of the industry. It's important to recognise and acknowledge the very hard work that all the stakeholders in this very difficult challenge have been putting in. That includes my department, it includes the Riverland Fruit Fly Committee and it includes the many industry members who have been involved in the eradication efforts and in consultation around the best way forward.

It's incredibly important that we actually work together on this, because this is an issue not just for fruit growers and this is an issue not just for the Riverland; this is an issue for our state. It's important for our state economy and it's important for the many thousands of people who work within the horticulture industry and the indirect jobs that flow from it.

So my question could perhaps be—if I were to ask questions; of course I am answering them here—were similar questions asked of the previous minister in the Liberal government about the way the funding was established? Is it only now that there is some implied problem with reacting to outbreaks by going to seek the funding needed to address them?

This is exactly the same process—exactly the same process—in terms of accessing funding that was used by the former Liberal government. They have dealt with fruit fly for two years prior to the change of government. They accessed funding by going back to DTF if and when more funding was required to address these eradication attempts. That is exactly what I have been doing and exactly what I will continue to do.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question regarding the budget.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The Indonesian government reported at the end of May that more than 20,000 livestock had been infected by foot-and-mouth disease in 16 provinces. Foot-and-mouth disease is a contagious viral disease of livestock which, if present in Australia, could have catastrophic consequences for both animal health and trade. In the budget papers released on 2 June, biosecurity targets for 2022-23 included 'emerging high-level threats of Lumpy Skin Disease, African Swine Fever and Avian Influenza'.

My question to the minister is: given the current outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in Indonesia, why wasn't this potential catastrophic disease included as a priority or target in her department's budget?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question. While there has been no official declaration of foot-and-mouth disease in Australia, as mentioned there have been outbreaks in Indonesia. Despite the fact that there is no official declaration in Australia, the Australian government's Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment is engaged with Indonesia on a constant basis. In the event that an exotic animal disease occurs, it is centrally coordinated through the Consultative Committee on Emergency Animal Disease (CCEAD).

The financial support required is requested through Treasury and relevant federal agencies, which is also how fruit fly has been managed over the last two years. I am advised that, should foot-and-mouth be detected in South Australia, the State Emergency Management Committee would also be activated. We continue to work closely with the federal government, our colleagues interstate and our local livestock industry, remaining alert to any developments.

It is appropriate that we take great stock of any risks in terms of foot-and-mouth disease, because it is indeed one of Australia's greatest livestock biosecurity risks. The April 2022 outbreak

was detected in cattle in Indonesia. It has also been detected in East Java and Sumatra. It is indeed likely that it is now more widespread.

The Australian government has offered assistance to Indonesia to combat and contain the foot-and-mouth disease outbreak. This comes on top of the assistance already being provided to respond to an outbreak of lumpy skin disease recently detected in Sumatra. It is likely that this outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Indonesia will take many years to eradicate. This biosecurity threat will remain a high risk to Australia for the near future.

I have mentioned in this place before that a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak would have devastating impacts on Australia's livestock industry, with severe economic losses due to the shutdown of Australia's export markets for live animals, meat and animal products. I have also mentioned, I think in the last question time, the estimated impacts in dollar terms of a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak.

PIRSA will be working closely with our state peak industry bodies and nationally through working groups to contribute to both national and state preparedness activities. PIRSA's key areas of activity for preparedness will be enhanced surveillance to ensure early detection of disease and planning to ensure a rapid and effective response should detection of this disease occur in Australia. This will include a communication strategy to complement the national efforts being undertaken.

I am also advised that many of the preparedness activities being undertaken for a potential lumpy skin disease outbreak will address the threat of foot-and-mouth disease. An industry task force has been established to work on preparedness activities, and the resourcing required will be extensive. It is expected that foot-and-mouth disease preparedness and costings will be raised at national cabinet.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question regarding foot-and-mouth disease.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The New South Wales government has announced \$164 million in funding to address growing biosecurity concerns that threaten the agricultural industry. With outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and lumpy skin in Indonesia, New South Wales Deputy Premier and Minister for Regional New South Wales, Paul Toole, has said, 'We want to make sure biosecurity does not become the next big issue.' My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the Malinauskas Labor government follow the strong leadership of New South Wales and emulate its investment to address biosecurity concerns that threaten South Australia's agricultural industry?

2. What efforts are being made by the Malinauskas Labor government to investigate the development and/or acquisition of appropriate vaccines which would allow livestock to be vaccinated against the disease whilst keeping trade open?

3. What is her government doing to make sure foot-and-mouth disease does not become the next big issue for South Australia's livestock industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:37): As I mentioned in answer to the previous question, we are working closely with our national colleagues and also in cross-jurisdictional forums to ensure that this issue is addressed.

ABORIGINAL VETERANS COMMEMORATIVE SERVICE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN: Will the minister inform the council—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN: —about the 2022 Aboriginal veterans commemorative service and launch of the book titled *For Love of Country*?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for his important question. It would be a great pleasure to inform him of the commemorative service and the launch of the book. At the end of Reconciliation Week recently, on 3 June, I had the opportunity to attend the 2022 annual Aboriginal veterans commemorative service and launch of the new book by Ian Smith, who is co-chair of the Aboriginal Veterans of South Australia, titled *For Love of Country*.

I want to thank a number of parliamentary colleagues who were there at that service, including the Hon. Justin Hanson and the new member for Waite, Catherine Hutchesson MP, from another place. Also from the other place, the member for Dunstan, Steven Marshall, and Mr Adrian Pederick were in attendance.

For 16 years, the Aboriginal Veterans Commemorative Service has run to honour those who have and who continue to serve our country. While it was a very wet and cold morning, the sombre nature and the importance of the event were not detracted from by the weather. The morning started with a Welcome to Country and smoking ceremony by Flight Lieutenant Steven Warrior, followed by the keynote address by guest of honour Lance Corporal Joanne Simpson-Lytle, an Indigenous woman who is currently serving.

Those commemorating the service reflected with live music and an acoustic rendition by Katie Aspel of the Vonda Last song *For Love of Country*, and the background music later was provided by the Naval band, which was exceptional as always. Once again, dozens of tributes were placed at the base of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial, which included a number of wreaths but also, in an increasing and I think welcome trend, quite a number of new books.

The placement of new wrapped books at the base of war memorials as a tribute sounds a little different but this has been an initiative run over a number of years now. Once the service is over, these books are collected and donated primarily to regional Aboriginal schools that can benefit from these new books.

There were a number of Australian Army cadets present who contributed to the commemoration. It was pleasing to see so many young people, not just the cadets, interested in the service and interested in paying tribute to those who have served. This follows on from the service each year that happens on ANZAC Day. I have reflected in this chamber before about the ANZAC Day service on North Terrace that had a particularly inspirational component paying tribute to Aboriginal people who have served, as well as the ANZAC Day service at the memorial at the Torrens Parade Ground.

The morning finished with a gathering in the drill hall to hear from Ian Smith, who launched his new book *For Love of Country* about Indigenous men and women from South Australia who have served in the Australian Defence Force since Federation. I particularly want to acknowledge Veterans SA for putting on such an important event. I encourage members of the council to get online and see if they can find the book and do themselves a favour and buy a copy.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question on the topic of the proposed ban on live exports.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Prior to the recent federal election, the federal Labor Party recommitted to its 2019 promise to ban live sheep exports, a promise many in the community, including the Greens, welcome. My questions to the minister are:

1. Are you on the front foot on this matter?
2. What conversations with your federal counterparts have been undertaken since they have been elected, as have you, into the role of ministers?
3. What suggestions will the South Australian government be making to this federal move into banning live exports?
4. What role will the Malinauskas government take in any consultations?
5. What consultations have you directly had with any relevant farmers and unions for the live export industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for her question. Indeed, she is correct that the new Albanese federal government has maintained its commitment to this issue. I have asked my department to draft a letter to my federal counterpart seeking information about the consultation process, as I understand the federal minister has indicated that this ban on live exports will only continue once a full and robust consultation process has occurred.

Both as the state minister and also in partnership with our federal colleagues, I will be very keen to see that engagement with industry and that consultation process, and look forward to seeing the outcomes of those as we move forward.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:44): Supplementary: will you be the lead minister for the Malinauskas government on this issue?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): We certainly work as a team on this side of the chamber. The issue, of course, impacts on the livestock industry and therefore regional development and primary industries, but it is also a matter of animal welfare. My colleague in the other place the Hon. Susan Close is the minister with responsibilities for animal welfare. I am sure, as we do on this side of the chamber, we will continue to work as a team, looking at all these issues as we move forward.

LIVE ANIMAL EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:44): Supplementary: will you be the lead minister on this issue—yes or no?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): I just answered that question.

SUPERVISION ORDERS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding supervision orders.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Last week, Premier Malinauskas called on you as the state Attorney-General to review your decision to knock back a request of the Parole Board to keep a violent offender behind bars. The Parole Board chair, Frances Nelson QC, reportedly revealed that you denied the board's request to impose a detention order for a man who had breached an extended supervision order. She says the man was released, but was arrested three days later. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. What advice were you given in relation to the request, and by whom exactly?
2. Have you reviewed your decision since and, if so, what is the outcome of the review?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question and the opportunity to outline how the scheme, which includes high-risk offenders, extended supervision orders and continuing detention orders, works in relation to high-risk offenders. The

relevant act of parliament is the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015 and it provides for the making of extended supervision orders and continuing detention orders in relation to high-risk offenders.

High-risk offenders are those who have been imprisoned in respect of a serious sexual offence or a serious offence of violence. The express object of the legislation is to provide the means to protect the community from being exposed to an appreciable risk of harm posed by a serious sexual and violent offender. The high-risk offenders act does this by allowing for an application to be made to the Supreme Court for a high-risk offender to be subject to an extended supervision order on their release into the community following a term of imprisonment.

In order for the Supreme Court to make an extended supervision order, the court must be satisfied that the person is a high-risk offender, as defined by the act, and that the person poses an appreciable risk to the safety of the community if not supervised under such an order. An extended supervision order can be made for up to five years and allows for the imposition of conditions on an offender's release beyond the expiry of their head sentence.

These conditions can require the offender to attend treatment and undertake drug screening. Once an extended supervision order is made by the court, the Parole Board is also empowered to impose conditions on an extended supervision order under the act and to vary or revoke conditions that it has imposed. If the conditions of an extended supervision order are breached, the offender may be summonsed to appear before the Parole Board. After hearing submissions, the Parole Board may vary or revoke a condition imposed by the board or impose new conditions.

Alternatively, the Parole Board may detain the person in custody, pending referral to the Supreme Court, to determine whether or not a continuing detention order should be made. If a referral is made to the Supreme Court for a continuing detention order, the parties to that application are the Attorney-General and the offender. The Parole Board is also entitled to make submissions on the hearing.

The Supreme Court may order that a person be subject to a continuing detention order if satisfied that the person has breached a condition of their extended supervision order and the person poses an appreciable risk to the safety of the community if not detained under such an order. The paramount consideration is the safety of the community. Where a continuing detention order is made by the court, the offender is detained in custody for the duration of what would have been remaining on the extended supervision order.

On 7 June 2022, the chair of the Parole Board spoke on radio about a particular offender, who is currently the subject of a supervision order. The chair of the Parole Board stated that the offender had acted entirely inappropriately, where the offender had recently appeared before the Parole Board. Having had the opportunity to review the file in question, in early May of this year I was asked whether or not to support a continuing detention order on the basis that the person had breached conditions broadly related to their place of residence.

The breaches did not relate to drug taking or further offending, on the information put before me, and the conduct spoken of by the chair of the Parole Board was not included in the material provided to me to consider. The offender had one month left on the offender's interim supervision order because an application to put the offender on a second extended supervision order was at the time listed for determination in the first week of June.

This meant that any continuing detention order would come to an end when the second extended supervision order application was determined. That would mean, in effect, based on advice that was provided as to the seriousness of the breaches and length of time a continuing detention order would operate, there would not be support for a continuing detention order.

My office has held extensive discussions with the Parole Board and the chair of the Parole Board and the secretary of the Parole Board. The issue of not having all the information about the offender's conduct, particularly at the hearing, will be resolved through changes made regarding information flow between the Parole Board and the Attorney-General's.

I have also instructed my department to prepare an advice on the operation of the high-risk offenders act and the role of the Attorney-General in relation to the making of applications regarding

high-risk offenders. In particular, I have asked that we undertake to identify which body or person is best placed to furnish the Supreme Court with the information necessary to determine whether an extended supervision order or continuing detention order might be made.

GREEN TRIANGLE FIRE DETECTION

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Forest Industries. Will the minister inform the chamber on new technology being delivered to the Green Triangle region to support industry with their important fire detection and response capabilities?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in this matter. I was pleased to be able to join my cabinet colleagues last week for this government's first country cabinet meeting. In the beautiful Limestone Coast, God's country, we were very warmly welcomed and received by the local community.

I was particularly pleased to join with the Minister for Emergency Services to see the exciting technology utilising artificial intelligence that is being used to identify fires in forests and surrounding areas. This proven technology has identified and prevented well over 400,000 fires interstate and overseas. I am proud that the Malinauskas Labor government has budgeted \$2 million to replace fire towers with this new technology, which will greatly improve the ability to detect dangerous fires early.

This government is very well aware of the immense contribution that the South-East makes to the state and will continue to support the \$1.3 billion sustainable plantation forest industry. The Limestone Coast region is an economic powerhouse for South Australia, and the importance of the plantation estate to regional employment—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and the state's economy, domestic processes and the housing construction industry is immense. It is critical that we proactively protect this valuable forest asset as well as the safety of those working within the forests, within nearby communities, and visitors to the region. The delivery of this election commitment will provide the capability for landscape-level fire detection while ensuring existing fire towers remain serviceable during the transition.

This technology, which will be delivered in partnership with the Green Triangle Alliance, which is a group of the nine largest forest growers in the region, has been operating successfully interstate and overseas for many years. The system, which uses artificial intelligence to continuously improve the way it detects smoke plumes, notifies operators to the likely presence of a fire. The operator then alerts emergency responders, who are able to be provided with real-time images and meteorological data to help them determine the best and safest approach to combating the fire.

This new technology will augment existing efforts of government and the companies that constitute the Green Triangle Alliance, who undertake substantial fire mitigation and response activities, including coordinating a fleet of industry-funded tankers, including Vikings; bulk water carriers; slip-on units; quick-response vehicles; as well as access to graders, dozers and aerial appliances as needed, such as a spotter plane and a B2 Squirrel water bombing helicopter.

I would like to thank all of the staff for the information and the warm welcome we received, both myself and the Minister for Emergency Services. Indeed, that warm welcome was reflected across the Limestone Coast community during last week's country cabinet. It was overwhelmingly positive.

This government will continue to engage strongly with the regions because we care, because we want to listen to local communities and because it's the right thing to do. South Australians living in regional areas can be assured that this government is being proactive in identifying new technologies to keep them safe from bushfires, and they can be assured that this government will go to their communities and will listen to what they need.

KALIMNA HOSTEL SITE

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, on the topic of the Kalimna Hostel.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: In February 2017, the Labor government closed the Kalimna Hostel, a 24-bed residential aged-care facility located at 48-50 High Street, Strathalbyn. The following year, chartered accountants StewartBrown were engaged and prepared the 'Kalimna Options Paper', published by SA Health in December 2018. StewartBrown costed the refurbishment of Kalimna (1) as an aged-care facility; (2) as 12 independent living units; (3) as a community hub; and (4) as a car park, with the car park being the cheapest option. The consultants recommended retention of the heritage listed administrative building at 48 High Street but the demolition of the residential care facility at 50 High Street to make way for 35 to 45 car spaces.

In March 2019, the Marshall government announced a \$12 million upgrade of the Strathalbyn and District Aged Care Facility and the reactivation of Kalimna as part of a new Strathalbyn aged-care precinct. My questions to the Attorney-General representing the minister are:

1. What are the government's plans for the Kalimna Hostel?
2. What are the plans to support aged care as a whole in the district of Strathalbyn?
3. Does the Labor government admit that closing Kalimna Hostel in the first place was a mistake that taxpayers must now pay to fix?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her questions and will refer them to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

VANDALISM

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding vandalism of MPs' offices and other public property.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: On Thursday 19 May this year, the offices of five federal members of parliament were vandalised by the activist group Extinction Rebellion in an apparent effort to make a political statement, although that statement was lost on me, sir. This of course is not the first time that vandalism targeting MPs has been attributed to this group, with Extinction Rebellion protesters taking aim at Parliament House in Canberra, the Prime Minister's home and a senator's office in Adelaide last year.

I am aware that the penalties received by four of the five perpetrators of the vandalism of the Parliament of Australia and other sites, other public property, were fines in the order of \$20 each. One protester, who received two \$20 fines for his personal involvement in the crimes, stated—and I quote directly—'With two \$20 fines, the magistrate sent me a clear message: keep going.' My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. What actions are the state government taking to prevent similar acts of vandalism from occurring in the future to public property?
2. Has the Attorney-General reviewed the existing legislation to ensure adequate penalties are in place in South Australia to deter the vandalism that is encouraged and perpetrated by activist groups?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is an important one. The protection of public institutions and things like MPs' offices are important. I'm not sure if he is suggesting it, but one thing I wouldn't favour is differential penalties depending on the offender. If it's a suggestion that an offender, because they are a part of a group, should

necessarily attract a differing penalty, that's something I don't think we would apply elsewhere and wouldn't look at here.

In terms of criminal damage and interference with property, there are fines that are attracted. I am not aware of any of the incidents that were mentioned. I think the honourable member said five maybe federal electorate offices in Adelaide had some level of vandalism. My expectation would be they would be properly investigated and, if the evidence showed that there was a reasonable prospect of conviction based on the evidence, a prosecution, if that was determined by the DPP, would occur.

VANDALISM

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:59): Supplementary: Attorney, is a \$20 penalty in the instances I have outlined sufficient in your view?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary. I might have misheard the question, and I would want to have a look before I made comment about the entirety of sentencing remarks or a judgement, but I took the honourable member's comment to relate to something that happened in Canberra in terms of the penalty. That's obviously not a South Australian court, so I don't think it would be applicable, if I am understanding it correctly, to have a comment. I would want to see the whole context before sensibly commenting on it, but it doesn't sound like one that was from a South Australian jurisdiction, if I understood the question correctly.

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER FLAGS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister update the council on the recent news that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander flags are now flying permanently on Government House?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:00): I thank the Hon. Russell Wortley for his question and again will be happy to answer his question and update the chamber. It is fantastic news that for the first time Government House is now permanently flying the Aboriginal and the Torres Strait Islander flags alongside the Australian and South Australian flags at the front of Government House. This was made possible by works to install a new flag deck at the very front of Government House as you enter from the gates on the corner of King William Street and North Terrace.

Just as you leave Parliament House on the corner you will no doubt be able to see the new flags flying. This is a meaningful gesture by Her Excellency the Governor and the Government House team. A few weeks ago, as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, and alongside some other South Australians, it was a distinct honour to be part of the ceremony and to raise the Aboriginal flag for the first time to fly permanently.

Raising the Australian national flag at the ceremony was Mr Keith 'Chook' Fowler, a veteran of World War II now aged 102 years old, and he raised the flag very proudly. Raising the South Australian flag was Miss Lara Nguyen, a Year 11 student who is a remarkable leader in her school community. Alongside myself raising the Aboriginal flag was Tanya Hosch, the 2021 South Australian of the Year, raising the Torres Strait Islander flag alongside her daughter, Marley. For all of us it was a great privilege to be part of the ceremony at Government House hosted by Her Excellency and, as I said, I would like to pay tribute to Her Excellency and the team at Government House for this.

Government House is one of the most recognisable colonial symbols in our state and therefore I know that like other colonial symbols it therefore sometimes symbolises the hardships that came to many Aboriginal people when colonisation occurred. I think it is important, acknowledging that dispossession and the often brutal treatment of Aboriginal people, that we now seek to address that history. I think the permanent flying of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander flags at Government House plays a small part in that.

To fly the flag at the site permanently, to invite a senior Kaurna man to welcome guests to country and perform a smoking ceremony, and to invite senior leaders of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities from across our state played a part as well. It is a small gesture, but an important one, particularly in Reconciliation Week that was held from 27 May to 3 June.

Again, there were other members of this parliament who were at the ceremony, including you, Mr President, taking part in the occasion and that reflects well on the Legislative Council. The Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Attorney-General from the other place were also in attendance, as were many other important guests, and I look forward to continuing to update the chamber on ways—both big and small—that our state is continuing the work of reconciliation.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the SkyCity Adelaide Casino.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: National media is reporting today of yet another independent inquiry into the operations of an Australian casino. The Queensland Premier today relented after months of resistance and announced that an independent inquiry will be held to investigate Star Entertainment's fitness to continue holding casino licences in Brisbane and the Gold Coast after revelations of money laundering, fraud and illegal junkets at the gaming giant's Sydney operations.

The move follows months of evidence of criminal behaviour aired at the New South Wales inquiry into Star's Sydney casino, which has prompted an exodus of the company's executives and a recommendation that it be stripped of its licence. Similar probes were also held into Crown casinos in Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia.

At the same time, AUSTRAC has revealed it is investigating SkyCity Adelaide Casino—which has been confirmed today in the response the minister has provided—after it identified potential serious noncompliance with the Australian Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2006. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Do you, as Attorney-General, and the state government have confidence in the operations of SkyCity Adelaide Casino, given what we are learning about casinos around the nation?
2. Since forming government, what assurances have you sought from SkyCity Adelaide Casino itself that it is operating within the conditions of its licence?
3. What is preventing the government from holding an inquiry of its own into the Adelaide Casino, especially given the ongoing AUSTRAC investigation of the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services into the Casino and, more generally, the appalling conduct of casinos in other jurisdictions?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I am not aware of specific allegations, but this area of responsibility falls under the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, and I will certainly refer the substance of the questions to her and bring back a reply.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:05): Supplementary: does the Attorney, in his capacity as Attorney-General, have any oversight of this in relation to crime and public integrity measures?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:06): Specifically in relation to the Casino, that falls under the ministerial responsibility of the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, and I will certainly ask her about those matters and bring back a reply.

PETROL AND ENERGY COSTS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding rising petrol and energy prices.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Whilst many primary producers will try to minimise their fuel and energy prices as the prices climb, most expenses are unavoidable. For example, if you are a grain grower, things like putting the seed in the ground, putting fertiliser on it and spraying your weeds must all be done, and they all require growers to burn some diesel. It means the outlays are much, much higher and therefore the risks carried on the investment are much, much higher. My questions are:

1. Has the minister discussed with the Premier the impact of increasing petrol and energy costs on regional agricultural businesses?
2. What is the minister's plan to help regional agricultural businesses impacted by dramatic increases in petrol and energy costs?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for her question. Issues around cost of living, as well as impacts on particular industry areas, are constant discussions we have within the Malinauskas Labor government, both within cabinet and in the broader context. Members would be aware of a number of initiatives that have been put in place to address some of the cost-of-living issues that are within our remit, such as an increase in assistance for education costs for children and so on—all of which, of course, are experienced in our regional areas as well.

We are looking overall at a number of issues that will assist in the long term with assistance for energy prices in particular, and the hydrogen plan that we announced prior to the election—and which is now taking its first steps—is a huge part of that. We want to ensure that we have better, cheaper energy for industries across South Australia and that, of course, includes regional areas.

A number of the issues the honourable member touches on fall into other portfolio areas as well. I am happy to take those aspects of the question on notice and bring an answer back to the chamber.

ONE BASIN CRC AND CRC SAAFE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister inform the chamber about SARDI's involvement in the One Basin CRC and CRC SAAFE?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. SARDI is, without a doubt, a world-leading research organisation that the people of our state can rightly be immensely proud of. The work that it does, often in partnership with other organisations and other levels of government, is simply incredible. There is no other term for it, it is absolutely incredible, and it paves the way forward for a number of industries and learning institutions to build upon.

Today, talking about further developments of these kinds of partnerships includes SARDI's participation in two newly funded cooperative research centres, the One Basin CRC and the CRC for Solving Antimicrobial Resistance in Agribusiness, Food and Environments. The One Basin Cooperative Research Centre is led by the University of Melbourne and is a focused collaboration that is developing policy and technical and financial solutions to support and reduce exposure to climate, water and environmental threats in the Murray-Darling Basin.

The CRC has three interlinked programs to tackle major agriculture water challenges in the Murray-Darling Basin. These programs are named Foresight and Decisions, Technology and Opportunities, and Capability and Commercialisation. The federal government announced in May 2022 that the One Basin CRC was successful in its application for a \$50 million grant through the commonwealth CRC Program. A further \$106.5 million will be provided from the CRC's 85 partners

over 10 years. I guess, in hearing those figures, we can all get a sense of the scale of the research that's being undertaken, which is fantastic.

Over the course of the One Basin Cooperative Research Centre's 10-year term, research will be concentrated across four regional basin hubs around the country, being Loxton, Mildura, Griffith and Goondiwindi. PIRSA and SARDI will be playing a lead role in the Loxton hub. SARDI is a tier 2 partner in the One Basin CRC and will undertake research projects in its own right and in collaboration with other partners.

SARDI has been supported through an initial quick-start project within the CRC's Foresight and Decisions program, one of the three interlinked programs that I mentioned. In this project, SARDI researchers will model changes in irrigation demand for major irrigated crops across the basin and for a range of climate change scenarios. The project outcomes will provide a better understanding of the changes in crop water demand to support growers and irrigation supply companies in their medium to long-term planning. It will also inform other innovation strategies with the Cooperative Research Centre, including transformational planning, demands on technology and infrastructure and adaptation plans.

The second program is the Cooperative Research Centre for Solving Antimicrobial Resistance in Agribusiness, Food and Environments. That doesn't really roll off the tongue, so I will stick to the acronym CRC SAAFE from here in. In May 2022, the federal government confirmed grant funding of \$34½ million dollars to CRC SAAFE, whose 70 partners will contribute an additional \$115 million in cash and in-kind support. The CRC is led by UniSA.

SARDI is one of those 70 partners who will contribute to the antimicrobial resistance response for the Australian agribusiness, food, organic waste and environmental management sectors. Antimicrobial resistance poses a threat to the security and growth of Australia's food and agribusiness sectors and also, of course, puts our water security and circular economy at risk. One of the most important objectives of this CRC is to tackle resistance to essential antibiotics, antifungals and antivirals. If not addressed, that resistance could wipe up to \$283 billion from the Australian economy by 2050, so it's obviously incredibly important work.

Once again, I thank SARDI for their important work and for being involved in these important national projects and partnerships that really do have significance, not just to our state but also nationally and internationally.

AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Attorney-General on the issue of raising the age of criminal responsibility.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Last week, my office received a substantial number of emails, as I believe have other members of this place, calling for the age of criminal responsibility to be raised to 14 years. Just last week, the Tasmanian government committed to raising the age to 14, in line with the recommendations from the United Nations. This follows the ACT, where a similar commitment has been made.

The council of attorneys-general last year postponed the decision to raise the age, meanwhile children between the ages of 10 and 14 continue to be sent to detention. When asked about this issue last month, the Attorney-General told this house that raising the age is an important issue. He also informed us that, and I quote, 'on occasions the entire population of the youth detention centre in South Australia is made up of Aboriginal people'.

Given the Attorney-General sees this as such an important issue, my question to him is: how many children does the Malinauskas government intend to allow to end up in detention before it follows the lead of other states and territories and raises the age of criminal responsibility to 14?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is an important one, and I note his strong interest in this area. I think since the honourable member

last asked that question a number of discussions have taken place, and certainly over the winter break I will be discussing this with colleagues, initially in the ACT but following the announcement the honourable member referred to that I think Tasmania made last week about their intentions, I will also seek advice about what they are doing.

It is not just a case of changing a bit of the legislation to say instead of 10 substitute the number 14. It is also about what alternatives there are, what services might be provided to young people who find themselves in contact with the justice system. Also, I know that jurisdictions that are starting to go down this path are looking at whether there are any things that will stay included in the carve out. It is an important question. There will be further discussions over the winter break that we will be having with other jurisdictions, but we certainly continue, both myself and officers from my office and my department, discussions with different groups around Australia about this issue.

RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General on the subject of restrictive practices.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: As honourable members would be aware, restrictive practices legislation has been enacted in recent years for people with disabilities who are NDIS participants. Without a legislative regime to approve them, restrictive practices are unlawful. Under the previous government, work was being undertaken to examine what restrictive practices exist across a range of portfolios, including child protection, education, correctional services and the like. My question to the Attorney is: what is the status of the cross-government work into restrictive practices?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for her question. I will seek some advice and ask relevant ministers in other areas about the status of the work that the honourable minister didn't complete when she was in office.

RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:17): Supplementary: is the minister indicating that he hasn't actually been briefed about this, and is his agency still the lead agency?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): I have answered. I have said I am seeking advice.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: You don't know. That's alright. Just say no, you don't know.

The PRESIDENT: It is up to the Attorney-General whether you wish to answer. The Hon. Mr Martin has the call.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Martin, when we have some silence, please.

DUST DISEASES

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Will the minister please update the council on steps the government is taking to support organisations fighting dust diseases?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for yet another good question today and his interest in this area. Sometimes threats to safety are obvious, such as exposed wiring and unsecured load, or bullying and harassment in the workplace. Other times, the threat is hidden, such as with dust diseases. We have seen this with the scourge associated with the widespread use of asbestos installations, and while dust diseases such as work-related asthma and asbestosis are showing a downward trend, sadly we are seeing a new threat to workers in the increasing incidence of silicosis associated with engineered stone manufacturing.

In 2021, the National Dust Disease Taskforce concluded that every case of silicosis affecting a stone benchtop worker is evidence that business, industry and government need to do more to recognise and control the risks of working with engineered stone. The new Labor government was proud to commit \$400,000 over four years to two registered charities seeking to increase the awareness of dust diseases, reduce risk and create a safer community for South Australian workers and families.

The first organisation is the Asbestos Victims Association (AVA). The AVA was established in 2000 and is a not-for-profit organisation providing support for people and their families living with asbestos-related diseases, amongst other diseases. The AVA also offers assistance to family members, carers and friends, including through services such as gatherings of victims to share experiences as well as phone services for those unable to attend in person.

As I know a number of members here have attended, the AVA hosts the annual Asbestos Victims Memorial Day service at Pitman Park in Salisbury to coincide with National Asbestos Awareness Week. Impressively, the organisation is volunteer-run and a testament to the dedication of those volunteers to tackle this serious issue.

The second organisation is the Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia. It is a community-based charitable organisation providing information and education awareness to those who contract asbestos in the environment, home and workplace. It oversees the annual Asbestos Victims Memorial Breakfast held at the Jack Watkins Memorial Reserve, which is in itself a memorial to the man affectionately known as 'Asbestos Jack' due to his strong advocacy against the dangers of asbestos and in support of workers. He was an organiser for the then builders labourers union, and then at the United Trades and Labor Council before becoming president of this organisation at its formation in 2005.

Both of these are well respected charities doing important work to support people living with the impact of dust diseases, and it is proactive work to ensure that people are not exposed to dust diseases in the future. That is why I am proud that the government has provided a commitment over the next four years of \$400,000 funding to help them continue their important work.

DUST DISEASES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:21): Supplementary: is the Attorney committed to addressing anomalies in our dust diseases laws when it comes to their interaction with the Return to Work scheme to ensure that plaintiffs are not worse off under the Return to Work scheme as they would be under the dust diseases legislation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think she raised that last week and I can inform the member that we are investigating and seeking advice from ReturnToWork. Of course, the dust diseases are listed under the South Australian Employment Tribunal that hears cases where—if my memory serves me correctly—negligence has to be proved under the Dust Diseases Act 2005, which is different to the no fault Return to Work Act. So it was an important question to raise and we are investigating it.

SANITARY PRODUCTS IN SCHOOLS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney representing the Minister for Education in another place a question about period products in public schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Last week, the Queensland government announced that all its state schools would be given the opportunity to receive a dignity vending machine which provides free period products to students following a \$13.3 million investment in next week's state budget. The Queensland Premier correctly stated that access to essential period products should never be a barrier to learning.

Her announcement comes as new research reveals that period pain is taking a toll on girls' academic performance as they report not being taught enough about menstruation before their first

period. The study found that menstrual health literacy has a direct impact on young people's quality of life, health, academic and professional performance. The previous Liberal state government had the golden opportunity to lead the nation in this crucial area of providing free period products for public school students in South Australia and, I'm afraid to say, failed to do so in any adequate way.

My question to the minister is: given its support in opposition of the scheme that was proposed in this place, does the Malinauskas government have plans to follow in the footsteps of its Labor counterparts in Queensland and Victoria and make period products universally free for all public students in South Australia and, if so, when and how?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for her questions and I will refer them to the education minister in another place and bring back a reply.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:24): My question is to the minister assisting the Premier regarding her role. I ask the minister assisting the Premier:

1. Does she have an office allocated to her at the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?
2. Has she been allocated ministerial staff and, if so, how many?
3. As the assistant minister has repeatedly advised the council that she has no portfolio duties allocated to her, why has she been allocated an office at the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?
4. What is the minister responsible for?
5. Can the minister advise the sum of the additional salary she receives as an assistant minister?
6. Given that the assistant minister has no portfolio responsibilities, what value for money do South Australians derive from her appointment?

The PRESIDENT: Before the Hon. Ms Bourke answers, the Hon. Ms Bourke has been sworn in as parliamentary secretary and it would be proper to address her as such.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:25): Yes, that is right, I am the parliamentary secretary and I do not have any portfolio responsibilities. I feel like we have gone through this a number of times in this chamber. As the honourable member would know—you have been in this chamber far longer than I have and I am sure you have the same handbook that I have—I receive a 20 per cent loading, whilst the members on your front bench receive a 25 per cent loading, so perhaps we should be asking what the members on the other side of the chamber are doing, too, with taxpayers' money.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I do not have portfolios.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bourke will be heard in silence.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Thank you, Mr President. To use the fine words of a very fine Labor leader indeed—there have been many great Labor leaders produced, not only in this state but also the country—Paul Keating:

The institution of a parliamentary secretary provides a very inexpensive means not only of giving talented individuals executive experience but providing ministers with their needs of support.

So I think I must be that very talented individual. I think my role is to provide support to ministers, as that is the role of the parliamentary secretary, not to necessarily have portfolios, not to run around being the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, but to be the assistant, to be a secretary and to provide support to any minister who may need support.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Wade has a supplementary question.

MINISTER ASSISTING THE PREMIER

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:26): Supplementary question: the honourable parliamentary secretary refers to the support she provides to the Premier. What support does she provide to the Premier other than attending events on his behalf?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:27): I said I provide support to ministers and the Premier. It is a team on this side of the chamber; it is why we are on this side of the chamber—because we provide support.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: If the minister wants to learn how to be in government and how to provide support to each other so that you can be a successful government, I am happy to sit down with you every day of the week and tell you how to be a good minister—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: —because the reason why—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: —you are on that side, on the backbench, is because you failed as a minister and you had a far bigger loading—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order on both sides of the chamber!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: —than I have. You can keep asking me this question and I will keep responding. You are on that side because you failed as a minister.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Martin, that's enough.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: You are there because of you not being a minister that could listen to the community. That's why your front bench are the opposition front bench.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I have a 20 per cent loading and I am there to support the team that has won government.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bourke, sit down. I can't hear the parliamentary secretary give her answer. She will be heard in silence. Have you concluded?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I've concluded.

Bills

CROSS BORDER COMMISSIONER BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 2 June 2022.)

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Centofanti-3]—

Page 2, after line 12—After the definition of *cross border communities* insert:

government agency means—

- (a) a State authority; or
- (b) an agency or instrumentality of the Crown in right of the Commonwealth;

responsible Minister in relation to a State authority means—

- (a) if the authority is a person who holds an office established by an Act or a body established by or under an Act—the Minister responsible for the administration of that Act; or
- (b) if the authority is an administrative unit—the Minister responsible for that administrative unit; or
- (c) if the authority is an assessment panel appointed or constituted under Part 6 Division 2 of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*—the Minister responsible for the administration of that Act; or
- (d) in any other case—the Minister declared by the regulations to be the responsible Minister for the authority or, in the absence of such a declaration, the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act;

State authority means—

- (a) a person who holds an office established by an Act; or
- (b) an administrative unit; or
- (c) a council; or
- (d) an assessment panel appointed or constituted under Part 6 Division 2 of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*; or
- (e) any incorporated or unincorporated body—
 - (i) established for a public purpose by an Act; or
 - (ii) established for a public purpose under an Act (other than an Act providing for the incorporation of companies or associations, co-operatives, societies or other voluntary organisations); or
 - (iii) established or subject to control or direction by the Governor, a Minister of the Crown or any instrumentality or agency of the Crown or a council (whether or not established by or under an Act or an enactment); or
- (f) a person or body declared by the regulations to be an authority to which this Act applies,

but does not include a body or entity excluded from the ambit of this definition by the regulations.

This amendment defines key terms and phrases that will need to be added to part 1, clause 3, in support of a further amendment that will be moved in my name: amendment No. 5 [Centofanti-3].

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Mr Chairman, would it be appropriate for this amendment to be considered a test case for the later amendments and therefore we make the discussions in regard to the annual plan and so on, which I think is the amendment being referred to, at this clause and then that will be taken as a test for the actual amendment that may or may not be moved by the Leader of the Opposition afterwards?

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Centofanti, now we are going to enter into your substantive arguments with regard to these amendments and then we will put this amendment as a test for the remaining amendments.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: To say that this is a test for the remaining amendments actually flies in the face of proper process. It might well be the exact same numbers later on, but there is no

done deal just with this amendment that then determines the votes on future amendments. I just wish to make that quite clear to certain people who are not necessarily the Chair.

The CHAIR: Your point is well made. We will put each amendment separately, if that is the will of the council. The Hon. Ms Franks, the reality, though, is that if this amendment is defeated, then the other amendments cannot stand, I am advised. The Hon. Ms Centofanti, perhaps you could cover the ambit of your amendments that you are wanting to raise.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I refer particularly to amendment No. 5, which is the insertion of clause 6A—Annual plan. This amendment seeks to alter of the requirements of the commissioner in regard to the annual plan. Clause 6(d) of the bill states that a function of the commissioner will be to prepare an annual plan. Clause 6(f) states that the function of the commissioner is to provide reports on any aspects of the commissioner's function at the request of the minister or on the commissioner's own initiatives.

My questions to this are: to what end, and what will the annual plan contain? What reports is the minister likely to request, and will they be made public? What responsibilities does the commissioner have to prepare the proposals? What responsibilities does the commissioner have to outline priorities that the commissioner recommends be pursued? Also, what responsibilities does the commissioner have to consult with the local community and seek their views, most importantly?

To my point, at the moment there is no clear requirement—or rather, no clear minimum requirement—as to the level of consultation, communication or engagement that the commissioner must undertake with that cross-border community, whether that be a local council that may be directly affected by a proposal of the commissioner or, indeed, the local member of parliament that represents that electorate or a mum-and-dad business or an individual member of that community.

We on this side of the chamber want the commissioner to be accountable, and we want the commissioner to be responsible to the local community and have a legal requirement to seek their views. We want to ensure that there is a mechanism for adequate community consultation within this piece of legislation. This amendment ensures that the bill legislates a minimum requirement that the commissioner must seek in regard to consultation with local government, consultation with the local member of parliament and consultation with individuals in the community. Importantly, it also legislates that the consultation process be made public. This ensures that there is an important level of transparency within this piece of legislation.

Individual members of the community should have an opportunity to have input into a decision that affects their community. Everyone should have the opportunity to know who was consulted and the views of the community on a particular proposal. If we were going to go down the path of creating a legislative framework for the cross-border commissioner, then I think we should make sure it has some teeth in it. Otherwise, I think it does run the risk of being a costly bureaucratic exercise that achieves little more than the addition of red tape.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I appreciate the opportunity to make some comments in regard to this. We have just heard from the Leader of the Opposition that she wants to avoid this becoming a costly bureaucratic level, but in fact the amendments that are proposed do exactly that. The amendments that are proposed add a layer of bureaucracy, they add a layer of red tape, and they actually work against the intent of the bill.

The issues that the Leader of the Opposition has referred to are very well adequately covered in clause 6 of the original bill under Functions of Commissioner:

The functions of the Commissioner are as follows:

- (a) to facilitate collaboration between governments and service providers to address issues involving cross-border communities;
- (b) to work and engage with all tiers of government, businesses and the community to ensure the needs of cross-border communities are considered in the development and implementation of policy, procedures and legislation;

It goes on to identify key barriers for economic development in cross-border regions and to advocate for a simplified regulatory environment for business growth and labour mobility in cross-border regions. It then goes on with some of the other aspects.

The advice that I have in regard to the level of additional bureaucracy and red tape that would be the result of these amendments going into the bill and being passed is that it would add at least between three and four months before the commissioner could actually start doing their job.

These amendments require, in addition to obviously some time—so let's say the commissioner was appointed tomorrow. The commissioner would obviously need to prepare the draft annual plan, some sort of draft, which is reasonable to suggest would take, let's say, four weeks at a minimum. Then, according to these amendments, the commissioner would need to publish the draft and consult, and that includes three weeks up on the website.

For that to be meaningful, surely you would allow at least four weeks for responses to that draft. It then needs to go through a cabinet process and then go to the Governor. Now, that is usually at least four weeks for a cabinet submission to be prepared, for there to be a costing comment, for it to go to other departments for consultation and for it to come back, and then go through the minimum 10 days' process of notice to cabinet.

Those three items come to three months by themselves. That does not allow for extra time, which would have to be involved, for example preparing letters to the councils. As we know, councils generally meet once a month, so if the commissioner was appointed tomorrow but the council had met today, we are looking at another potential month before a council meeting could be held. We also need time, obviously, to put content on a website, to write the letters, to write the requests for input and consultation.

I very carefully did not exaggerate in any shape or form the amount of time that takes. Most of those are in the proposed amendments and some are simply the process that would have to occur. At the very least, we are looking at three to four months before the annual plan could be agreed to and assented to by the Governor.

If we appointed a commissioner tomorrow, we cannot expect that commissioner to actually start doing the work for at least three to four months, and then at the end of the year they need to go through a similar process again. It might be an update, so hopefully it would not include that extra four weeks at the beginning, but then it needs to be published on a website. To get meaningful feedback you would want to do that for at least four weeks. It needs to go to cabinet and it needs to be approved by the Governor, either in whole or in part, according to the amendments.

So do we want the commissioner to actually be responsive? Do we want the commissioner to be able to work with local communities? Do we want the commissioner to be able to, from day one, be hearing from local communities, from local businesses, from other bodies, about what the issues are and be able to start in the commissioner's remit of actually undertaking the functions to facilitate collaboration between governments and service providers, to work and engage with all tiers of government, businesses and the community as outlined in clause 6?

I think we need to be very conscious that border communities want this cross-border commissioner. They wanted a cross-border commissioner well before COVID hit, but then when COVID did hit the need for this sort of role was magnified a hundredfold, maybe a thousandfold for some people. They want this to proceed. They do not want to be bogged down in red tape and bureaucracy, they do not want it to be sabotaged through a legislative amendment process in a way that will actually prevent the commissioner from getting on with the job. The commissioner wants to be able to engage, liaise and facilitate relationships. I am aware that—

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I know that I should not respond to interjections, but the Hon. Ms Franks asked, 'Who is this commissioner?' No; no-one has been chosen at all. The community spirit is that the commissioner will want to be getting on with the job, and I would honestly hope that everyone in this place would want that to occur as well. To bog it down in red tape and bureaucracy, under the guise of trying to get rid of red tape and bureaucracy, does not make any sense.

It will mean a commissioner's office, which will have a very small staffing level—there will be a commissioner and, based on the budget, one or maybe two other staff members—involved in engaging with the community, engaging with business, trying to engage with the cross-border

commissioners in Victoria and New South Wales and, of course, relevant state bodies in other states and territories.

They want to be able to get on with the job. They do not want to be spending all their time planning out an annual plan that might need to change. COVID surely showed us how we need to be able to change, react, 'pivot' (to use the term so popular during the height of COVID). We want the commissioner to be able to respond to the community.

This role is about building relationships, particularly with other jurisdictions. This is not about imposing a legislatively burdensome regime on the people who will take on the role of commissioner and his or her office. We want a streamlining, not additional bureaucracy. To that end, I ask the mover of the amendment who she has consulted with in terms of these amendments.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I think the point here is very simple. I do not think members of the cross-border community would view the consultation process by a commissioner as red tape. The minister is right; I think cross-border communities do want a commissioner. They want a commissioner out on the ground, and they want someone getting on with the job. In fact, is that not what this amendment does? It ensures that the commissioner is consulting and speaking with cross-border communities going forward.

I would have thought the first priority of a cross-border commissioner would be to ensure they are actually consulting with cross-border communities, with members of cross-border communities. In fact, this amendment most certainly does not bog us down with red tape but ensures there is a minimum requirement that the cross-border commissioner actually does consult with the local government, the local member and the community.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I reiterate, again, that a cross-border commissioner will consult, because that is their role. That is included in their functions. What we do not want to see is how that consultation should occur being prescribed in the legislation. We want the commissioner to be responsive to local and community needs, we want him or her to be able to respond to issues as they arise.

By setting out in advance, in a legislated way, how the consultation needs to occur—including, as I said, all those extra weeks, which actually add up to months, of consultation—before they can get on with the job is going to be counterproductive. It is going to sabotage the role of the commissioner before it even begins. I again ask for the Leader of the Opposition to answer the question of who she consulted with about these amendments.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: As the minister would be aware, I live in a cross-border community and I consulted with a number of people in my community. I also wrote to councils that are cross-border community councils. Again, to the minister's point, I think we can go back and forth for the rest of the afternoon but I think we do not need to do that. I would just make the point that this is purely a process of ensuring that there is adequate consultation.

The current annual plan uses what one could interpret as very subjective language when it comes to consultation and communication. What I am setting out to achieve with these amendments is purely and simply ensuring that we are moving away from that subjective language and ensuring that there is a minimum requirement for the commissioner to consult with the community that will be affected by whatever proposal the commissioner wants to put in place.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Can the honourable member indicate whether she wrote to the Limestone Coast Local Government Association and, if so, what was their response? Secondly, I think she mentioned in her second reading contribution the advocacy of the member for Mount Gambier. Has she discussed these amendments with the member for Mount Gambier and, if so, what were his views?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I have discussed these amendments with the member for Mount Gambier and he indicated to me that he thought that my amendment strengthened the position of the cross-border commissioner. I am sure the member for Mount Gambier has had many conversations in regard to the Cross Border Commissioner Bill, and I want to acknowledge the member for Mount Gambier for his advocacy in this area.

Like many of us that come from cross-border communities, he understands the need for a cross-border commissioner and he understands the importance of ensuring that a cross-border commissioner adequately communicates and consults with cross-border community members. In terms of the Limestone Coast, as I said, there was quite a long list of councils that I wrote to. A number of councils did not reply. Off the top of my head, I cannot tell you exactly which councils, and I do not have their documents on hand. I am happy to come back to the chamber at some point with that consultation.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Is the Leader of the Opposition saying that the member for Mount Gambier supports these amendments that she has put forward?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Really, that is a question for the member for Mount Gambier. You asked me whether I had had conversations with the member for Mount Gambier, and I have said that, yes, I have had communications with the member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The member for Mount Gambier is one of 69 members of this place, and there are 68 others who should be consulted over the same changes. I would be keen to hear what their views are on these changes as well, if we are going to ask about one particular member.

I cannot help but think that we are making a bit of a mountain out of a molehill on this issue. We often prescribe what our expectations are when it comes to the role that someone like a commissioner will undertake, or anybody else in fact, to make it clear to them what the intent of parliament was—not just one member of parliament but all members of parliament.

I cannot help but think that we are exaggerating a bit in terms of the effect of these amendments. I understand what the minister has said about the time frame for the annual plan, but there are nine functions stipulated in the bill, as I see it, and I am curious as to how this particular one would prevent the commissioner from acting on the other eight functions in that timely manner.

If there is going to be a three or four-month delay as a result of this one around the annual plan, what precisely would prevent them from getting on with the job in that time with respect to the other eight functions? Are they going to wait for the annual plan before they start working on the other, because I am seriously having concerns about the commissioner we are appointing in this role if that is the case. There are other functions that they will be able to undertake in the meantime, so what exactly is it that prevents them from doing that while this amendment is being implemented?

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Yes, multitasking.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I thank the honourable member for her question. I think there are two things to consider here. One is the amount that is involved in the consultation that is being prescribed in the amendments. There is actually a fair bit of work involved in that, in contacting all the councils that are affected and all the other aspects that are being proposed in here. What it is really about is what the focus is of the commissioner. The focus should not be around starting to report before he or she has even started the work of the commissioner.

What it should be about is being out listening, looking at those issues that have already been identified and exploring how they impact local people, because we do know that there are some issues that have been identified. That is why the commissioner position is being called for. It is being called for by members of parliament, among others, as well as the community, who are particularly impacted by those cross-border issues.

It is about where we want the focus to be. Do we want the focus to be on getting a plan together in advance before hearing all of the issues from the local community and from local business, going through a process of very formalised consultation that is going to take a long time, or is it about building relationships, building relationships on our side of the border as well as building relationships across the other sides of our borders, particularly with the cross-border commissioners that exist in Victoria and New South Wales.

It really comes down to how much time we want the commissioner to be spending reporting and how much time we want the commissioner to be spending on actually being responsive, being

able to react to the issues that arise, being able to get out there and let people know what his or her role is, so that they can come to the commissioner with the issues that they want resolved and then start going about the means needed to resolve them. It is about that kind of focus and where the priorities should be.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I did have a question for the minister about whether or not she has consulted with the member for Flinders on this matter, particularly with the Far West Coast Aboriginal Corporation. Has she consulted with those two entities?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Not specifically, no.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: When she says 'not specifically', does she mean not at all?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I think I answered a similar question when we were in question time a few weeks ago, this was set up as an election promise. It is a commitment that we made through long-term listening whilst we were in opposition to members of the community across the state. We were able, through our country shadow cabinets, to engage very frequently with the various communities and businesses across the state, and this is something that was called for by them. That is where the cross-border commissioner commitment has come from. That is why we would like to get on with it and actually start delivering for cross-border communities.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The minister spoke about the commissioner wanting to get on with the job and listen to the community. Does the minister believe that the commissioner would not be listening whilst he or she is consulting with cross-border communities as per this amendment?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I said, the question comes back to where we want the focus to be, particularly in those early months. Do we want it to be in setting up a preconceived plan and then going out, or do we want it to be in establishing those relationships, in establishing relationships that will enable collaboration?

I think where this arises from is that, as I understand it, these amendments were based on the legislation that was used for the Kangaroo Island commissioner. The purpose of the KI commissioner was quite different. The purpose of the KI commissioner was particularly focused on infrastructure on Kangaroo Island and getting government services on Kangaroo Island. It was very much focused on funding and infrastructure.

It may well have been worthy, if you are going to be building something you go out to formal consultation, particularly to councils, because you have already established what it is you are going to be building and then you go out to consult on it. This role is very different. This role is about those relationships, those collaborations, working with other jurisdictions—which we have no power to bind—to be able to actually come up with appropriate outcomes for cross-border communities.

I think that is where the difference lies, and that is why a lot of these amendments actually do not work for the role that is a cross-border commissioner. Certainly, on some of the other amendments I will have something more to say about that. I think we should be able to think about specifically: if we had an annual plan in place it has to go out through consultation and then be approved by the Governor.

What would have happened in COVID? What would have happened during COVID with this annual plan? How would the commissioner, had he or she been in place at that time, have been able to be responsive, how would they have been able to be flexible because, according to these amendments, they would have had to go through that same consultation to change the plan? If we are talking about an annual plan, do we not want that to be the simplest, least red tape approach that we can get? Do we want it to be responsive to local communities or do we want it to be bogged down in red tape?

That leads me back to a question from an earlier response from the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the member for Mount Gambier, who she did acknowledge in her second reading speech had been a strong advocate for this. Is the Leader of the Opposition saying that in her consultation the member for Mount Gambier supported her amendments, or is she saying that despite wanting to have consultation as such a key part of this she cannot actually tell us what the outcome of her consultation was with one of the prime advocates for this role?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: With respect, this is ridiculous. Clearly, we have two members in this chamber who have had discussions with one member from another place. Perhaps we would like to haul him in here now and get an answer from him directly. There may be more of us who have had discussions with him. I acknowledge also that, in relation to the point the minister just made, we have had a couple of different versions of this amendment and I can say categorically that we had concerns about the first one. I am pleased the member saw fit to go away and address those concerns we had because we did think it was overly prescriptive.

Perhaps the member for Mount Gambier thought that was overly prescriptive and did not necessarily relay the same concerns in relation to this. But notwithstanding what he thought, it is irrelevant. We are here considering this amendment not the member for Mount Gambier. He can do that in his chamber and he can provide perhaps responses or his position in that chamber, not in here. As the Hon. Tammy Franks has pointed out, he is not the only regional member. There are other members who represent the regions who have an equal say in relation to where they stand on this issue.

We are not doing this for one member of parliament—unless there is something the minister would like to tell us about that one member of parliament and any discussions that have taken place with him that none of us are aware of. Perhaps we would like to elaborate on any discussions that happened with that particular member of parliament in the lead-up to this bill getting before us. It is absurd that we are having this discussion in this chamber around the views of one member of parliament—absolutely absurd.

I do not know if the minister provided this answer, perhaps I did not hear it. But if she did, or if she did not, could she confirm again what budget was set for this function, and is it more a case of us being concerned that we have not set aside enough money for the commissioner to undertake their role effectively? Could the minister elaborate again on the budgetary figures that were set for this position?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Before I do that, just to respond to the question, I am very happy to talk about discussions with the member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. C. Bonaros: All of them? Want to talk about all of them—I'd be careful!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Happy to talk about any and all discussions I have had with the member for Mount Gambier. We can talk about the food we enjoyed at the free barbecue last week, if you want to. However, I am advised, the member for Mount Gambier wants this not to be—

The Hon. C. Bonaros interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The honourable member asked about my conversations with the member for Mount Gambier, so I am responding to her question. The answer is that he has indicated today that he does not support the amendments in regard to the annual plan that those opposite are putting forward. It is important that his view is not perhaps inadvertently misrepresented, which is why I was asking the question.

In terms of the budget, we have allocated \$2 million over four years. My discussions with my Victorian counterpart in regard to the budget they have indicate that that should be a suitable amount. Of course, that was within the framework of the commissioner being able to get on with their job and not being bogged down in unnecessarily bureaucratic and proscriptive processes. If for some reason that amount is not sufficient because of additional bureaucratic processes, the problem would be with the bureaucratic processes rather than with the budget.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The member for Mount Gambier's ears will well and truly be burning this afternoon. He has been the subject of a riveting debate. In the interests of time, I think we need to cut to the chase here. I am concerned that what we are seeing is a meal being made of an entree. I am not a good cook—the Hon. Tammy Franks can attest to that—but I do think that what we are seeing is something being whipped up out of nothing.

I do understand the Hon. Clare Scriven's concerns, and it is for that reason we made it very clear that we were not going to support the original amendments that were put forward by the Leader

of the Opposition in this place, because we could see the potential for there to be some unintended consequences. I take at face value the leader's claims that she wants to ensure that taxpayers get good bang for their buck in terms of this role and is not trying to hold up the position.

What she has come back with, though, in terms of some revised amendments, I think strikes the right balance. I understand that it is the government's desire for this not to be amended at all and for it to go through as is, and I completely understand that, but I think what is being proposed is a fairly reasonable compromise. I do not think the sky is going to fall in if we agree to this.

I would be concerned if someone is appointed to this role who does not have the capacity to deal with scoping out a plan versus also beginning the work. That does not strike me as being terribly onerous, and I am keen to understand why that might be the case. My view is: let us move on with this. I know the minister says that she is very keen to get this happening and for it to be a priority. We in the Greens share that desire; we have always been supportive of this proposal. Indeed, my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks has advocated previously that any such commissioner should reside in a regional community, and we think that is an important principle.

The idea of having some requirements in terms of the development of an annual plan and setting in place some consultation requirements I do not think is an outrageous suggestion. Obviously, Mr Bell will be a very important stakeholder, but there will be a range of others as well whom I envisage would be engaged with, and I think they are stipulated in the leader's amendment. So let's kind of move on, because I am concerned that this is, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros said, making a bit of a mountain out of a molehill—or a Mount Gambier out of a molehill; there has been a lot of mention of the Limestone Coast. So let's move on.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I can take on board the comments of the various members, but there are some other issues within the clause that we need to look at. Can the Leader of the Opposition explain why the Governor needs to approve, partially or in full, the annual plan?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: It is my understanding that it is a formal way of setting government policy. It means that ministers are aware of the plan and what is required of their department, so in essence it binds the Public Service to deliver an outcome for a community, which is what I would have thought this bill should be all about.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Why does it have the provision to approve it partially or in full?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Because there may be some things that ministers become aware of and feel that they cannot support, but that is the prerogative of the government.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Will the cross-border commissioner be able to act on the annual plan before it has been approved by the Governor?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: What is the definition of 'act on the plan'? One would imagine the commissioner should still be able to, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros points out, deliver the other eight functions. Also, I see that there would be no issue with the commissioner continuing to have dialogue with cross-border communities and to consult with cross-border communities.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Can the Leader of the Opposition explain why the amendment seeks to bind the commonwealth?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The advice I received is it does not bind the commonwealth; it is purely a reporting function. It is the state authority that must endeavour, as far as practicable, to act consistently with the plan or provision. In regard to the commonwealth, it is purely a reporting function.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: There are two aspects, one the member may be correct in where it suggests in amendment No. 2, 3B—Act binds Crown, but I am advised there is a further section in the third set of amendments which is identical to an earlier set of amendments in terms of, if the commissioner is satisfied that the government agency has failed to act consistently or to cooperate with the plan or other body or has frustrated proposals, they may report to the minister or Premier and forward copies to both houses of parliament and request they be there laid.

That is in regard to binding the commonwealth through a public reporting mechanism and it particularly refers to the definitions we are currently discussing where a 'government agency' means, under paragraph (b) 'an agency or instrumentality of the Crown in right of the commonwealth'.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Again, the advice is it is just a reporting function. The commissioner may make a report and may forward copies of such a report. It does not bind the commonwealth; it is just purely a reporting function.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Why else would one report unless one was seeking to bind the Crown? If you are talking about reporting on the Crown not adhering to what the requests were, why would you have such a public reporting mechanism if you are not seeking to bind the Crown?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Purely because then I think it allows this chamber and the other chamber the ability to read that report and act on that report, if it chooses to do so.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I am not sure where this line of questioning is going. We have had advice that this does not bind the commonwealth in the way that the minister would like us to believe that it does. I think the rest of us are satisfied with that advice. Clearly, the mover has sought advice about the effect of her amendment, and the advice is that it just does not bind the commonwealth in the way that the minister would like us to believe it does. I am going to take that advice over some suggestion that there is something else at play here binding the commonwealth. In any event, what we do know is that we simply cannot bind the commonwealth.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: We cannot, and I do not think there is any intention here to bind. Perhaps the minister would like to say for the record, so we are all on the same page: (a) on the part of the mover, there is no intention to bind the commonwealth and (b) more importantly, we cannot bind the commonwealth. For whatever reason, the provision has been drafted the way it has because that is the way it ought to be drafted. That is the advice we have. I am not sure where we are going with this.

The CHAIR: Again, minister, I am keen to put the amendment when you have no more questions.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I have one question. Given that we are drafting legislation in the interests of accountability and transparency and openness and consultation with the community, precisely what part of this do we find offensive in terms of requiring consultation to go beyond the scope of just the minister that is responsible for this legislation and not other ministers or other persons or other bodies that the commissioner actually deems appropriate to consult with? They may deem that there is nobody else appropriate to consult with or any member of a house of parliament, other than the one from Mount Gambier, or any other council. Precisely what part of that do we find offensive in all this?

The CHAIR: I think the question is directed at you, minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: We were still getting advice on the previous question. I am advised that, while this is considered a transparency measure, it would actually have no effect. The question then arises why we would put into the bill something that has no effect.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: With respect, it would have no effect if the minister responsible or the commissioner chose to ignore it, but if it is there and it is a requirement that they do this, how on earth could it have no effect? There is a requirement there that the commissioner is to consult with councils, if they think that is appropriate, members of parliament who are affected or any other minister or person. How does that not have any effect?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Sorry, we are talking at cross-purposes. I was answering the previous question in regard to binding the Crown. As I mentioned, I was getting advice and it was fine to proceed with answering other questions. But I think it is appropriate to receive advice, which I have now received, which is why I pose that question to the mover of the amendment: why would we put something into legislation that would not have any effect?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Because I think it is about being transparent and it is about allowing this chamber to have some oversight if the commissioner or indeed a department is not, as is stated, reasonably satisfied that a particular agent has failed to act consistently. I think that indeed this chamber should be made aware of that as a measure of transparency. I think the members of the public should be made aware of that as a matter of transparency.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: For that transparency that would be included at the end of the year in the annual report, so that would certainly exist, which leads to my next question of: why is the mover of the amendment not wanting a memorandum of understanding (an MOU) to be used, which is the mechanism that is used with other jurisdictions that have a cross-border commissioner? It is far more flexible, it is far more able to be responsive, and is certainly the preferred instrument of myself as minister.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Cross-border commissioners in other jurisdictions are not legislated for.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Why does that change the appropriateness of a memorandum of understanding?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Minister, with respect, can I just clarify your question just then because you talked about your preference. Were we actually suggesting that we should be following your preference as the minister above the views of this chamber when we are drafting this amendment? You have just said that was your preference. Does that mean that the rest of us do not count? Should we just pass the bill without any debate at all? It can be your preference, but it is ultimately the decision of this chamber what we will end up with. Unless our legislative making process has changed overnight—and I am not aware of it—how on earth is your preference more important than the will of this parliament?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I find that statement quite remarkable.

The Hon. C. Bonaros: Well, you said your preference.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Sorry, if I may finish, I think I have the floor. My question was: why would we not use our memorandum of understanding? I stated that that is my preference because of its flexibility and its ability to be responsive. The fact that we are having this debate here obviously means that the will of the chamber will prevail, so to suggest otherwise is quite remarkable.

I think it is important for members to understand what other mechanisms are available, which in my view would be far more responsive, far more flexible and far more appropriate for a cross-border commissioner role. Of course, it is entirely open to other members to have a different view, but my question to the mover of the amendment is why she considers that this legislative mechanism for the annual plan would be preferable to a responsive memorandum of understanding, which is what is used elsewhere?

The CHAIR: The honourable Leader of the Opposition, it sounds to me like this question has been asked a number of times. You can give an answer but I do intend to put the amendment.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I have nothing further to add except to say that this part of the amendment is in essence to deliver an outcome or ensure that an outcome is delivered for a community and that there is a mechanism that if there are situations where that outcome is being prevented, for want of a better term, that there is a mechanism that the commissioner can report to this house and the other place to ensure that there is a degree of transparency.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Could the mover of the amendment indicate whether under the annual plan it can be amended at any time, and whether the consultation and other processes will need to be followed to do so?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I am quite intrigued by the focus on the South-East, and I seek some assurances at this point from the minister, given we did jump clause 1. I am interested to know how the other communities, other than the South-East, will be addressed and responded to, given there seems to be a very heavy focus here on the South-East.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: This is the minister's own annual plan we are talking about here. In terms of my amendment it is purely the drafting of an annual plan, that step through the minimum requirements of consultation for a community on the annual plan. It is the minister's annual plan. I am purely adding that there needs to be a minimum requirement of consultation with the cross-border community within that plan.

The CHAIR: Would the minister be able to answer the Hon. Ms Franks' question first, while it is fresh?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: This is fresh, because the question has not been answered as to whether, under these amendments, the annual plan—the commissioner's annual plan, in consultation with the minister—can be amended and, if so, does it need to go through all the processes that are outlined in this amendment?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: This amendment is just in terms of the annual plan, so I think it speaks for itself.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Franks, would you like to repeat your question to the minister?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Thank you, Chair. Noting that we did jump clause 1, how will all cross-border communities be addressed? For example, will there be more than one office provided outside metropolitan Adelaide: one near the WA border, one near the Northern Territory border, one near the Victorian border, and one near the New South Wales border? Is this what is envisaged? Will those facilities be made available? How will this person be able to undertake their duties in a way that is not simply focused on one cross-border community?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I thank the honourable member for her question. As she would be aware, we have announced that the office will be based in Mount Gambier. It was important that it was not based in metropolitan Adelaide, and that is why we have announced a location. In fact, with the various people I have spoken to in a number of cross-border areas, they said, 'Well, it needs to be somewhere,' and they are happy that it is not going to be in metropolitan Adelaide.

I have spoken with the Victorian cross-border commissioner, in particular, in regard to how he addresses the various borders that Victoria shares; we have had some early discussions. For the information of members, he has, if you like, temporary office space in their equivalent of the regional development associations, where he will advertise that he is available to speak with people.

There are a number of other options, and that will be developed by the commissioner and his or her staff going forward. I envisage that there would be regular what we sometimes call clinics or sometimes call outreach. There are a number of different ways it can be done, but it is absolutely important that all our cross-border communities are able to access the commissioner. Of course, there will also be online options, telephone, all those sorts of things.

I am very keen that the commissioner is also visible, not in the sense of having a permanent office—which would not necessarily be applicable or the most effective use of resources—but instead regularly travelling to various cross-border communities, regularly in conversations with local organisations, businesses and individuals, so that they are able to work with the other jurisdictions to iron out the issues that have, for so long, been difficult for cross-border members of our community to address.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I ask the minister what provisions have been made for the cross-border commissioner to be able to access the APY lands without a permit?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Once we get the Cross Border Commissioner Bill passed, assuming that is the will of this chamber and the other one, we will be able to start addressing those issues. At the moment, we do not have a bill passed, so we are unable to start any of the work. We want to get it moving.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Why was it not in this bill that the cross-border commissioner does not need a permit to travel to all the communities without having to go through, let's just say it, some bureaucracy, some understandable bureaucracy? In fact, there have been commonwealth and state agencies refused access to these communities before. So why was it not provided in this piece of

legislation by the minister that the cross-border commissioner could actually travel to every single part of this state, in the legislation provided for this commissioner to exist?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: That was not raised in any of the briefings that I or my office gave to any members in this place. I would certainly have been happy to hear that when I briefed the members of the Greens. It is not an amendment that has been put forward, from what is on the books. I am happy to look at what would be the best arrangements, if and when we get this bill through.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Just for the record, this is not actually my portfolio, but some of the issues that the cross-border commissioner will deal with are in my portfolio. I raised a question earlier in this debate about whether or not the Far West Aboriginal Corporation had been contacted and consulted, and in fact we did raise that, apparently, in the Greens briefing on this matter and we were told that it was not important.

So I am not sure that the minister has actually done her proper consultations to get us to this point where the bill is not simply an election promise made with one community in mind, rather than all communities in mind. With that, I note that the minister has also made much mileage of the Leader of the Opposition's consultations. Quite honestly, they seem to have been far more diligent than the minister's own.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I think I was present at the briefing with the Greens party, with the Hon. Rob Simms. I cannot say that I recall it being raised, and I certainly would not say that such a thing was not important. I could press this and ask the member to withdraw, but I do not think that is necessary—

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! The Hon. Ms Franks, you will have your opportunity.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you. As I say, I do not think I would ever respond to someone by saying, 'That's not important.' I am very conscious of the need to address cross-border issues all around our state, and I think I have indicated that we will be very keen to discuss with the commissioner, when he or she is appointed, if we get this bill through, about how we can best make sure that all cross-border communities are represented in their dealings with him or her.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 10
Noes 7
Majority 3

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Franks, T.A.
Game, S.L.	Girolamo, H.M.	Hood, D.G.E.
Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.	Simms, R.A.
Wade, S.G.		

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Hanson, J.E.	Maher, K.J.
Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Wortley, R.P.		

PAIRS

Curran, L.A.	Hunter, I.K.	Pangallo, F.
Pnevmatikos, I.		

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

New clauses 3A and 3B.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Centofanti-3]—

Page 2, after line 12—After clause 3 insert:

3A—Interaction with other Acts

Except where the contrary intention is expressed in this or any other Act, this Act is in addition to and does not limit or derogate from the provisions of any other Act.

3B—Act binds Crown

This Act binds the Crown in right of this State and also, so far as the legislative power of the State extends, the Crown in all its other capacities, but not so as to impose any criminal liability on the Crown.

This amendment will add clause 3A, which provides that the bill is to work in conjunction with and does not limit other laws. This amendment is particularly needed in relation to the proposed amendment No. 5 in my name regarding the annual plan and the responsibilities placed on ministers, state authorities and government agencies because of the myriad other acts that place responsibilities on them also.

The addition of clause 3B ensures that the Crown is liable under the act, so this amendment is important in relation to, again, amendment No. 5 regarding the power to require information. In amendment No. 5, 6B directs the provision of information from Crown agencies, so clause 3B is necessary for the act to bind the Crown.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I indicate that the government realises that this is linked to the other amendment. We have said everything that needs to be said. We do not support it, but we understand the numbers are with it.

New clauses inserted.

Clause 4.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Centofanti-3]—

Page 3, after line 1 [clause 4(3)]—Before paragraph (a) insert:

(aa) must primarily reside in a cross border community; and

This amendment is present to ensure that the new cross-border commissioner primarily resides in a cross-border community. We understand that the government has indicated that the office of the commissioner will be based in the South-East in Mount Gambier, and we welcome that the office will be in a cross-border community. We are confident that the commissioner will understand and appreciate that there are many cross-border communities in our state. In fact, South Australia borders five other states. We expect that, despite being situated in Mount Gambier, all of these communities will be at the forefront of the commissioner's mind.

As mentioned in my second reading speech, we on this side of the chamber believe it is lived experience that counts. The government in its bill has legislated that the commissioner 'should have a detailed understanding of the issues affecting cross border communities', and we completely agree. However, we also believe that the commissioner should, during their term, primarily reside within a cross-border community. I think it is fair to say—and I said it in my second reading speech—that country people in cross-border communities would have an expectation that the commissioner would reside within a cross-border community, and I think they would be comforted by the amendment getting support from this chamber.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I rise on behalf of the Greens to express support for the amendment. We have long been of the view that the individual involved should reside in the regions. Indeed, the cobbler might make the shoe but it is only the wearer who knows where it pinches, and it makes

sense for someone who is going to be dealing with these issues that are so important to regional communities to actually be in a regional community and for that to be their primary base.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I indicate for the record that we absolutely support the intent of this amendment. I have spoken to the mover and also the minister potentially about any unintended consequences that we might have. I will start with the intent. The intent is we think that they ought to reside in the regions. We do not want to appoint someone from metropolitan Adelaide to be undertaking this work.

I am wanting to raise for the record the concern that we have around unintended consequences of this amendment insofar as it relates to somebody for some reason having to, for a prolonged period of time, perhaps leave a region and reside somewhere else. I think the example that we discussed was potentially, for example, a family member receiving medical care based in Adelaide as opposed to the regions, and having to temporarily relocate to Adelaide as opposed to residing during that period in a region, and whether this could have any ramifications in that case.

It is whether there could be any contractual issues, employment issues or questions raised about whether they are sticking to the letter of the law by residing where the legislation is saying that they need to reside for the purposes of undertaking their work, or whether they would be in breach of those provisions by leaving and living somewhere else, albeit temporarily. If we can resolve those issues—and during discussions we were trying to work out how we could do this—I think 'should' does send a clear message regarding the intent, that is, to appoint somebody from the regions in this role.

What is important here—and I do not think we need to get bogged down necessarily over this provision—is to place on the record what everybody's intention is insofar as from where we expect this commissioner to be appointed. If we can get a reassurance one way or another that 'must' is not problematic, that 'should' will send the same message in terms of the intent, then we can find somewhere to land.

We do not want to cause any unintended consequences as a result of this and give rise to contractual disputes or being in breach of the legislation because somebody has for some reason had to reside somewhere else for a prolonged period of time, which means they would not be following the letter of the law as prescribed by this place. If we can have that clarified for the record, our position is certainly that we support the intent of this amendment.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [PrimIndRegDev–2]—

Amendment to Amendment No 3 [Centofanti—3]—Clause 4, page 3, after line 1—

In inserted paragraph (aa) delete 'must primarily' and substitute 'should'

This is to, as the Hon. Ms Bonaros just outlined, replace the words in the amendment 'must primarily' (being 'must primarily reside'), with the word 'should'. Concerns have already been put very well by the Hon. Ms Bonaros, and I would certainly like to reiterate our concerns in that regard. If somebody, for example, has to be in Adelaide for medical treatment, or perhaps their partner does, for an extended period of time, we do not want them feeling concerned that they might lose their job because of contractual issues based around this amendment.

The other issue is that the term 'primarily' is not defined, so it is very much open to interpretation. I absolutely want the cross-border commissioner residing in a cross-border community. As outlined, the office will be located in Mount Gambier. It would be quite difficult, though I guess not impossible, to be not residing in that cross-border community. In opposition I was certainly very critical of the former government because, when they were called to have a regional representative on the emergency management committee (however it was termed at the time), they chose someone who, whilst very good—he is now the CE of my department—did not reside in the regional area.

The intent is absolutely to have the person reside in a regional cross-border community. I think saying that the commissioner should reside in a cross-border community sends that message very loudly, but it does avoid any unintended consequences, such as those the Hon. Ms Bonaros has outlined, and there may well be others as well.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate that the opposition will support the minister's amendment to my amendment. I am heartened to hear from the minister that the intent is for the commissioner to reside in a cross-border community. That is what members of cross-border communities expect, and that is what they should have delivered. I take the point of unintended consequences. We can have an argument and a debate about the term 'primarily', but I will not. Suffice to say we are happy to support the amendment: the change from 'must' to 'should'.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: We will also support the amendment from the minister. In the spirit of consensus, we are happy to get on board.

Amendment to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Centofanti-3]—

Page 4, line 3 [clause 6(g)]—Delete 'in consultation with the Minister' and substitute:
in accordance with section 6A

This is consequential to amendment No. 5. It is amending clause 6, which is the clause that states the functions of the commissioner. Specifically, it amends clause 6(g) by deleting the words 'in consultation with the Minister' and substituting them with the words 'in accordance with section 6A'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clauses 6A and 6B.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Centofanti-3]—

Page 4, after line 7—After clause 6 insert:

6A—Annual plan

- (1) The annual plan prepared by the Commissioner must set out—
 - (a) the proposals of the Commissioner in relation to the provision of infrastructure, the effective delivery of services and other matters relating to cross border communities; and
 - (b) the priorities that the Commissioner recommends be pursued in order to implement the proposals; and
 - (c) strategies for consulting and engaging with persons or bodies whose cooperation is required for the effective implementation of the proposals,
 and may set out any other matters the Commissioner thinks fit.
- (2) After preparing a draft of the annual plan, the Commissioner—
 - (a) must undertake consultation in relation to the draft annual plan with—
 - (i) any council that the Commissioner thinks will be directly affected by any proposal in the plan; and
 - (ii) any members of the House of Assembly whose electorates include areas affected by proposals in the plan; and
 - (iii) any Minister or other person or body the Commissioner thinks fit; and
 - (b) must, publish a draft of the annual plan on a website determined by the Minister and invite interested persons to make written representations on the draft plan within a specified period (which must be not less than 3 weeks).
- (3) The Commissioner must, when finalising the annual plan, have regard to any representations made by persons or bodies consulted under subsection (2)(a) or by members of the public in response to the invitation published under subsection (2)(b).

- (4) The Commissioner must publish—
- (a) the finalised annual plan; and
 - (b) subject to subsection (5)—a list of all persons and bodies that made representations in relation to the draft plan and a summary of those representations,
on a website determined by the Minister.
- (5) If a person or body making a representation indicated to the Commissioner that the representation was being made in confidence, the Commissioner must not publish any details under subsection (4)(b) in relation to that representation.
- (6) The Governor may, by notice in the Gazette, adopt (wholly or partially) the annual plan published by the Commissioner under subsection (4).
- (7) If the Governor publishes a notice adopting the annual plan, or provisions of an annual plan—
- (a) a State authority must endeavour, as far as practicable, to act consistently with the plan or provisions so adopted; and
 - (b) if the Commissioner is reasonably satisfied that a government agency has failed to act consistently or to cooperate with the plan or provisions, or that the actions of any other person or body have frustrated proposals included in the plan or provisions or are otherwise likely to affect the implementation of the plan or provisions—
 - (i) the Commissioner may make a report on the matter to the responsible Minister and to the Premier; and
 - (ii) the Commissioner may forward copies of any such report to the Speaker of the House of Assembly and the President of the Legislative Council with a request that they be laid before their respective Houses.
- (8) A function of the Commissioner under subsection (7)(b) must not be delegated.

6B—Power to require information

The Commissioner may, by written notice given to a person who is an officer or employee of a State authority, require the person to give the Commissioner, within a reasonable time specified in the notice, information in the possession of the State authority that the Commissioner requires for the performance of the Commissioner's functions under this Act.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Again, the government does not support this amendment because it adds bureaucracy and red tape and will slow everything down, but we appreciate that the chamber has a different view. I just state that for the record.

New clauses inserted.

Clauses 7 to 10 passed.

Clause 11.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Centofanti-3]—

Page 4, line 32 [clause 11(1)]—Delete 'section' and substitute 'Act'

This amendment is consequential to amendment No. 5 [Centofanti-3], which proposes the insertion of subsection (8), which says that the commissioner must not delegate a function under subsection (7)(b).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 12 and 13 passed.

New clause 13A.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Centofanti-3]—

Page 5, after line 31—After clause 13 insert:

13A—Review of Act

- (1) The Minister must cause an independent review of the operation of this Act to be conducted, and a report on the review to be prepared and submitted to the Minister—
 - (a) after this Act has been in operation for a period of 2 years; and
 - (b) at the end of each period of 5 years thereafter.
- (2) The Minister must cause a copy of a report submitted under subsection (1) to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.

This amendment inserts a requirement for an independent review of the operation of this act. This has become a reasonably standard addition to legislation. An independent review provides an opportunity to assess whether the intent of the act is being achieved and to consider if there are areas for improvement.

I note the Hon. Frank Pangallo has a set of amendments to my amendment relating to a review in three years rather than two years and that the minister has 12 sitting days not six sitting days in which to lay the report of the review before both houses of parliament after receiving the report. On behalf of the opposition, I indicate that we will be supporting both of these amendments to the review process.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I will be moving the amendments on behalf of the Hon. Mr Pangallo. I do not know if you want to me to do that now.

The CHAIR: I will hear from the minister first and then I will come to you to make comment. I will hear from the Hon. Mr Simms after you have moved those amendments.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government will not be supporting this amendment. The purpose of the cross-border commissioner is to achieve outcomes, and it is those outcomes on which he or she will be judged. Indeed, the performance of the cross-border commissioner as a concept, if you like, will be judged on the outcomes for cross-border communities.

I am advised that, whilst the legislation to establish the Kangaroo Island commissioner did have such a review of the act, other commissioner-type roles do not have a review of the act. My understanding is that that would be for the same reason: we want to assess the outcomes of the role rather than revisiting the act through a formal review process. I am advised that the Small Business Commissioner legislation does not have such a review provision, nor does the Skills Commissioner, nor the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, nor the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

That is my advice. I think it is because of the type of role that this legislation establishes. It is establishing a role and within that there are performance outcomes that are expected, which is what I would expect the commissioner to be judged upon rather than reviewing the act at this time. I certainly would support, if there is to be such a review, that it is in the terms of the amendment filed by the Hon. Frank Pangallo. But just to restate: we want outcomes rather than reviews.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: On behalf of the Hon. Mr Pangallo, I move:

Amendment No 1 [Pangallo-2]—

Amendment to Amendment No 7 [Centofanti-3]—New clause, page 5, after line 31—

In inserted section 13A(1)(a)—delete '2 years' and substitute '3 years'

I have to say, I find the response from the Minister quite astounding that the government will not be supporting this amendment, which really has become a standard clause in so many of the bills that we pass in this place each and every day. I have inserted review provisions umpteen times in this place and I cannot think of one single occasion where a review provision like this has not been supported by the government, or the opposition in fact.

If the minister was actually concerned about those annual plans that we have just discussed, this would be the ultimate opportunity for those to be reviewed. The reason we have changed two to three is that what we have found over the years in this place is that three is a more reasonable time frame in terms of allowing the establishment of a role and then a period of it functioning before you actually undertake that review. It does not undermine the role of the commissioner in any way whatsoever.

What we know is in fact that successive governments have appointed retired judges or whatever the case may be to undertake these reviews to ensure that the intent of the legislation is actually being fulfilled to identify any shortcomings of the legislation or any problems with the legislation, but certainly there is no intention here. There is no conspiracy to undo or undermine the role of the commissioner. We just want to make sure that the legislation is working effectively, as was intended by parliament. That is the role of a review.

Again, for the record, I am gobsmacked that the government would say that we do not or should not have a review in this case just because we have not passed one in other pieces of legislation. If we go through the statute books I think you will find that it has become a very standard clause and it serves a very important function in terms of reporting back to the remainder of parliament as to how a particular piece of legislation or the role of a commissioner—whatever the case may be—is actually functioning. That is an accountability and transparency measure, and if there is anything wrong with that then it will be highlighted.

The Return to Work scheme that was introduced in this place in 2014 or 2015 had a review act very similar to this and Mr Mansfield undertook that review. We know also that governments can choose to ignore the findings of those reviews at their own peril. That happens all the time as well, but at least the rest of us get to understand and appreciate what is or is not working in a piece of legislation as a result of this in a depoliticised process. That is the intention of having one of these reviews inserted in here.

It is an independent review; it is not an annual report. They serve very different functions. It gives to the rest of us the reassurance we need as to whether a piece of legislation is indeed functioning effectively or not.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: We are supportive of the amendment being moved by the Hon. Connie Bonaros on behalf of the Hon. Frank Pangallo. Initially, we were concerned that maybe two years did not give enough of a lead time to the commissioner, but three years does seem like a reasonable compromise, so on that basis we are happy to support it.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I mentioned, that compromise position that the Hon. Mr Simms refers to is preferable to the original amendment, but I would just like to place on the record that one of our concerns is that such a review could be used as a pretext to try to abolish the cross-border commissioner. I appreciate that may not be the concern of other members—they may not think that is a potential impact of it.

Certainly, the government is very supportive of reviews of many other acts, and we have inserted such provisions in various forms, the difference being that such a provision does not exist, according to my advice, in any of the acts that establish a role such as a commissioner: not the Small Business Commissioner, not the Skills Commissioner, which was established under the former government, not the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity and not the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. So it is a different sort of purpose for an act and that is my understanding of why such a review process is not in there, but of course I will be guided by the council.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The minister forces me to respond, because that is an absolutely laughable response we have just received in relation to potentially abolishing the role of commissioner. I advise the minister, then, to appoint the independent reviewer very carefully. Perhaps do not make a political appointment, but ensure they are truly independent and that they undertake that role as was intended. It is laughable to suggest that an independent reviewer would have some other agenda in terms of undertaking a review that could potentially result in the outcomes the minister has just described in this place.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I will move on, but I want to correct the record. I did not suggest the reviewer would have an alternative agenda. My concern is that the outcome of a review could be used on that basis. However, we do not want to get bogged down. I think we are all happy to move on and vote, given that we know what the outcome of this particular vote will be.

Amendment to amendment carried.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: On behalf of the Hon. Mr Pangallo, I move:

Amendment No 2 [Pangallo–2]—

Amendment to Amendment No 7 [Centofanti—3]—New clause, page 5, after line 31—

In inserted section 13A(2)—delete '6 sitting days' and substitute '12 sitting days'

As has already been highlighted, this simply extends the reporting days from six to 12 to ensure the minister has ample time to provide the report to parliament.

Amendment to amendment carried; new clause as amended inserted.

Remaining clause (14) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:08): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Committees

COVID-19 DIRECTION, ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

The House of Assembly appointed Ms Andrews and Mrs Hurn to the committee.

Bills

NATIONAL GAS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MARKET TRANSPARENCY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 17:11 the council adjourned until Wednesday 15 June 2022 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***UNEMPLOYMENT**

In reply to **the Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO** (3 May 2022).

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

According to the latest data available, in April 2022, the first full month of the Malinauskas Labor government, South Australia's unemployment rate was 4.5 per cent. This is a fall from the rate as reported at the recent election of 4.9 per cent. This was the highest rate in the nation, a persistent statistic in the latter part of the previous Liberal government.

In March 2018, this rate was 5.6 per cent (which at that time was lower than the unemployment rate in Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania).

For future reference, these statistics are publicly available in the monthly Labour Force data published on the Australian Bureau of Statistics website www.abs.gov.au.

The Malinauskas Labor government is committed to a range of policies to support the economy and job creation in South Australia as articulated in the state budget released on 2 June 2022. Key commitments include a range of projects under construction and in the pipeline across the entire state, including the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, and a new Economic Recovery Fund.

The government has not adopted a specific target for the number of jobs to be created, similar to the approach of the previous Liberal government. However, we note the increase in business confidence metrics already shown and continuing strong economic conditions since the election.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (3 May 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Since coming to office, in addition to the incoming government briefs and parliamentary briefing notes, I have requested and received advice on remote Aboriginal housing, the history and management of broader Aboriginal housing programs, the South Australian Housing Trust's Aboriginal Advisory Committee and the appointment of a new Head of Aboriginal Housing.

I look forward to working with the new federal Labor Minister for Indigenous Affairs, the Hon. Linda Burney MP, and the new federal Minister for Housing and Homelessness, the Hon. Julie Collins MP, to deliver better housing outcomes for our community.

When Labor was previously in government both in South Australia and federally, South Australia secured approximately \$292 million in commonwealth funding for remote housing. When it was the Liberal Party or Coalition at both levels of government, South Australia secured just \$37.5 million from the commonwealth for the same purpose.

COST OF LIVING

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (3 May 2022).

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

No new taxes are included in the 2022-23 budget.

The indexation rate for government fees and charges has been limited to 2 per cent in 2022-23 and the emergency services bill for a median valued metropolitan residential property will increase by around 2 per cent in 2022-23.

This is well under current annual CPI growth rate of 4.7 per cent in Adelaide, according to the most recent figures published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

COST OF LIVING

In reply to **the Hon. D.G.E. HOOD** (3 May 2022).

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

The Essential Services Commission of South Australia publishes this information annually in its Energy Retail Price Offers Comparison Report.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (3 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The state budget includes more than \$177 million in additional capital funding for the South Australian Housing Trust to build 400 new homes, bring 350 vacant properties back up to standard so they can be homes again and to conduct a maintenance blitz on 3,000 homes.

The 400 new homes will include 150 in regional areas and a 50-unit complex with onsite supports that will be funded by a further \$4 million in the budget.

Federal Labor has also committed to deliver a \$10 billion Housing Australia Future Fund which will build 30,000 new social and affordable housing properties in its first five years. The Malinauskas Labor government is looking forward to working with a federal government that is committed to addressing housing and homelessness.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (3 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The biggest loss of public housing in South Australia's history, possibly Australia's history, occurred under the SA Liberal Party when approximately 12,000 homes were lost from 1994 to 2002. This included a single year with a reduction of around 3,000 homes.

When the Liberals were next elected, their 10-year housing strategy promised to deliver 1,000 affordable homes—not even social housing—by 2025 through an alleged \$398.7 million initiative. After Labor was elected in 2022, it was discovered that only 54 homes had been completed. Even more startling was the discovery that 73 per cent of the program total to April 2022 was for the Housing Trust's own internal land with barely a quarter being spent on construction. The Liberals were selling off Housing Trust land instead of building social housing on it. The Productivity Commission's Report on Government Services showed a reduction in public housing for every year of the Liberal Party's recent single term of government.

In contrast, Labor is working to maintain our level of public housing through a commitment of more than \$177 million in new capital funding.

Federal Labor has also committed to deliver a \$10 billion Housing Australia Future Fund which will build 30,000 new social and affordable housing properties in its first five years. The Malinauskas Labor government is looking forward to working with a federal government that is committed to addressing housing and homelessness.

NUCLEAR WASTE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (3 May 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Energy and Mining has advised the following:

The Environment, Resources and Development Committee of the South Australian parliament will consider its obligations arising from the commonwealth minister's site declaration under section 14 of the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000* to inquire into, consider and report on the likely impact of the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility on the environment and socio-economic wellbeing of all South Australians.

HOMELESSNESS

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (17 May 2022).

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

The Minister for Human Services has met with a number of homelessness alliance leaders and made it clear that she has no plans to dismantle the alliances. The minister has every intention of fixing serious flaws in the homelessness system that were left by the Liberals. This includes no outcomes framework for a sector with more than \$71 million per year in government funding. The Liberal model also lacked critical CBD supports that Labor has addressed by committing an additional \$6 million to Catherine House, the Hutt Street Centre and St Vincent de Paul.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (19 May 2022).

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

As is customary on forming government, the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, as the state's regulator of the liquor, gambling, casino, wagering, lottery and charity industries, provided the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs with briefings about the regulatory framework for the gambling industry in South Australia and the approach adopted by his agency, Consumer and Business Services.

As would be appropriate, the briefings included information about the AUSTRAC investigation, recent inquiries relating to the operation of certain Australian casinos and the work being undertaken by CBS in relation to the SkyCity Adelaide Casino.

In accordance with part 11 of the *Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2006*, I am prevented from disclosing details of the meetings held with AUSTRAC.

Any relevant findings coming out of the AUSTRAC investigation into SkyCity Adelaide will, however, inform the commissioner's advice to the government as to any action required.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (31 May 2022).

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

The Malinauskas Labor government committed to building 150 new public housing homes in regional areas. The first 10 homes, to be located in Mount Gambier, have been designed, received planning approval and are now in a procurement process. A further six homes in Mount Gambier are undergoing design. Sites and designs for the other 134 regional homes are under consideration. The Liberal Party committed to no new homes in regional areas at the 2022 election.

KANGAROO ISLAND BUSINESS HUB

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (1 June 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Small and Family Business has advised that the Labor government will commit to investigating the KI Business Hub's future uses through consultation with the KI Industry Associations and has confirmed that funding for the KI Hub has been extended to 30 June 2023.