

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 15 November 2022**

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

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

*Bills***PRIVATE PARKING AREAS (SHOPPING CENTRE PARKING AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

*Parliamentary Committees***ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:19): I bring up the final report of the committee on its inquiry into Aboriginal governance.

Report received and ordered to be published.

COVID-19 DIRECTION ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:20): I bring up the report of the committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Reports, 2021-22—

Balaklava and Riverton Health Advisory Council Inc
Bordertown and District Health Advisory Council Inc
Commission on Excellence and Innovation in Health
Controlled Substances Advisory Council
Hawker District Memorial Health Advisory Council
Health Services Charitable Gifts Board
Lower North Health Advisory Council Inc
Millicent and District Health Advisory Council Inc
Mount Gambier and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc
Murray-Darling Basin Authority
Naracoorte Area Health Advisory Council Inc
Native Vegetation Council
Northern Yorke Peninsula Health Advisory Council Inc
Penola and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc
Pharmacy Regulation Authority
Port Augusta, Roxby Downs, Woomera Health Advisory Council

Port Broughton District Health Advisory Council Inc
 Port Pirie Health Advisory Council
 Quorn Health Advisory Council Annual Report
 South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme
 South Australian Public Health Council
 Southern Flinders Health Advisory Council
 Veterans' Health Advisory Council
 Wellbeing SA
 Women's and Children's Health Network
 Yorke Peninsula Health Advisory Council Inc
 Regulations under Acts—
 Plastic Shopping Bags (Waste Avoidance) Act 2008—General
 Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 4 of 2022—Overseas Accommodation and Daily Allowance—International Bar Association Annual Conference—
 Justice Livesey
 Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 4 of 2022—Overseas Accommodation and Daily Allowance—International Bar Association Annual Conference—Justice Livesey

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

Regulations under Acts—
 Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007—
 Miscellaneous

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

Reports, 2021-22—
 Adelaide Venue Management
 Department for Correctional Services
 Official Visitor—January to June 2022—Tristan Colmer
 Official Visitor—January 2022 to June 2022—Timothy Fitzgerald
 Official Visitor—January 2022 to June 2022—Lauren Messmer
 Official Visitor—January 2022 to June 2022—Joanne Battersby
 Parole Board
 South Australian Multicultural Commission
 South Australian Tourism Commission
 Urban Renewal Authority
 Regulations under Acts—
 Road Traffic Act 1961—Miscellaneous—Drug Driving and Careless or Dangerous Driving

Ministerial Statement

HYDE AND ALEXANDER CHILD PROTECTION REPORTS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:24): I table a ministerial statement made in the other place by the Minister for Child Protection.

Parliamentary Committees

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:38): By leave, I move:

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

Motion carried.

*Question Time***POWER SUPPLY**

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Leader of the Government about South Australian safety and wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On 1 November, the Leader of the Government was asked a question in this place about the precarious position South Australia finds itself in in relying heavily on the Victorian interconnector for its energy security. On the weekend, the interconnector received considerable damage from the storm activity, resulting in South Australia becoming disconnected from the Eastern States.

The most important purpose of any democratic parliament is community safety and wellbeing, so my questions to the Leader of the Government are:

1. What guarantee will he and his government give to our community to ensure that South Australians can keep their lights on and afford to keep their lights on?
2. Will the government explain what immediate measures it has put in place, other than another review, to minimise the risks to energy security?
3. Given there is sunshine forecast on Thursday and we lead the nation for solar energy generation, how will his government offload excess energy generation on Thursday without a functioning interconnector?
4. Can you rule out rolling state blackouts and have you learnt nothing since you plunged us into a statewide blackout in 2016?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her enthusiastic and dramatic start to question time.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There are many things that the government can and will do for the benefit of South Australia. Controlling the weather, I am afraid, is not one of them that is within the power of the state government. What I would like to do, though—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —is thank, firstly, the many, many volunteers, the many, many professionals—not just of our state emergency team but those who work repairing powerlines in what are difficult and sometimes dangerous situations—and those, I think, 80-odd people who have come from New South Wales to help in South Australia after the catastrophic weather events we saw over the weekend.

When major transmission lines that feed into an interconnector go down, that creates difficulties for a state. What I don't accept, and I don't think any reasonable person accepts, is that somehow renewable energy had anything to do with the weather events and the downing of, I think the media reports said, some 500-odd powerlines throughout the state and certainly the interconnector to Taillem Bend. One thing that I will note is that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —I think the science is well established and becoming more and more established—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —that as a result of human-induced climate change we run an increasingly greater risk of extreme weather events. We run an increasingly greater risk of hotter days during the summer period.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think the science is now demonstrating we run an increasingly greater risk of natural disasters, of bushfires and floods and of extreme weather. I know that there are many good people across government departments who worked tirelessly over the weekend and are continuing to work to ensure the supply of electricity systems in South Australia is working as well as it can be, given the catastrophic weather events we saw over the weekend.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The two leaders, the way this works is that I will call the Leader of the Opposition and she will ask a question and the Leader of the Government will answer it. It's a new thing. I call the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Acting Minister for Local Government on council amalgamations. As a resident of the District Council of Grant, was the minister one of the 278 out of the 3,201 people who voted yes to further investigate council amalgamation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): Yes.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:44): I have a supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Simms, if it's arising from the original answer, it's going to be really interesting.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the minister advise how much the plebiscite cost?

The PRESIDENT: It's not arising from the original answer, the Hon. Mr Simms. It could be a question you might want to ask later.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the acting local government minister regarding council amalgamations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In September of this year, Peter Malinauskas introduced legislation for a plebiscite to investigate—

The PRESIDENT: Leader, the Hon. Mr Malinauskas or the Premier, not Peter Malinauskas.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Apologies. In September of this year, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas introduced legislation for a plebiscite to investigate the merger of the District Council of Grant and the City of Mount Gambier into this parliament with little to no consultation with either council or the community. My question to the Acting Minister for Local Government is: given the results of the District Council of Grant and the City of Mount Gambier plebiscite were what was described in *The Advertiser* as an overwhelming rejection of the state government's bid to merge these councils, will the government rule out further uninvited meddling in other council boundary processes?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question. I find it quite remarkable that a process that enabled consultation with all residents of the City of Mount Gambier and all residents of the District Council of Grant who are on the electoral roll is not acknowledged as important consultation. There was not a bid from the government to amalgamate the two councils. What the government did—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —was ask whether there was sufficient local interest to investigate potential benefits or disadvantages to such a merger.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I notice that the Leader of the Opposition is interjecting with questions such as, 'Why don't you go and talk to the people?'

The PRESIDENT: And indirect interjections are out of order.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Anecdotal discussions are important, and indeed the raising of the potential merger—a potential merger—had been raised with the now Premier on a number of occasions. Of course, the now Premier had the opportunity to listen to members of the community who raised the possibility because of his very frequent trips to Mount Gambier and the South-East, both since being minister and also while in opposition.

Of course, what those opposite don't want to acknowledge is that their former leader, the former Premier Marshall, never bothered or very rarely bothered to go to the South-East, and when he did what local people said was, 'Well, we can't actually get to see him. We don't know he is coming. We can't get to see him unless we are a member of the Liberal Party going to a Liberal Party event.' So I'm very glad that our current Premier has taken such a different route.

He was in the Limestone Coast on many occasions while we were in opposition, and he has visited the Limestone Coast on a number of occasions since—I think it is about four so far since the election or this calendar year; I will have to check—so it was really important that we actually asked the question. I think that is an important part of democracy, and it is a shame that those opposite don't value democracy in the same way that those of us on this side do.

Overall, of those who responded to the plebiscite about a third indicated they would like it to be further investigated. That shows that there was significant interest in investigating the possibility—

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —of an amalgamation. What we wanted to do as a government was test how strong that sentiment was, how strong that community support was. We have now tested that. It has been incredibly successful in asking the question and having the feedback returned to us.

Roughly a third were keen for it to be further investigated—it doesn't mean they necessarily wanted an amalgamation or didn't, but they were happy for the question to be asked and then for that investigation to take place—and roughly two-thirds did not want it further investigated. So that's

important information to have. It was therefore successful in gauging the level of community support in the local area, and given that the community has now said that there is not sufficient support for that investigation to proceed it will not proceed.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Supplementary: can the minister rule out further uninvited meddling in other council boundary processes?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:49): If the question is, 'Will the Malinauskas Labor government cease asking local people what they would like to see in their local communities?' then of course we will continue to ask local people what they want to see in local communities. If others wish to approach—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: We've got constant interjections from those opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, claiming this is uninvited meddling—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you are not supposed to acknowledge interjections.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —so presumably she hasn't listened to the many people who have raised this issue. There are roughly a third of respondents who would have liked to have seen it proceed to an investigation. It's important to be able to have discussions and debates about changes, whether that be in any sector of government. It's important to have those discussions. It's important to have those debates.

If those opposite think, 'Well, government should just decide to do something or to not do something, not bothering to consult with the local community,' then maybe that's a record of their previous four years in government, and the outcomes of that are fairly evident. I'm really pleased that we have been able to have that discussion. I'm really pleased that the question has been asked. I'm really pleased that those in my local community have been able to consider the matter and make their views known. That's a positive outcome for democracy.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:50): Supplementary: just following on from—

The PRESIDENT: Just ask the supplementary question.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: —around the plebiscite, how much did the plebiscite cost and was there value for money for the South Australian taxpayers?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I am not sure how that comes from the original answer, but you are on your feet so let's briefly do this before we move on.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:51): I am happy to answer the question. I think from memory it was approximately \$10,000, and it was able to be such a modest amount because it was included with the local government elections. As I am acting minister, I am happy to go back to the office and have that checked, but I am fairly confident that was the figure.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: The member for Bragg cost \$500,000 or \$600,000.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: How much was it?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Over half a million.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The honourable member asked whether it was value for money. I think to hear from the local community, to be able to answer in the future anyone who raises the

topic of wanting to look at amalgamations to say, 'The community has spoken,' \$10,000 is a very modest cost for democracy.

MYPOLONGA

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Could the minister please inform the chamber about the recent announcement of the Ag Town of the Year award winner for 2022?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for her question and her ongoing interest in the regions. It's a great pleasure for me to be able to talk about the recent Ag Town of the Year award winner. It was my pleasure to recently announce that winner at this year's Ag Town of the Year event, and the winner of course is Mypolonga.

Known affectionately as Mypo, the town beat a strong field to win this year's award, edging out Crystal Brook, Kapunda, Orreroo and Waikerie. After having been a runner-up in 2021, Mypolonga has shown that it is well worth having another shot at the prize, and I would expect that probably all four of the other finalists who missed out this time may well be in the running in the future.

Mypolonga, home of the Mypo Tigers football and netball clubs, sits at the heart of the Murraylands in between two of the state's other great regional towns, Murray Bridge and Mannum. With a population of around 475 people, Mypo's social media hashtag throughout their successful campaign to win Ag Town of the Year was apt and powerful, #myposmallbutmighty.

Mypolonga's heritage is notable in that the area was settled by many returned soldiers after World War I, who took part in the government's Soldier Settlement Scheme. Returned soldiers, who would learn their new career skills at a training farm set up by the then government in nearby Pompoota, planted orchards and started dairies on small blocks of reclaimed swampland, establishing much of the town around about this time. Despite the difficulties they and other settlers in Mypolonga faced, they created a legacy, which lives on today with diverse agricultural interests, that has become known as a food bowl for our state and beyond.

Mypolonga's diversity is key to its current and future successes, as the town has adapted and changed quickly over the years to meet whatever challenge it has faced, whether it be floods, droughts, impacts of climate change, or simply ensuring viable and sustainable agriculture continues within the town.

Mypolonga creates produce that on its own could just about service every aisle of any supermarket, with broadacre cereal and grain; onions; garlic; citrus; pomegranate; avocado; market gardens; olives; figs; finger lime; blueberries; stone fruit; dairy products from goat, buffalo and cow; livestock, consisting of beef, sheep, chickens, pigs, bees—and the list goes on. Produce from the town, including cheeses, jam, olive oil, chutney and also, very importantly, gin, have gone on to win many awards and are found widely across the country and even at the Los Angeles farmers market.

The entrepreneurial spirit in Mypolonga is strong and continues to evolve, with South Australia's first buffalo milking herd supplying cheesemakers across South Australia and the country. Aussie Apricots not only grow fruit but create amazing value-added products from it such as jams and chutneys, choc-dipped and dried fruit, and more, in processes reducing food waste.

There is the incredible Woodlane Orchard, whose founder, Kelly Johnson, takes farmers' surplus produce and creates an amazing range of products, including soups, meals, snacks and garnishes, that often take only minutes to prepare and are now found in a number of retail locations around the state. There is also a fully automated dairy that uses a drone to wake the cows up on those early mornings. These are just a few examples of what you will find in Mypolonga.

There is a steady focus on creating interest in agriculture amongst the town's young people, with students taking part in educational and career pathways that give them exposure to the many wonderful careers that are available.

The Ag Town of the Year awards are a wonderful acknowledgement of the regions across our state that so often are the backbone of our society, providing food and fibre and contributing

enormously to jobs and the economy, but they don't always get the recognition they deserve. While the winning town receives fantastic prizes such as a sign at the town entrance, certificate and trophy, a community event and sign unveiling and a double page feature in SALIFE magazine, it also gets respect and acknowledgement and that great feeling of satisfaction that comes from receiving such respect and acknowledgement.

Once again, congratulations, Mypolonga, on a very well-deserved win.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about ICAC.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: With your indulgence, Mr President, and that of the chamber, I seek your patience, given the complexities and the gravity of the matter, to put this issue into context.

Last week, I called on the state government to support my calls for a royal commission into the operations of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) after deeply disturbing revelations of its flawed investigative practices were exposed over its pursuit of former senior government bureaucrat John Hanlon. I also called for ICAC commissioner Ann Vanstone KC to either resign or be sacked over her role in the matter along with the director of investigations, Andrew Baker, who was in charge of the witch-hunt.

My call follows the announcement last week by the Director of Public Prosecutions, Martin Hinton KC, that he had dropped charges against Mr Hanlon, a former Renewal SA CEO, after a four-year wild goose chase over alleged corruption. His decision followed a series of bombshell revelations disclosed in the District Court, including that ICAC hid evidence—phone data—for three years which supported Mr Hanlon's version of events but did not disclose it to his legal team or DPP prosecutors until last week; that ICAC investigators knew they had breached international law by travelling to Germany to interview witnesses without obtaining a mutual assistance agreement—

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order: with respect, these matters that are being raised in a brief summary are actually all matters on the public record and don't need to be reargued in the advance of asking a question.

The PRESIDENT: No, I am sorry, that is not a point of order. Many issues are regurgitated from the public arena that we listen to in this place. I know that you are getting towards your conclusion, the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, continue.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you, Mr President. I mean, it is not just—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The sooner the Hon. Mr Pangallo concludes the sooner we can get on with it.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: —members that actually hear this, it is also people that take an interest in it outside. That is why we are streaming.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, continue.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I will continue that again, thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It's the brief explanation rule, Frank.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: ICAC investigators knew they breached international law by travelling to Germany to interview witnesses without obtaining a mutual assistance agreement (MAR) made through the International Crime Cooperation Central Authority of the federal Attorney-General's Department between Germany and Australia—an issue Germany regards as a breach of

its sovereignty. ICAC investigators admitted they had known for several years the evidence they obtained in Germany from the witnesses was inadmissible, yet failed to disclose the facts.

It gets worse. Publishing his findings today on his reasons for refusing an application by prosecutors to adjourn Mr Hanlon's trial, District Court judge the Hon. Timothy Heffernan was scathing of ICAC. He said, and I quote:

The failure of ICAC to have obtained permission by way of a MAR to conduct their inquiries in Germany falls well short of what should be expected from an investigative agency of ICAC's powers and responsibilities.

Earlier today in the District Court, legal argument occurred, which the legal fraternity suspects could now become a growing trend with ongoing ICAC matters before the courts. Lawyers for former public servant Brian Turner, accused by ICAC of mishandling \$14 million, have now asked to look at evidence previously deemed not relevant by ICAC—even to the DPP.

My questions to the Attorney are: do you have full confidence in Ms Vanstone and her ability to lead ICAC, and do you have serious concerns over the failed history of ICAC and its now tarnished reputation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his important questions and his well-known interest and advocacy in this area. I think anyone who followed the proceedings in the District Court last week in relation to the matter that was withdrawn from prosecution would hold concerns. These are serious issues. When you are talking about matters of upholding justice and the rule of law, I think it's reasonable that those who investigate and prosecute are held to the highest standard.

When the Director of Public Prosecutions discontinued the prosecutions in the Hanlon matter on 9 November last week, after being advised of the discontinuance I wrote to both the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, asking for an explanation of why the matter was discontinued and in relation to matters that were raised in court.

I note comments that the Hon. Frank Pangallo has referred to in the judge of the District Court's, I think third, judgement in relation to the matter, which makes reference to the gathering of evidence in a foreign jurisdiction. I have received some initial advice from the DPP and ICAC. We are now considering that initial advice and deciding what further information may be needed before deciding on a course of action.

Quite reasonably, there has been much media comment about this matter. I think the public expects that our institutions and our bodies need to conduct themselves with the highest probity so that everyone can have confidence in what they do. We won't be rushing to decide what the next steps are, but we will be considering the information that has been provided and what further information may need to be provided before we take any further steps.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:03): Supplementary question: in light of your letter of concern to those parties, has Ms Vanstone offered her resignation, or have you requested it, and has Mr Baker resigned or been sacked over his leading role in the investigation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:03): As I said, before deciding what the next steps are in relation to this we want to consider information that has been provided already and decide if we need further information. While I appreciate the honourable member's interest and advocacy in this area, I'm not going to provide a running commentary as we do that. But I can assure the honourable member I will let him know once we have come to a decision.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:04): Further supplementary: will the Attorney-General ask the police commissioner to investigate ICAC to see whether any criminal offences have been committed and, if they have, how can charges be laid?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:04): Again, I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area but, as I have said, we have received some initial advice, and while we are deciding what further information we may need before a course of action I won't be making commentary on what future actions the government might take.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Acting Minister for Local Government a question regarding council amalgamations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: As we know, the Local Government Association of SA has come out against forced amalgamation, but on 6 September, when Premier Peter Malinauskas announced his intention to hold a plebiscite to investigate council mergers in the South-East, he said, 'In my numerous visits to the Limestone Coast, this issue was repeatedly raised,' as well as saying, 'Council mergers have long been a matter of debate in the South-East.'

On Sunday, it was revealed that the South-East voted with an overwhelming 70 per cent against the move, which is contrary to the Premier's statement. My questions to the acting local government minister are:

1. Who were the people that the Premier spoke to on his numerous visits to the Limestone Coast?
2. With over 70 per cent voting against the merger, will the Malinauskas government admit that they got it wrong?
3. Will the minister please explain to the South-East community why the Malinauskas government is not taking their views seriously?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:06): What a remarkable question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The process that was established—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —was that there would be a plebiscite on whether local residents wanted the pros and cons of an amalgamation further investigated. If the answer had been yes, then that request would have been referred to the Local Government Boundaries Commission. If the answer was no, then no further action would be taken. The answer was no, so no further action will be taken. That to me seems like very much listening to the views of the local community. It seems incredibly similar—

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: Something you never did.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —to listening to the views of the local community. To ask a question and then to take action or cease to take action on the basis of their response seems very much like listening to the views of the community.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The Leader of the Opposition is interjecting to say—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The Leader of the Opposition is interjecting to say that they didn't know what they were voting on. On one level, I would say I respect the intellect of my local community—

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, enough!

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, enough!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I respect the intellect of the members of my local communities, and I think they were able to understand the question. If there was any ambiguity, we really need to ask where that originated from. I suggest that some of that ambiguity originated from those opposite, because they went down to the South-East—a rarity, I might add. They went down to the South-East—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, on both sides!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —because they sensed some political advantage—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and what did they say at their meetings? They held forums, and what did they say at those forums? Did they attempt to point out that the question—

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —was whether an investigation should occur, or did they deliberately muddy the waters? Did they deliberately indicate that this was about an amalgamation would happen if they voted yes? I think that's an incredibly irresponsible—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! That's enough. Sit down. The minister will be heard in silence, and the minister will conclude her remarks and we will move on.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, Mr President. So to deliberately misrepresent what the plebiscite was, as those opposite were inclined to do, I think is incredibly irresponsible. However, we are very pleased that the plebiscite has been held and the views of the local community are clear.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Roughly a third were in favour, roughly two-thirds were not in favour of an investigation. That is now the end of the matter.

INDIGENOUS BUSINESS MONTH

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about the annual Indigenous Business Month and one of this year's winners, the Healthy Dreaming program from Port Augusta?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his longstanding interest in this area. Indigenous Business Month occurs every October and provides a month where we proudly celebrate our First Nations business owners and non-Indigenous allies to reflect on the individual actions that can be taken now and into the future to support such businesses.

It is an initiative that was first driven by the alumni of Melbourne Business School's MURRA Indigenous Business Master Class Program. Indigenous Business Month was established in 2015 as a way of providing positive role models for First Nations Australians and improving the quality of life in Indigenous communities. Running annually from 2015, each year has had a different theme. Since 2015, the themes have been 'Founding Year', 'Celebrating Leadership', 'Indigenous Business is BIG Business', 'Because of Her We Can', 'Indigenous Ingenuity', 'Invigorate. Build. Maintain.' and 'Powering the Indigenous Economy'.

The theme for this year's awards is 'Actions Today. Impact Tomorrow.' The aim is to inspire the next generation of First Nations leaders in our community. The theme explains that every action we take and everything we do today will impact on lives tomorrow. By embodying this theme, we can together have a huge impact on First Nations businesses and create opportunity and change in many communities across our nation. Through expansion and growth, we can unlock opportunities for our First Nations communities not just in South Australia but across the country.

With this common theme in mind, businesses this year were asked, 'What has inspired your actions today, and how will they impact tomorrow?', getting the businesses and those involved to think about how our contributions to these businesses and how running one of these businesses will provide greater opportunities in the future. This year, there were five awards given out: the Regional Business Award, the 121 Award, the Indigenous Digital Inventiveness Award, the Indigenous Ingenuity Award and, lastly, the PwC MURRA Boost Initiative Award.

I want to congratulate all the winners in these categories right across Australia, but I particularly want to congratulate the winner of the PwC MURRA Boost Initiative Award, which was Healthy Dreaming, a social impact support service from Port Augusta here in South Australia that provides culturally safe social, health and community care for NDIS participants. Healthy Dreaming is a 100 per cent Aboriginal owned and operated business with key representatives registered with AHPRA, specialising in Aboriginal community nursing and Aboriginal primary health care.

These services are invaluable to communities where accessing primary health care can often be difficult. Healthy Dreaming offers health and social care to those in our communities facing adversity who may not have been able to access, or may not have wished to access, this sort of care before. The actions that Healthy Dreaming are taking today will have a ripple effect and impact on our communities of tomorrow. Through winning the PwC MURRA Boost Initiative Award, Healthy Dreaming will receive \$30,000 in skills and support from PwC and Melbourne Business School to support business practices and the capacity to grow in the future.

REGIONAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Regional Development on the topic of regional energy infrastructure and resourcing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: As a result of the storms that swept across South Australia over the weekend, a number of regional communities are still without power, I understand, in the Riverland, Yorke Peninsula, Fleurieu Peninsula and the Mid North. On 28 October this year, the Secretary of SA Unions, Mr Dale Beasley, wrote an open letter to the Premier, Mr Peter Malinauskas, that called for the reversal of privatisation of electricity, stating:

Clearly it is not in the best interests of South Australians that the natural monopoly of public electricity supply is run by private corporations to create huge profits. This model has seen under-investment in maintenance and replacement of electricity distribution infrastructure.

My question to the minister therefore is:

1. Does the minister believe that there has been sufficient investment in energy infrastructure and resourcing in the regions?

2. Would the minister support reviving ETSA to ensure that our electricity network meets the needs of our communities, particularly those living in regional South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, electricity services in regional areas are incredibly important and, in the general sense, are part of the need for regional development. However, in terms of the specifics, I will refer the question to my colleague in the other place the Minister for Energy and Mining.

REGIONAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:15): Supplementary: given the minister is the Minister for Regional Development, does she not have a view on the issues that I have raised?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you can respond to that.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: I have answered it, I think.

PREMIER'S COMMENTS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Assistant Minister to the Premier on the subject of the Premier's comments.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Last week, as we all know, the Premier used some fairly appalling language in a press conference, which is highly sexualised, pejorative slang referring to a woman having multiple sexual partners. Is the parliamentary secretary aware of whether the Premier used the term 'sloppy seconds' in the press conference, firstly, to impress the football community with his capacity to utilise locker room terms; secondly, to demonstrate his ability to engage in slut-shaming; thirdly, to ensure that he would enter the Wikipedia hall of fame (and I will refer members to reflect on the phraseology on Wikipedia in their own time); fourthly, to gross out anyone in the community who knows what the term means; and, fifthly, to impress the rest of the members of Labor's boys' club?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:16): I think the Premier has made his comments very clear through the media.

PREMIER'S COMMENTS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:17): Supplementary: does the assistant minister support what he said?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:17): The Premier made his comments very clear through the media, and I think that stands for itself. I do support him.

PREMIER'S COMMENTS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:17): Further supplementary: has the assistant minister raised any concerns with the Premier about his use of this language?

The PRESIDENT: It's not really out of the answer.

STAY AFLOAT

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the Stay Afloat mental health program for commercial fishers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Malinauskas Labor government values our important seafood sector and looks to support the industry, as we have done, for example, with ensuring flexible arrangements for carryover of quota

and fee relief for the rock lobster industry as the industry comes through the other side of some difficult times, both with market pressures and with COVID-19.

South Australia's commercial fishers provide high-quality seafood to both the domestic and international markets and are an important part of the economic, social and cultural fabric of our state and its history. There is, unfortunately, growing evidence suggesting that mental health issues in the fishing industry may be higher than in the general population. The seafood industry is considered to have a unique suite of stressors that require a tailored approach to services to effectively engage and address mental health issues in this industry.

The Stay Afloat program is a national mental health program run by Seafood Industry Australia to deliver a dedicated service for Australia's seafood industry. The program has been piloted in three industry-identified focused communities—Lakes Entrance, Newcastle and Darwin—since 2019.

Recent funding through the recent federal budget will now allow the program to be expanded and extended. Key activities of the program will now see the initiatives rolled out across South Australia, including the establishment of a peer support program, which will engage trusted advocates in up to 50 seafood community hubs nationally. We expect at least 10 of these to be in South Australia, from Eyre Peninsula to the Limestone Coast, including Kangaroo Island.

Trusted advocates are trained volunteers who are supported by Seafood Industry Australia through local coordinators, clinical support and ongoing training. The funding includes locally delivered training and education in mental health and wellbeing for members of the seafood community, their families and friends.

A community resilience fund will enable local communities to hold events and activities that support human connection, wellbeing and messaging around mental health. An Adelaide company, Culturise, has been selected to manage the national rollout of the program, and South Australia's fishing industries are collaborating closely with the Stay Afloat team to ensure their representatives understand the program and the support it provides.

I encourage members of the commercial fishing industry in South Australia to get involved and learn how they can better look after their own mental health and also learn what they can do if they are worried about the mental health of a friend or colleague. Similarly, I encourage those here present, if they know anyone within the industry who would benefit from this knowledge, to also pass on those details about the program.

CABINET DOCUMENTS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Attorney-General representing the Premier on the release of cabinet documents to the Auditor-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: At a hearing of the Budget and Finance Committee on 7 November, the Auditor-General confirmed that on seven occasions he asked for the release of cabinet documents from this government and that all seven requests have been refused. He advised that up until that point it had been a standard and approved practice to be given access to cabinet documents on request. I understand the former Liberal government released cabinet documents on request and that the Liberal leader has given approval to the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for the release of cabinet documents from the former government's time in office.

It was the Auditor-General's understanding that in the majority of Australian jurisdictions it is standard practice to release cabinet documents to the Auditor-General upon request, for the purposes of fulfilling their responsibilities to parliament. Without access to key cabinet documents, the Auditor-General has expressed concern that the audit process may be significantly slower than otherwise expected.

The refusal of this government to hand over requested documents to the Auditor-General, combined with an unprecedented efficiency dividend that his office has never previously been subject

to, paints a concerning picture for governmental transparency in this state. My questions to the Attorney-General representing the Premier are:

1. What is the government's justification for refusing all seven requests to release key cabinet documents to the Auditor-General?
2. Does the Premier share the Auditor-General's concerns that his auditing process will be slower than usual due to these refused requests?
3. What is your response to the Auditor-General's concerns about meeting his professional obligations as a result of budget cuts?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. My understanding is that governments of both stripes over history have not given access to cabinet submissions or cabinet notes from time to time.

CABINET DOCUMENTS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:22): Supplementary: is it your policy as a cabinet to not disclose any cabinet documents through to the Auditor-General?

The PRESIDENT: You are obviously not going to answer.

CABINET DOCUMENTS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:22): Supplementary: was there not a practice change under the Weatherill government with regard to releasing cabinet documents?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am not aware of that, but I can certainly make an inquiry.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Okay, we are not having a discussion.

PREMIER'S COMMENTS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the Premier's comments.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: During a press conference late last week, the Premier, when referring to the AFL Magic Round and South Australia's bid against New South Wales, said, 'I didn't want anyone else's sloppy seconds.' My question to the minister is: does she condone the comments made by the Premier?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:24): The Premier has been in media discussing the expression, and I think he has responded to that fully.

PREMIER'S COMMENTS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:24): Supplementary: do you personally condone the comments made by the Premier, and do you think that they are inappropriate?

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: I've already answered that question.

VINCE COPLEY MEMOIR

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council on the recent launch of the late Vince Copley's memoir *The Wonder of Little Things*?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:24): I thank the honourable member for his question today. Last week, I was invited to and very privileged to be at the official launch of Vince Copley's memoir *The Wonder of Little Things*. The late Vince Copley, a Ngadjuri elder, was a fierce activist and a renowned sportsman. His memoir, which was cowritten by Lea McInerney, is a reflection on Vince's time at St Francis House as a young boarder, particularly in the 1940s and 1950s.

St Francis House was a home for Aboriginal boys from 1946 to 1959. As I understand it, St Francis House was predominantly a home for Aboriginal boys from Central Australia as boarders, with the permission of their caregivers, with the intention of furthering their education in the city. However, I must emphasise there were Aboriginal children who were placed involuntarily at the home at the request of the government, as happened so often in decades gone by.

Over the forties and fifties, there were more than 50 Aboriginal boys who resided at St Francis House. Many, like Vince, went on to become household names across Australia and have had a significant impact on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander rights and affairs. Many also became very well known for their sporting endeavours. These included names like Charlie Perkins, an activist, soccer player and administrator. He was the first Indigenous Australian man to graduate with a tertiary education.

Gordon Briscoe was an academic and activist. In 1997, Gordon became the first Indigenous person to be awarded a PhD from an Australian university. John Moriarty, an artist, government adviser and the first Indigenous international soccer player, and Harold Thomas, an artist, activist, known and renowned for designing the Aboriginal flag.

The event, held at St Francis House last week in Semaphore South, was an opportunity to officially launch the memoir and, in addition, celebrate Vince's life and his experience at St Francis House. The event filled the Glanville Hall and included family, friends, local community members and former St Francis House residents like South Australian Aboriginal leader and stolen generations advocate Brian Butler.

It was also fantastic to see the Port Adelaide Mayor, Claire Boan, attend and speak at the event, reading out a few excerpts from Vince's memoir. However, a highlight I think for most people at the launch was hearing from Vince's daughter and niece, Kara McEwan and Patricia Waria-Read. It was exceptionally special to hear Kara's perspectives of her father and what the memoir meant to her. Kara spoke of her father's wisdom in the accumulation of little moments, decisions and experiences that shaped him into the man that he would become. It was a fitting insight into the title of the memoir, *The Wonder of Little Things*.

Nunga elder Patricia Waria-Read, who is the niece of Vince and sits on the City of Port Adelaide Enfield Aboriginal Advisory Panel, spoke of her uncle's passion for Aboriginal rights and the rights of cultural heritage. She reflected on his kind personality and the influence he had on shaping her as a leader within the community today.

Hearing from the co-author with Vince himself, Lea McInerney, provided an interesting insight into some of the elements—from Vince's perspective—that embedded the activism, competitiveness, success and achievement of many of the boys from St Francis House. In addition to the activism, there were reflections on Vince's exploits on the football field, particularly at Alberton.

Some weeks ago, I ambitiously bought a copy of Vince's memoir with an intention to read it very quickly, but I am hoping over the Christmas period I might actually find the time to do so, and I encourage other members who are looking for some Christmas reading to have a look at *The Wonder of Little Things*.

SNAPPER FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:28): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about snapper fishing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The Marine Fishers Association, the state's professional fishers group, has asked the state government to delay the much-anticipated reopening of the snapper

fishery on 1 February next year after a three-year ban. It says the marine scale fishery industry would prefer to suffer the financial costs of the delay rather than risk the future sustainability of stock.

The MFA's calls have been supported by SARDI's Snapper Stock Assessment Report of this year, which shows that while the three-year ban on catching snapper has stabilised the decline of the biomass, there has been no measurable improvement in fish numbers, which are still at historically low levels. MFA's pleas follow the release of a position paper by RecFish SA, the body representing recreational anglers—recently proposing widespread changes, including radical catch reallocations between the sectors—that has outraged professional fishers.

Releasing the SARDI report last week, you said, minister, the report would be considered by the Marine Scalefish Fishery Management Advisory Committee and its scientific subcommittee with meetings scheduled across the state over the following two weeks, after which that committee will provide recommendations to government, with a decision by government expected next month. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given commercial and charter fishers have extremely robust management frameworks with regard to accountability of catch, are you intending to introduce similar strategies for other stakeholders prior to considering the reopening of the fishery, especially given the paramountcy of sustainability of stock and accurate reporting in all fishing management practices?
2. Do you agree that sustainability of stock and accurate reporting are paramount in all fisheries management practices?
3. Has the minister or her department had representations made to her from the recreational fishing sector, both before and since the release of the SARDI report?
4. What are those representations with respect to snapper closures and catchment reallocations between the sectors?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:31): I thank the honourable member for her question and her ongoing interest in fisheries and fisheries management in South Australia. I am glad to say that the one thing there does seem to be widespread agreement on from the commercial sector, the charter boat sector and the recreational fishing sector is that sustainability has to be the number one priority and the number one consideration when looking at whether the three-year ban on snapper fishing should be lifted or whether it should continue and, if so, in what form.

I have been very pleased that, despite the differences within the different sectors, that is something they are united on. I think we all want to see a sustainable fishery going forward. When it comes to recreational fishing, certainly the sorts of views that have been put to me include that we want to be able to take our children and our grandchildren fishing in the future, so sustainability has to be the primary focus.

Last week, the snapper stock assessment was released, as the honourable member indicated. Prior to the election, the Malinauskas opposition as we were, now government, committed to providing more information about the way that decisions are made, in particular in the fisheries sector, so releasing that report was one very important step in terms of being transparent about the way that decisions are made and the reasons that decisions are made.

The next part of the process is that report is now being considered by the science committee of the Marine Scalefish Fishery Management Advisory Committee (MFSMAC), and then there will be a meeting of the MFSMAC in the coming weeks and they will develop some recommendations to come to me. Individually, and as a government, I have committed to making a decision by the end of the year.

In terms of potential changes to allocations, it would be premature to be looking at that. I will be keen to receive the recommendations from the MFSMAC, which does have representatives from a wide variety of the affected sectors as well as independent science expertise and also traditional fishing. It is an important process. What's really important is that we get it right. We need to make sure we have a sustainable fishery going forward, and I am very pleased that that is something we do agree on. I look forward to receiving those recommendations.

The honourable member also asked about representations, I think, from RecFish. RecFish SA did release a position paper that was prior to the release of the snapper stock assessment, and I have received a copy of that position paper.

SNAPPER FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:34): Supplementary: on information currently before it and its commitment to the reliance on scientific data, is the government likely to extend the snapper ban, given the concerns that have been raised by MFA?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:34): It would be premature to be talking about what we will or won't do. The MSFMAC is the appropriate body to provide recommendations. Science, of course, is one of the most important parts of that, but I will wait for those recommendations, and then a decision will be forthcoming following that.

SNAPPER FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:34): Further supplementary: will any such decision be based on the advice of the SARDI report or the recommendations of the Marine Scalefish Fishery Management Advisory Committee?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:35): This may not be what the honourable member intended, but it sounds as though it is one thing or the other. They are all part of the input into the decision-making. So the snapper stock assessment report, prepared by SARDI, is information that is fed into the MSFMAC, and then they provide recommendations. I hope that is clear. If there is some part of the question that I have misunderstood, happy to obviously answer a further question.

SNAPPER FISHERY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:35): It is clear. Further supplementary: will the SARDI report weigh heavily in terms of the recommendations that the minister ultimately adopts?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:35): I would always hope that the science has a very significant focus within any decision-making, and I am confident that the Marine Scalefish Fishery Management Advisory Committee, with its diverse membership, will certainly take into account the most up-to-date science.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney in relation to the Hanlon case.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Attorney has publicly indicated that he has requested a briefing from the Director of Public Prosecutions regarding the circumstances surrounding the withdrawal of charges and the abandonment of proceedings against Mr Hanlon on the first day of the trial in the District Court on Wednesday 9 November. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. When did the Attorney make that request?
2. In what form did the Attorney make the request?
3. Did the Attorney-General's request to the Director of Public Prosecutions include a specific request for any particular information?
4. Has the Attorney received any response from the DPP at this time?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. His questions ask exactly what I responded to the Hon. Frank Pangallo earlier in question time, but I'm happy to repeat for the honourable member what I said in relation to the last question. It is a pity

for other members that the Hon. Stephen Wade uses the time of this chamber to ask questions which have already been answered, but if that's his wish, I'm happy to answer the questions for him.

As I responded earlier today, the Director of Public Prosecutions discontinued the prosecution of Mr Hanlon in the District Court on 9 November 2022. On the same day, 9 November 2022, as I informed the Hon. Frank Pangallo, after being advised of the discontinuance and, as I said to the Hon. Frank Pangallo—and I will say it again exactly the same—I wrote to both the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, seeking a briefing on the investigation and the prosecution of Mr Hanlon.

As I outlined earlier, the fact that this matter has attracted significant media attention and the fact that the bodies have very significant powers creates a need for very significant oversight and very significant confidence in what such bodies do. That's why I wrote to both the DPP and ICAC the same day as the discontinuance of the prosecution on 9 November, last week.

Also, as I outlined before, I think there have been three judgements handed down. The latest, the third judgement, on I think it was Friday afternoon, talks about some of the issues as the judge in the District Court saw about the conduct of the investigation—of witnesses in an overseas jurisdiction raising legitimate issues about that particular investigation.

Whenever you have matters like this, where significant issues are raised—and particularly in a matter like this that has had much attention, and rightly so, in the media—I think it's reasonable that both the ICAC and in this case, as I referred to earlier, the DPP provide a full explanation of what has occurred.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:39): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the Report of the Auditor-General 2021-22 to be referred to a Committee of the Whole and for ministers to be examined on matters contained in the report for a period of one hour's duration.

Motion carried.

In committee.

The CHAIR: I note the absolute majority.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: My references will be all from report 8, Part C: Agency Audit Reports, which is the one that is 450-odd pages, or whatever it is. I refer to page 17 of that report, the big thick one, which I am assuming most people will be referring to. In relation to purchase recommendations for procurements not signed by all participants and some conflict of interest forms not completed, there is quite a bit of commentary on page 19. Can the minister advise how many conflict of interest forms remain unsigned, whether there has subsequently been found to have been a conflict, the procurement value of the forms that they relate to, and whether the minister has raised concern over this with the department and relevant individuals?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I can provide some general information in relation to conflict of interest forms not completed, and then take on notice the remainder of the specifics about numbers and, if it can be ascertained, values. Under the Attorney-General's Department procurement framework, all participants in an evaluation process must complete a conflict of interest declaration and confidentiality agreement prior to receiving responses and commencing the evaluation. On audits sampled, I am advised that, with a procurement that identified that conflict of interest forms had not been completed by participants in that evaluation, audit recommended that conflict of interest forms be completed for all procurements prior to the evaluation of offers.

I am advised that the Attorney-General's Department Procurement Services adviser would remind agency staff of their obligations to ensure conflict of interest forms are completed by all evaluation team members prior to reviewing responses, and that this action would be undertaken by

31 October 2022. I further advise that the Attorney-General's Department Procurement Services emailed the agency in September 2022, seeking confirmation on what processes they would implement to ensure the issue does not occur again. The agency replied, stating that this was an oversight and that they would ensure all the evaluation team members would sign these forms for future procurement.

I am further informed that, under the second audit finding under the Attorney-General's Department procurement framework, all evaluation team members must sign-off on the purchase recommendations. In two of the procurements sampled, the purchase recommendation was not signed by all members of the evaluation committee. The signing shows that all members of the evaluation committee are aware of the purchase recommendations and the information within the document.

The audit recommended that the purchase recommendation procurement templates be updated to have an area for all members of the evaluation team to sign-off and to ensure that all members of the team do in fact sign-off on the purchase recommendations before implementation of the recommendations. I am advised that the Attorney-General's Department Procurement Services has updated its simple purchase recommendation template to include a section for the evaluation team members to sign.

In relation to the detailed questions about numbers and value, I will see if I can get that information and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I thank the Attorney for that response. I have a follow-up question that is on the same matter. On page 19, it states that the department has responded that it will update its simple purchase recommendation template to require all members of the evaluation team to sign-off before the implementation of the recommendation. Can the minister advise what procurement value of the forms was referenced there, whether standard practice has required two signatures in the past and whether the minister has raised this concern with his department and relevant individuals?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. As I outlined, the department is aware of it and is taking action to remedy the situation. In relation to the value of the particular procurement form that was the subject of the audit comments, I am happy to take that on notice and see if I can bring back a reply.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Moving right along to page 21, 'Highlights of the financial report—controlled items'. Under Expenses it states that employee benefits expenses have gone up from \$152 million in 2021 to \$158 million in 2022. Can the minister advise what the additional \$6 million in employee benefits expenses was spent on?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I am advised that there are a number of factors that will contribute to that increase. A part of it, I am advised, is likely to be accounted for in the full-year effects of the machinery of government changes that happen after a new government is elected—different parts of departments that come in and go out.

I am also advised that the increase in costs and indexations, of an indexation of costs as well as wage increases, will contribute to that as well. Things like salaries and wages, employment on-costs of superannuation, annual leave, employment on-costs of payroll tax, long service leave, board fees, TVSP, skills and experienced retention leave, workers' compensation, other employee retained expenses, as these increase with indexation and wage increases they will also go up.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Can the minister advise what termination payments were included in the \$1.1 million spent on the SA Public Sector Workforce Rejuvenation Scheme payments? I appreciate that you might need to take some of these on notice.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Which page is that?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: This one is on page 22.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I am advised that this was the name for one of the previous government's targeted voluntary separation schemes. I

am advised that included 25 employees who accepted an offer under that scheme to the value of \$1.1 million.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Can the minister advise, in a similar section here, whether the increased salaries were a standard rate across the department because of EB negotiations, or did it vary from employee to employee?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: A general increase in salaries across the department?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. My advice is it is not a uniform increase. There are a number of industrial instruments that govern the different members of the Attorney-General's Department. There are the ASO levels of standard public sector industrial agreements, and there are executive agreements that govern other ones. I am informed there are a number of different industrial agreements and mechanisms, so it will not be a uniform increase in wages right across AGD.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Chair, I seek your guidance. I have a public sector payroll software, Frontier, question. Is it appropriate at this point?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can put it to the Treasurer.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I assumed it was the public sector portfolio.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Maybe for some guidance, my advice is that the issues concerning the Frontier software security fall under the purview of the Treasurer. I think that is probably why the Hon. Rob Lucas was the one who spoke about this in the former government. If there is a question about this, I am more than happy to pass it on to the Treasurer.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: On page 7 of Part A, the Auditor-General's Report found with regard to the public servant payroll software provider that:

...over an extended time dating as far back as 2015, a significant number of data files were compromised. More than 90,000 current and former SA Government employees were affected.

Following, also on page 7, the Auditor-General found that Frontier breached their contractual obligations by 'routinely taking data from the separate environment and storing it on its corporate network'. It was from this corporate network that the public servants' data was stolen. On page 19 of Part B, it was found that:

There was no contract management activity or risk assessment to conclude on, or test, Frontier's compliance with the data security and storage requirements included in the contract.

My questions are: what steps have been taken to prevent further breaches and theft of government employee data, to ensure that contract management procedures are now in place to enforce contractual obligations that were not met and to put a system in place to ensure that external service providers are meeting their contractual obligations on an ongoing basis?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I will refer it to the Treasurer, but I am pretty sure the issue of cybersecurity falls within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. It might be that I refer her questions to both of those and see who gets the best answers for her.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I refer again to page 21 of the report in relation to expenses. Supplies and services have gone up from \$139 million in 2021 to \$169 million in 2022. Can the minister elaborate on the \$30 million on supplies and services? We might get to page 23 in a minute. This is page 21 we are on.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. My advice is overwhelming: the vast majority, almost all of that amount, is to do with machinery of government changes, particularly contract payments for land administration services, which previously came under the Attorney-General's Department in the planning area but now fall under Minister Champion's area. The overwhelming majority of the changes in that supply and services is in relation to the contract payments for land administration services.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: On page 23 there is a reference to accommodation charges of \$22.1 million. Can the Attorney please provide a breakdown of what those are? I appreciate that he might need to take that one on notice.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. As she has rightly suspected, I will take that on notice and bring back a reply. Even after some of our advisers have been sitting next to ministers for some 20 years, I do not have that information with me, so I am happy to take it on notice.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I refer to page 30 of the report, which refers to the Public Trustee. Has there been any deferral of the integration of the Public Trustee ICT services within the Attorney-General's Department? If so, can the Attorney provide an update, please?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. There has been some deferral of the integration of the Public Trustee's ICT services with the Attorney-General's Department. As the third dot point under 'Significant events and transactions' on page 30 states, there has been some deferral. I do not have information as to what aspects and the time frame of deferral, but once again I am happy to take that on notice and find an answer for the honourable member.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I go back to page 20. It might have moved under machinery of government changes, but does the bonds management system still sit within AGD?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. The Bonds Management System does not sit under myself as minister. Minister Andrea Michaels has responsibility for that area of government now.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: There have been some issues that were identified on page 20. Perhaps the government could provide some responses to those issues. Still on page 20, in regard to the South Australian Computer Aided Dispatch system, what work has been done to ensure optimal system function as well as protection of data?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I will just confirm that, in relation to the previous question on the bonds management system, I am happy to refer those issues that are raised on page 20 to Minister Michaels. I am going to have to do the same for the South Australian Computer Aided Dispatch system, which sits under Minister Szakacs. I will be more than happy to refer those and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I refer to page 27. This in relation to the Victims of Crime Fund. Where an offence has not been established, the Attorney-General has discretion to make an ex gratia payment to the claimant. Can the Attorney provide some details about how many ex gratia payments he has made since he commenced his role and give a breakdown of those, including the value of each?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I do not have a breakdown of the value or volume since I became minister, but we will see if we can find that for the honourable member. I can let the honourable member know that in the fiscal year 2021-22—which includes part of when I have been minister but also a large part, I think, of when the member for Heysen was performing the functions of the Attorney-General and before that the member for Bragg was Attorney-General—I am advised the value of ex gratia payments was \$881,000.

I will see if it can be broken down into a time frame. I am not certain that we will readily be able to do that, but I can inform the honourable member that I certainly have made a number of ex gratia payments under the Victims of Crime Fund. Many of those concern people who have been the victims of childhood sexual abuse where there has not been a conviction recorded for a whole lot of reasons, a lot of them being the difficulty in recording convictions where the victim is a young child and the passage of time has diluted the evidence. I know that attorneys-general of both stripes have in the past awarded ex gratia payments in particularly that area, but I will see if a breakdown can be found.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: My last question is on the sentences at the bottom of page 27 and the top of page 28 in relation again to the Victims of Crime Fund. The amount that is subject to

being actively managed has increased quite significantly from \$1 million to \$11.1 million. Can the minister provide some details about why that is the case?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. It is a very good question. That is a just over eleven-fold increase. I do not have information or advice as to the reasons behind that, but again I am happy to take that on notice and provide a response for the honourable member.

I think I mentioned in response to the honourable member's last question an increase from \$1 million to \$11.1 million. What the amount is has increased by \$1 million to \$11.1 million. So it is not an eleven-fold increase, it is an increase from about \$10 million to \$11 million, but I will still find an answer as to why that is the case.

The ACTING CHAIR (Hon T.T. Ngo): Any further questions?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I have other questions I can ask about the Public Trustee. I do not want to let you off that easily. So page 36, Public Trustee, the underlying investment strategy and Public Trustee client funds. Very poor returns. How does that impact upon the clients themselves, because this is money that is placed in trust for them which I assume they try to derive some sort of income from? Can the Attorney provide some more information about that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her questions. As funds held and invested by Public Trustee decrease in your adverse investment environments, that is reflected in the funds they hold in trust for people, but in years when the investment environment is more favourable and those investments go up there is the relative increase for funds held in trust for their clients. In a number of recent years where the investment environment has been very challenging those funds will go down, but the investment funds follow the market and, as a general proposition, as the market increases over time—as with nearly all investment funds—clients' investments increase over time.

The ACTING CHAIR (Hon. T.T. Ngo): Any other questions? If there are no more questions, I call on the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development and Minister for Forest Industries.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: My questions relate to Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 343. Pastoral land held by the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development was revalued upwards by \$15.1 million to \$69.2 million. Can the minister inform the chamber as to whether an increase of \$15.1 million in valuation of pastoral land is consistent with previous valuations?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: We do not have information about previous valuations. We are happy to take that on notice.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I refer to Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 349, risk management procedures. Can the minister please explain why PIRSA did not proceed with its new enterprise risk management framework in 2021 and instead revert to its former policy and procedure reviewing, to reflect current practices?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the PIRSA risk management framework was reviewed and endorsed by the risk and performance committee prior to being approved by PIRSA executive on 17 June this year. The PIRSA risk management framework includes the risk management policy and procedure assessment guide and templates and is published on the PIRSA intranet.

Changes to the risk management framework included alignment to the South Australian government's risk management guide in Treasurer's Instruction No. 2. Strategic risk themes aligned to the departmental priorities and the corporate plan have been agreed by PIRSA executive as the first step to finalising the strategic risk register, and this process also includes the review of PIRSA's risk appetite.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Thank you for that information. You might not have this information to hand, but I am wondering why PIRSA did not proceed with that new enterprise risk management framework in 2021.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that that decision was taken under the previous chief executive. Of course, it was also under the previous government. I do not have any additional information at this stage, but I am advised that it was then adopted in June of this year.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I refer to Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 350, legislative compliance register. Can the minister inform the chamber as to when PIRSA commenced quarterly reviews of its legislative compliance register?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that that quarterly review commenced in September 2021 and that prior to that they were annual.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 351: can the minister please confirm whether it was only six positions of the 23 employees who separated under the South Australian Public Sector Workforce Rejuvenation Scheme within PIRSA that were listed as filled?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised the answer is yes.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister explain to the chamber what was the department's reasoning for not refilling these positions to rejuvenate the workforce, as was the intent of the scheme?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that it should be emphasised that that question relates to a particular point in time. At that point in time, it was six positions that had been filled. I am advised that the rejuvenation scheme was announced as part of the 2021-22 state budget, which of course was under the previous government, and it aimed to rejuvenate the South Australian public sector workforce by giving ongoing employees access to a financial incentive should they wish to separate from the South Australian public sector employment.

The scheme apparently was not a savings measure, because the department was able to retain those positions for new recruitments. The scheme was available until 31 December 2021. At the time of the scheme, PIRSA was also undergoing an organisational restructure. I am advised that those circumstances, combined, were the reason.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 351, leave return reports: has the direction to restructure PIRSA directly resulted in delays of reviewing leave return reports, and does this risk employees being able to access leave they are not entitled to, potential salary overpayments and misstated employee benefit liabilities?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that it has no relationship whatsoever to the restructure. It is an ongoing challenge not only for PIRSA but also, we understand, for other government departments. In response to the Auditor-General's findings that leave return reports were not reviewed promptly, PIRSA has implemented regular monthly compliance reporting across divisions.

A reminder to relevant PIRSA officers on the importance of timely review of all leave return reports has also been implemented. Departmental quarterly reporting to the senior executive will be implemented during 2022-23. I am also advised that the procedure is currently under review and, once finalised, will be communicated to all responsible managers to enhance compliance.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 352, contract complexity assessment: can the minister please inform the chamber how is PIRSA ensuring its contract assessment aligns with the complexity scale factors in the Procurement Services SA guidelines?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that, in response to the Auditor-General's finding that the contract complexity assessment rationale was not documented, PIRSA confirmed that that was an isolated incident resulting from the transition period between a change in the assessment frameworks used by SA government from the former state procurement board and the newly formed Procurement Services SA (PSSA) in 2021-22.

A PIRSA complexity and risk assessment tool has since been developed in line with the PSSA framework for both procurement and contract management, to allow for a consistent and streamlined determination of complexity and risk.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 353, financial report highlights. The expenses regarding employee benefits increased from \$87 million in 2021 to \$95 million in 2022. Part of these expenses were due to an increase in targeted voluntary separation packages to the tune of \$3 million. Can the minister please confirm this \$3 million included payments under the SA Public Sector Workforce Rejuvenation Scheme of \$1 million?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the \$1 million is part of the \$3 million total referred to in the report.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Therefore, if the breakdown of employee benefit expenses increased by \$7.6 million, and that included \$3 million for the targeted voluntary separation packages, \$1.7 million due to re-evaluation of workers compensation liability, and increased salary and wages of \$951,000, this totals \$5.65 million. Can the minister inform the chamber what employee benefit expenses made up the remaining increase of approximately \$2 million?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the reconciliation is not with us here at present, and that question can be taken on notice.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 356, 'Statewide storm recovery grants'. My question to the minister is: have PIRSA undertaken an evaluation of the storm recovery grants program to determine its success or otherwise?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that that was not done during the period that this report relates to.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Sorry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is there has been no evaluation done during the period that this report relates to.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In the Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 357, 'Drought support package and On-farm Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate Scheme', can the minister please inform the chamber whether there have been any applications for the On-farm Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate Scheme approved since the state election? If not, can she give an indication of when they will be approved and announced?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I can take that question on notice.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 357, 'Supplies and services': can the minister please inform the chamber what the \$2.3 million decrease in contractors and temporary staff to help with the management of fruit fly was? I assume this was associated with the success of eradicating the metropolitan outbreaks.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the reduction was due to the reduction in the number of contractors. The member would be aware that there were metropolitan fruit fly outbreaks that required a large number of contractors. Once that was resolved, the contractors were no longer required.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I refer to Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, pages 343 and 357. On page 343 the report notes that:

Supplies and services expenditure of \$89.2 million was \$25.5 million higher than originally budgeted, largely due to the continued use of temporary staff for fruit fly biosecurity response activities.

On page 357 of the report, under 'Supplies and services', it states that:

Supplies and services expenses decreased slightly by \$381,000 to \$89.2 million in 2021-22, largely due to a \$2.3 million decrease in contractors and temporary staff, as fewer temporary staff were engaged to help with the biosecurity response to manage fruit fly outbreaks of South Australia...

To me, those two statements appear contradictory. Can the minister please explain if those two statements are contradictory and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the reference on page 343 is comparing the budget to actuals, whereas the reference on page 357 is comparing the actuals over two years.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 359, Liabilities: can the minister please explain the \$4.8 million increase in contract liabilities for which PIRSA has outstanding performance obligations to fulfil?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that that would predominantly be in relation to the Regional Growth Fund, where those liabilities have not been paid by 30 June. I am also more than happy to receive questions from the opposition about the Regional Growth Fund and other comments in the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I thank the minister for her commentary. I refer to Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 353, employee benefits expenses: the employee benefits expenses increased by \$7.6 million in 2021-22, which included \$1.7 million due to an increase in workers compensation liability because of the number of open seriously injured workers cases. My question to the minister is: what is the department doing to reduce the risk of injury to its employees?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that what the honourable member is referring to is the actuarial assessment. Of course, there are a number of steps that are gone through when someone has a workers compensation claim. Where appropriate, that can result in a review of the processes within a workplace, but the department takes the safety of its employees very seriously and is constantly striving to improve workplace health and safety.

However, that statement does not imply that workers compensation claims are necessarily directly related to any kind of deficiency in the department. Each case would be looked at individually, and ongoing work for improving the health, safety and wellbeing of employees is of paramount importance to the department.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Auditor-General's Report 8 of 2022, Part C, page 344, significant events and transactions. Can the minister please inform the chamber how many FTEs received targeted voluntary separation packages and what the levels and titles of these FTEs were?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: What page was the honourable member referring to?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Page 344, significant events and transactions.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that in 2021-22, there were a total of 60 non-executive separation packages accepted within PIRSA for a total cost of \$4.527 million, and 37 targeted voluntary separation packages (TVSPs) were accepted at a cost of \$3.482 million in the 2021-22 financial year. During 2021-22, following the development of the new strategic priorities for PIRSA, a review of the structure and functions of the department was undertaken to ensure that priorities could be achieved within allocated budgets. This resulted in the offer and acceptance of an initial 19 TVSPs. To further assist with ensuring PIRSA could meet its allocated budget, a subsequent expression of interest for TVSPs was issued.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I think this will be my final question. Back to page 251 and the vacancies resulting from the Public Sector Workforce Rejuvenation Scheme, can the minister inform the chamber, of the 23 employees who separated under the workforce rejuvenation scheme, what was the total FTE level and title of those 23? What was the FTE level and title of the six positions listed as filled at that point in time?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I can advise the chamber that, unfortunately under the previous government, there were five roles in Biosecurity SA which ceased and eight from SARDI which ceased. I am pleased to say that under the current government those roles are being filled. I think that is incredibly important because biosecurity is a very high priority and research is so important. I am very pleased that under the current government those roles will be filled.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I would just ask for the total FTE level and title of those 23 employees.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: We do not have that level of detail to hand.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Will the minister please take that on notice?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Certainly; if that information is available, I will provide it back to the chamber.

The CHAIR: There being no further questions, that concludes the examination of the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:37): I move:

That the report be adopted.

Motion carried.

Personal Explanation

MEDICAL SPECIALISTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:38): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In question time in recent weeks, I responded to questions from the Hon. Connie Bonaros regarding medical specialists' enterprise bargaining and the pay rates of salaried medical officers, visiting academics and clinical specialists. I have since received advice that clinical academics have a base annual salary consistent with consultant and senior consultant rates within the Salaried Medical Officers Enterprise Agreement. While difficult to calculate, it is therefore likely that visiting medical specialists would receive a higher yearly wage than salaried medical officers on a full-time annual basis, but clinical academics would be at a comparable level.

Bills

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (MONITORING ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November 2022.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:39): I rise to make some brief remarks in relation to this particular piece of legislation, which I understand is the fulfilment of an election promise, in that the Labor Party said that they would require firebugs to be electronically monitored during the bushfire season. There is not a great deal of detail about the particular commitment. Nevertheless, we will be supporting these measures.

Those who are convicted under section 85B will be electronically monitored. New division 8 of the bill outlines how the court must assess such an application, including the ability to suspend or revoke the order. I note that the Attorney said in his second reading explanation that the bill is modelled on existing provisions under the Criminal Procedure Act 1921. The provisions are similar in relation to the mechanisms by which police can apply to the court for a restraining or monitoring order. The introduction of an electronic monitoring device, however, is a rare event in circumstances outside of parole or circumstances of an extended supervision order. With those remarks, I support the bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:41): I rise to speak in relation to the monitoring orders bill. The Greens are supportive of this bill. We have seen the devastating effects of bushfires on our South Australian community. Over the last 20 years, we have had major bushfires on Eyre Peninsula, Kangaroo Island and Yorke Peninsula, and in the Adelaide Hills and the Barossa. All of these fires have resulted in loss of life and property and have left lasting impacts on each of these regions.

The most recent bushfires that swept across South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria were in 2019 and are referred to as the Black Summer bushfires. Over 270,000 hectares of land

were burnt in South Australia and resulted in more than 1,180 homes and buildings being destroyed or damaged, and three people tragically lost their lives. The recovery efforts continue, as people are still rebuilding their homes, fencing and their lives. I had the opportunity to travel to Kangaroo Island last year and met with a number of members of that community who are still trying to rebuild their lives after the bushfires that ravaged that community.

Our climate is changing, and it is widely accepted in the scientific community that bushfires will, unfortunately, increase in frequency in coming years. It is absolutely appalling that some bushfires are deliberately lit, particularly on days of high fire danger. That is a despicable thing to do and this is a view that I am sure is shared by all members of this place.

By monitoring people who have already been convicted of a bushfire offence, we can reduce incidences of fires being purposely lit during fire danger season. The Greens consider this to be an important protection for areas at risk of bushfires, and we believe this will help our emergency services stay ahead of any potential threats, particularly as we head into the bushfire season. I therefore indicate that the Greens will be supporting the bill and we recognise the government's efforts to try to reduce the risk of fires being purposely lit.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:43): I rise to speak briefly in support of this bill on behalf of SA-Best, for the reasons that have been outlined just now by the Hon. Ms Lensink and the Hon. Mr Simms, and we echo those sentiments. Stamping out firebugs with deterrence measures is appropriate during fire season, especially given the utter devastation that fires have on our communities. Weather and nature are one thing, but deliberately lit fires which wreak havoc on our communities are unacceptable and unforgivable in many respects.

It is for those reasons we support the bill, but I do want to place on the record that—and I appreciate the speed with which we are dealing with this bill is to get it passed before the fire season commences—I did try in the interim to reach out to the Law Society to have a position from them, not in terms of specifically the principle which we are talking about but any other consequences this bill may have.

I was informed that the Criminal Law and Human Rights Committee had expressed some preliminary concerns about the bill and its implications, but unfortunately I think due to time they did not have the opportunity to engage and consider those appropriately. I think they go to the heart of a couple of the issues that I raised at the briefing that I attended. The function of the bill is to model the monitoring orders for bushfires on the high-risk offender provisions for paedophile restraining orders that currently exist under the Criminal Procedure Act.

I think we have picked up provisions that apply in two separate pieces of legislation to high-risk offenders and to paedophiles and somehow come up with this scheme, so it is not identical. I do make the point that ordinarily we do not pass those sorts of laws lightly in this place, they are reserved for special categories of offenders—high-risk offenders. It is my understanding that they will only relate to sentences where consideration by a magistrate to impose electronic monitoring is based on previous convictions or guilty pleas of bushfires; that is, of course, if the court is satisfied that the defendant is at risk of committing a further bushfire offence.

A concern I suppose that I imagine potentially the Law Society would have was restrictive liberties this imposes against the general set of rights afforded to a defendant in the sentencing procedure, but I have by the same token been advised at the briefing that over the past four years there have been about six people who have been convicted of a bushfire, with only 1.5 people per year falling into this category, and that this electronic monitoring only applies during the bushfire season, so it is a small cohort of people we are dealing with. That does not make those restrictions on liberties any less important, but I think it is a worthy point.

The other issue I raised, which I am sure the Law Society's relevant committee would have wanted to explore, is whether the GPS tracking can be used as a tool for the purposes of other criminal investigations of potential offences and the fairness and admissibility of that type of evidence. I have asked some questions around that during the briefing, which I intend to put to the Attorney during the debate. As I understand it, based on the information provided—and this is what I will be asking the Attorney to confirm—there is nothing preventing the use of the material collected in this instance during other criminal investigations and being used in other criminal matters.

I note that we have also been debating changes to mobile phone detection devices and that that bill explicitly allows for the use of evidence obtained via camera detection for other major crimes being investigated by SAPOL consistent with other existing legislation impacting drivers, but in that case the government has made it explicit in the bill that it is the government's intention, and the intention of the legislation, to be able to use that evidence in other major criminal investigations.

In this case, there is no such provision making it explicit but there is also nothing preventing it, so it stands to reason that it may be a small cohort of people we are talking about, but those legal arguments are there to be had and there are good grounds for allowing the evidence to be used in other criminal investigations. Whether you agree or disagree with the use of evidence, that is not really the critical issue here. The critical issue is, I think, why the intent of the government with respect to the use of that evidence in this way has not been clarified in this bill, if that is something they have sought to clarify in other pieces of legislation. I will put that question to the Attorney during the committee stage debate.

That is not to take away from the overall intent of the bill, which is to, as far as possible, prevent and deter firebugs from deliberately lighting fires. That is something we support, but inevitably during these debates when we are introducing these sorts of measures there are other questions that arise. Certainly, they are some of the issues I have raised with the government and will seek some clarity on during the committee stage debate, particularly given we have not had the benefit of the advice that we all so readily rely on, particularly from the Law Society, on other implications and perhaps unintended consequences that legislation may have. With those words, I indicate our in principle support for the bill.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:51): I rise in support of the Criminal Procedure (Monitoring Orders) Amendment Bill, and I want to use this opportunity to thank the volunteers across South Australia within the Country Fire Service and our State Emergency Service personnel, who have to deal with the consequences of unmonitored arsonists. Bushfires are an unfortunate reality of living in our sunburnt country. We do not need any opportunity for additional fires that are started deliberately and dangerously.

One Nation believes in harsh penalties for those who put others' lives at risk, as well as livelihoods, homes, stock and wildlife. The consequences of bushfires are horrific. As a veterinarian, I understand the horrific outcomes bushfires have on livestock and other animals. I support this bill, as I also call for increased support for our CFS and SES personnel. They need the best resources available and the best support they can get.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:51): I thank members for their contributions. I note that the Hon. Connie Bonaros has foreshadowed a couple of questions, which I am happy to answer maybe at clause 1. I look forward to a speedy resolution of this through the committee stage so that we can send it to the other house to, firstly, give them some work to do but also make sure we have this passed before we rise this sitting year.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I have a general question for the Attorney. In developing this bill, has the government sought the advice of the Law Society or any civil liberties groups and, if so, what advice was provided?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: This was an election commitment so we sought internally within government advice about how best to implement it.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: In forming that election commitment, with whom did the then opposition consult?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am happy to take on notice the question as to who the now government, then in opposition, consulted with. I am not sure I will be able to find a detailed list. I think this crossed a number of areas of opposition portfolios, including some who were shadow ministers who are not in those portfolios now. I do not think I will be able to get much information, but I am happy to see if there is some.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just one final one from me. I can imagine the issues that cause people to commit offences such as this are complex in terms of mental health and so on. Does the government have any plans to address some of those issues as well as the monitoring component?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. This bill per se does not address some of those underlying and interrelated issues. I have been reminded in the advice I have just been provided that certainly in relation to the criminal justice system and, in particular, convictions that give rise to the possibility of this further application of electronic monitoring there was a case where a woman was convicted of numerous offences who had underlying mental health issues that were addressed through rehabilitation programs whilst in prison. So there are avenues available to those convicted of these offences, but this is not something contemplated in this particular scheme.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just to confirm—we might be talking about the same case—is that the case in which the Parole Board imposed conditions on the individual that required GPS tracking? If not, can we just confirm that that can occur under the existing framework?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think we are talking about the same person. I am advised that that was a condition of the parole from the sentence. Of course, the bill before us gives the ability to go beyond that, but, yes, I think we are talking about the same one.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just to confirm: even in the absence of this bill that could be a condition of parole? I am not taking away from the bill. I am just confirming for the record that without the bill we could still have that as a condition that applies.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, that is true. It could be a condition of parole but, of course, those conditions of parole could only run until the end of the sentence, whereas this bill contemplates going further. So you could not do what this bill does just under the parole system.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just flowing on from the questions asked by Hon. Mr Simms, aside from the fact that it is an election commitment, why did the government not choose in this instance, even in the short time frame available, to consult on what could otherwise have implications in terms of the restriction of liberties on individuals who are involved, albeit a small cohort of people? Why did the government not do that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. As she outlines, it is likely to be a small cohort. I just do not have the figures with me, but it is single digits over I think a three or four-year period or maybe each year that people are convicted of the underlying offence that gives rise to this. It is a small cohort. We based this on the scheme that relates to similar orders that can be made for child sex offenders. Given it was based on an existing scheme that operates, we consulted within government but not outside government.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: What saved you is the fact that it is the court that is making a decision. Notwithstanding that, can you just refer back to the questions that I asked during the second reading debate in relation to the use of evidence gathered via the GPS tracking and its potential use as evidence in other criminal matters by SAPOL? I understand the advice from your department is that there is nothing in this bill preventing that from occurring. Can you confirm that for the record, please?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that there would be nothing that would stop it being used for other investigations that are similar to a parole-ordered condition of GPS monitoring. It can be, and is, used for forming part of evidence for commission of other offences.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just to confirm for the record then, and I think for the sake of clarity for anyone reading this: it is the government's intention that evidence gathered as a result of this GPS tracking could be used in a subsequent or other criminal investigation by police? That is

the government's position in relation to evidence gathered under this, where there is subsequent or other criminal offending?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that there is nothing that would prevent that.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: If it is not the government's intention not to prevent it, then they would have had a provision that is similar, I suppose, to the mobile phone detection legislation I referred to, which allows it explicitly. In this instance you have not prevented it explicitly, so the intention is to allow it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, a lot of negatives there. There is nothing that would prevent it being used similarly, as I am advised, to similar monitoring that is part of parole conditions.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 and 3) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO 3) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November 2022.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:03): I rise to make some brief remarks in relation to this bill, which deals with matters relating to the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act that passed this parliament and, specifically, how a death in accordance with that act is to be dealt with by the Coroner. Currently, a death that occurs in accordance with the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act may be caught by the definition of a reportable death, with the result that there is a compliance with the process set out in the VAD Act, such as a death that would trigger a full investigation by the Coroner.

The bill introduces section 3(2a) to provide that the death of a person is not reportable under the Coroner's Act if the death occurs as a result of the administration of a voluntary assisted dying substance in accordance with the VAD Act.

Clause 4 requires that the State Coroner reports annually on the number of notifications received under the VAD Act, which is in addition to other reporting requirements. Under section 84 of the VAD Act, a medical practitioner must notify the Coroner of a death—which is to the relevant minister and then tabled in each house of parliament. The Liberal Party supports the bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:05): I rise to indicate the Greens' support for the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) (No. 3) Bill. The Greens have been very supportive of voluntary assisted dying laws across the country for over a decade, with the Greens campaigning strongly in every jurisdiction for this reform. In South Australia, my predecessor, the then Hon. Mark Parnell, twice moved for voluntary euthanasia bills—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I apologise; I understand he is still honourable. I would like to acknowledge both the Hon. Mark Parnell and my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks for their work on this important reform over many years in this parliament. Indeed, there is strong support across our movement within the Greens in terms of euthanasia reform.

The bill before us today ensures that deaths that occur under the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act do not require an investigation by the South Australian Coroner. The Attorney-General indicated

a concern about the current situation where the Coroner is required to provide findings in these types of deaths, leading to delays in finalising the affairs of deceased persons. The Greens share this concern. We believe we should minimise the risk of increased trauma for families in what is, of course, a very difficult situation for them.

However, there is provision to ensure that the Coroner can still investigate deaths that do not occur in accordance with the voluntary assisted dying scheme to ensure that legislative processes are enacted correctly. We consider this to be an important safeguard within the scheme. Furthermore, this bill ensures that deaths under the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act are reported in the Coroner's annual report. The Greens believe that reporting these figures is an important transparency measure.

The Greens support the measures outlined in the bill and are pleased that the government has indicated an intention to bring the voluntary assisted dying scheme into operation as soon as possible. I put on the record our belief that that cannot happen soon enough for families and those who are terminally ill and are waiting to access the scheme. With that, I conclude my remarks.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:08): I rise to speak very briefly on behalf of SA-Best in support of this bill. Also, given the opportunity, I echo personally the acknowledgement of the mammoth efforts by all honourable members over the years to get these laws through this parliament. We do support this bill, as I understand that it is somewhat of a clean-up to ensure future compliance with the VAD legislation. My understanding is that these changes were requested by the Coroner to address reportable lawful deaths—it always gives me a great degree of confidence when it comes from the Coroner directly.

I also understand that South Australia is the only jurisdiction where deaths that occur by way of a VAD scheme are reported as reportable deaths, and that keeps us out of line with those other jurisdictions. I do not think that was ever the intention when the legislation passed this parliament. Consequentially, requiring the Coroner to report and make findings on deaths by VAD will also, in addition to not being the intention of this parliament, clearly put immense and unnecessary strain on the Coroner and his jurisdiction's already very busy obligations.

Making this process streamlined—by adding a requirement of a notification by the Coroner's Court of VAD deaths as part of the annual reporting—in our view provides the right amount of transparency, alleviates any additional burden on the Coroner and is more consistent with what this parliament intended in the first place.

In addition to the VAD provisions, the bill also seeks to remedy some confusion in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act regarding child exploitation material offences by implementing one standard maximum penalty and removing the differentiation penalty scheme for first and subsequent offences, something that we also support. With those words, we indicate our support for the passage of this bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:10): I thank all honourable members for their contribution. I note the words in support of the voluntary assisted dying scheme, which is important, but these changes are not whether you support the scheme or not: this was an omission. Whoever drafted the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill last year stuffed up, I must say, by borrowing very largely from the Victorian model but not making the same changes to the Coroners Act, which we are now seeking to remedy in this bill.

I think I can reliably inform the Hon. Robert Simms, in relation to his contribution, that it may well be now that Mark Parnell is just plain old Mark Parnell, not having applied to carry on his title of 'honourable'. I think the Hon. Robert Simms was wrong when he corrected himself because he was right in the first place.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIVESTOCK (EMERGENCY ANIMAL DISEASE) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November 2022.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:14): I rise to indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition on the Livestock (Emergency Animal Disease) Amendment Bill. I would like to note up-front that the opposition will be supporting this bill. Indeed, the opposition is supportive of all reasonable measures that strengthen South Australia's preparedness activities, surveillance work and efforts to plan, prepare, mitigate and respond to an emergency animal disease incursion.

I have been very vocal on how important it is that we, as a state, remain alert and vigilant as we face an increasing prevalence of biosecurity threats and incursions, from fruit fly outbreaks in the Riverland, varroa mite outbreaks in the Eastern States, to the prevalence of the contagious foot-and-mouth and lumpy skin diseases in Indonesia. These biological threats have the potential to devastate our agricultural sector.

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry projects that a lumpy skin disease outbreak could affect approximately \$7.39 billion worth of exports across 23 countries. In her second reading of the bill the minister highlighted the potential devastation that would be caused by a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak, noting an estimated cost to the industry of \$80 billion to \$100 billion over 10 years. South Australia's exports of livestock products, which were worth \$954 million in 2020-21, would be threatened and \$1.3 billion worth of interstate trade impacted. Domestic prices for meat and meat-related products would also likely be significantly impacted.

But the potential cost and impact extends much further. An uncontrolled outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Australia would see mass slaughtering of our cloven-hoofed animals—animals such as cattle, sheep, goats, deer and pigs—and would bring our meat export market to an immediate closure. The impact to our agricultural sector would flow through to the cost of food production, placing unwelcome pressure on an already rising cost of living. It would have an enduring impact on the health and wellbeing of individuals, families and entire communities. It would devastate tourism, disrupt education and limit research. Regional communities would be crippled.

It is why I called out the cuts to PIRSA in this year's state budget, with the Malinauskas Labor government taking an axe to the department and, in an inexcusable omission, failing to include foot-and-mouth disease in the biosecurity list of priorities. It is why I called for increased biosecurity measures at Adelaide Airport, including boosting staff numbers, to allow for the luggage of every traveller from Indonesia to be individually inspected.

It is why I backed the calls of farmers and local sporting shooter groups for a feral animal cull to support a national cull of feral animals, and it is why I have continued to promote the need for our state and federal governments to ensure PIRSA, the federal Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and the Australian Border Force are adequately resourced to prevent, mitigate and respond to any incursions.

In this very chamber I have repeatedly asked questions of the minister about resourcing for PIRSA, particularly resourcing for preparedness activities and resourcing for surveillance work. The answers have been beyond poor, with the minister not even attempting to answer the substance of my question.

Last sitting week, on 2 November, I asked:

1. Is the minister confident that her department is sufficiently resourced to participate in preparedness activities relating to foot-and-mouth disease and lumpy skin disease?

2. Is the minister confident that her department is sufficiently resourced to participate in surveillance activities relating to foot-and-mouth disease and lumpy skin disease?

Mr President, I ask that you indulge me here and listen to the response she provided to this chamber—the response she provided to her constituents, the residents of South Australia:

I thank the honourable member for her question. She has mentioned two diseases, which of course have had increased risk profiles in recent months and indeed over the last couple of years. Many, many risks have been increasing for various emergency animal diseases. It's imperative that as a nation and as a state we have strong and resilient biosecurity systems to effectively prevent, prepare and respond to these threats. EAD prevention and early detection are core priorities for PIRSA, in addition to being prepared to respond to these diseases should they be detected in Australia.

PIRSA Biosecurity, animal health division, delivers disease surveillance programs to enhance SA's ability to detect and respond to disease threats of significant community, economic and public health importance. PIRSA is continuing to work closely with commonwealth, state and territory departments, Animal Health Australia, state and national peak industry bodies to continually improve Australia's biosecurity systems to address evolving threats.

We are very happy with the continual engagement with industry as well as the other jurisdictions as we continue to progress our preparedness activities, which of course will be ongoing, because different threats and threat levels change over time. That includes because of different climatic events or trends as well as dynamic markets and geopolitical issues that result in food security issues, amongst others, as well as changes in the amount of international travel, international trade and so on.

As an ongoing program, there has been increased focus, of course, on emergency animal diseases, including the two specific ones that the honourable member has mentioned. We will continue with that work.

Not only does the minister not answer the substance of the question, she does not provide a response that is even remotely near the fundamental premise of the question; that is, is she confident about resourcing? The utter failure to acknowledge or respond to the question can only leave us with one conclusion: the answer is a resounding no. Let's move on to another question I asked the minister last sitting week:

1. Has PIRSA raised any concerns with the minister regarding the resources available to the department to participate in preparedness activities or surveillance activities relating to foot-and-mouth disease and lumpy skin disease?

2. Has PIRSA raised any concerns with the minister regarding the available workforce and allocated FTEs to help meet research needs to participate in preparedness activities or surveillance activities relating to foot-and-mouth disease and lumpy skin disease?

Mr President, they are two reasonably straightforward questions, would you not agree? Has PIRSA raised any concerns? Apparently not. Please indulge me again as I read the minister's response:

The department and I have regular meetings. Of course, a number of issues come up frequently within that. That covers a wide range of discussions in terms of what is the appropriate response and preparedness activities. As I mentioned in an earlier question, we have been working closely with industry as well as, for example, regional vets and so on in terms of the preparedness activities, and I am very happy with the way that those preparations have been continuing.

Did the response even come within the ballpark of answering my question: has PIRSA raised any concerns? No, it did not. As you would expect, I asked a supplementary question:

...have PIRSA raised specific concerns with the minister regarding the resources available to the department to participate in preparedness and surveillance activities relating to foot-and-mouth disease and lumpy skin...

Mr President, I think you might find some amusement in the minister's response:

I just answered that question. It's the same question.

Yes, it is the same question, because no, you did not answer the original question. The minister is incapable of answering a question. She repeatedly demonstrates her contempt for South Australians by failing to go anywhere close to providing a response to the question she is asked. It is disgraceful. Why was the minister so evasive in answering my questions about preparedness activities and surveillance activities last sitting week? Perhaps it is because a briefing to the minister from her department dated 18 July 2022 states that:

PIRSA has less resources than the commonwealth and larger states and territories. This impacts our ability to participate in preparedness activities to the same level and will affect our ability to effectively mount a response.

It also states that the department has the added 'difficulty of securing a workforce at the present moment' and further states that participation in surveillance activities 'is limited by not having the PIRSA staff resource to organise, collect and report the results, which can be logistically time consuming'.

It is little wonder the minister did not answer the questions. How can she possibly assure livestock producers in South Australia that we are ready and prepared to manage any possible outbreak of lumpy skin disease or foot-and-mouth disease in this state when her own department is briefing her on their concerns about their ability to participate in preparedness activities, our ability to effectively mount a response and the difficulty in securing a workforce?

I welcome the introduction of this bill. I welcome the minister taking definitive steps to strengthen measures to ensure speed of implementation and enable any response to be agile in the event of an emergency animal disease incursion. These measures will provide clarity in the event of an emergency animal disease incursion that, with the exception of the Emergency Management Act 2004, the Livestock Act 1997 will prevail over other acts.

Other key measures will enable urgent notices to be published immediately, ensuring that industry, veterinarians and PIRSA can act swiftly when required. It will provide inspectors with the ability to take a required action where a person fails to comply with a notice or order in a specified or reasonable time frame. It will provide the ability to prescribe the kind of property for which an inspector may issue an order, take action or cause action to be taken for the destruction, demolition or disposal of the property, as well as adding the powers to undertake surveillance and proof of freedom testing when an increased risk of exotic disease has been declared, to allow for monitoring disease incursions or for market access purposes.

It is equally important that preparedness activities are sufficiently resourced and undertaken to ensure South Australia is well placed to respond to an emergency animal disease incursion. I expect this bill to be the beginning of those efforts and look forward to further announcements and additional resources for efforts to plan, prepare, mitigate and respond to foot-and-mouth disease, lumpy skin disease or any other biosecurity threat, because lives and livelihoods depend on it.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:24): I rise on behalf of the Greens in support of this bill. We recognise that biosecurity is vital to protect our precious environment and our native species. The Greens believe the protection and conservation of biodiversity are essential for the wellbeing of all life, and it is crucial to protect biodiversity from threats such as diseases and pests.

Australia's natural biosecurity advantage has helped to protect our communities from many diseases and pests that can cause illness or damage our environment and our agriculture. Although current animal disease threats are mostly confined to livestock, there is the potential for diseases to spread to native species and to threaten biodiversity, and it is important that we protect our local food security as well as our local species.

In South Australia, we have an enormous range of unique ecosystems and habitats that are vulnerable to invasive species and to pests. These can cause untold damage to human health, to agriculture and to our environment. There is also a consideration here for animal welfare. The spread of infectious diseases amongst livestock can cause untold suffering of animals. We hope this bill enables swift action to be taken to ease the suffering of animals by reducing the administrative burden that is placed in dealing with these responses and dealing quickly with biosecurity threats before they become widespread. I therefore confirm the Greens will be supporting this bill.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:26): I rise in support of this bill. Prevention and suppression are imperative when it comes to controlling livestock diseases and viruses, as is control and eradication. There is a strong current of change to the north of Australia. High movement of people and animals, along with small-hold farming practices, have resulted in high incident rates of five particular diseases affecting livestock right on our doorstep in Indonesia and Malaysia.

Foot-and-mouth disease, African swine fever and African horse sickness are all one plane flight or one cargo boat away from our shores. Transitory diseases such as avian influenza, which

travels on migratory birds, or lumpy skin disease, spread through biting insects which travel on the wind, have created unregulated pathways for disease to spread between animals. There have been eight outbreaks of avian influenza viruses in Australia since the 1970s in our commercial poultry operations, the most recent in Victoria only two years ago. It infected a free-range chicken flock due to wild birds sharing their feed and range. This is a real threat each and every year as migratory birds visit our farms to feed and rest.

In May this year, I was shocked to see the delayed implementation of control and suppression measures against foot-and-mouth disease to protect our cloven-hoofed herds. The disease is uncontrolled in hotspot areas of Indonesia and incursion of the virus would have severe and immediate consequences for Australia's agricultural industry and trade.

Had an active case of the virus arrived on our shores the impact would have been immediate. Stock movements would have halted and the price on hoof and on hook would have plummeted. Our economy would have been slugged. Food price rises for households would have skyrocketed at a time when inflation is already unworkable. The response was not fast enough. We were one of the last locations in the country to receive biohazard mats at Adelaide Airport despite direct flights from affected regions. We need to do better for our farmers, and it is my understanding that industry has led the push for these prevention, suppression, control and eradication measures.

One Nation understands that farmers are fundamental to our society. It is impossible to go a single day without accessing the food and fibre they provide. The cost of not implementing these measures is crushing. The human cost and the mental anguish an outbreak of a serious disease such as foot-and-mouth would cause is too much to think of. A research paper looking into the UK experience of foot-and-mouth disease in 2001 states:

The disease epidemic was a human tragedy, not just an animal one. Respondents' reports showed that life after the foot and mouth disease epidemic was accompanied by distress, feelings of bereavement, fear of a new disaster, loss of trust in authority and systems of control, and the undermining of the value of local knowledge. Distress was experienced across diverse groups well beyond the farming community.

There is an important balance between affirmative action and reasonable measure. I think this bill delivers a helpful balance of power when the stakes are high and the impacts of inaction or half measures are significant, and I have been assured there are enough safeguards in place to protect the farmers and associated businesses.

My meetings with the department have demonstrated to me that there are reasonable measures and safeguards to ensure any action by agencies will be proportionate to the threat. There are significant powers, but the procedures and checkpoints are as rigorous as one could expect for a biosecurity emergency. I believe they will remain accountable during the process, and we put our trust in the Chief Veterinary Officer to make the right decision each time our biosecurity is threatened.

The Chief Veterinary Officer must satisfy the minister of the day that a declaration of increased risk of exotic disease is necessary and urgent and poses a substantial risk of harm to animals and industry, as well as to the safety of any person or the economy. Equally, we must rely on cooperation from our farming families to ensure we can keep putting food on the table. It is in everyone's interest that these biosecurity laws are strict, swift and act in the best interest of Australian producers.

If veterinarian checks need to be made, it is in everyone's interest to comply. If fences need to be erected temporarily on a property to contain a possible herd outbreak, then these must be built with the support of agency officers. If livestock trucks need urgent disinfecting, local vehicle washers should be able to be seconded for such measures and compensated accordingly.

One Nation wants our agricultural industry to thrive. We want them to get on with the business of growing our food and fibre. If the threat of foot-and-mouth earlier this year showed me anything, it is that these changes to the Livestock Act are absolutely necessary. The response at that time was slow, lugged in bureaucracy and, from an outsider's perspective, looked far from effective.

These are sensible measures. These are measures to streamline PIRSA response time and reduce the red tape needed to take swift, proportionate action. One Nation stands to protect our farming communities and I support this bill because it is needed.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:31): I thank the Hon. Ms Centofanti, the Hon. Mr Simms and the Hon. Ms Game for their indications of support for the bill, and I also thank the Hon. Mr Simms and the Hon. Ms Game for their constructive and thoughtful contributions on the matter. I do feel that I must respond to some of the commentary made by the Hon. Ms Centofanti to place on the record the full context of the quotes she gave.

Firstly, she referred to a paragraph in a briefing that says that PIRSA has less resources than the commonwealth and larger states and territories. I would have thought it was fairly obvious that a small state such as South Australia and its department would have less resources than the commonwealth and indeed the larger states and territories.

Secondly, she referred to the issue of workforce, but what she did not emphasise is that the brief refers to 'similar to other states and territories, recently vacated government roles are not able to be filled with suitable candidates', indicating that there is a widespread issue around workforce both in the sorts of roles we are looking to fill but more generally. As someone who spends a lot of time in regional areas, I am very aware of the labour shortages and skilled labour shortages that are so prevalent. I think it is worth having that within a suitable context.

However, I place on the record again my thanks for the contributions that were thoughtful and constructive, in particular the acknowledgement from the Hon. Ms Game that streamlining the processes so that we can respond in a way that is agile and swift is incredibly important. I look forward to, I hope, the swift passage of this bill today.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I would just like to draw the chamber's attention to one aspect. It has been brought to my attention that there is a slight drafting error in schedule 1. I will not be moving an amendment today, as amendments are not being drafted nor distributed to members, but I just want to flag it as something I will be seeking to address between the houses, if this bill passes this upper house this afternoon. That is in regard to schedule 1, paragraph (k) and proposed subparagraph (vii), which currently reads:

requiring the destruction, disposal, eradication or decontamination of feral animals...

The paragraph subsequently fails to include the word 'decontamination' in the second mention in that paragraph. I am sorry if that is not very clear. It is not necessarily essential to be specific, as I have attempted to be here, but I just mention that that is an amendment that I would seek to have moved between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister please indicate to the chamber why a notice cannot be gazetted in one working day?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the process for gazettal generally takes more than that. The scheduled gazettes are weekly. If, for example, it is a weekend or for another reason, it could not happen quickly. I think it is also relevant to point out that not only would going up on a website be much swifter but also in a potential emergency animal outbreak we want all of our staff working on the most urgent tasks. Going through the *Gazette* process would perhaps be important but not the most urgent, so if it can go straight up onto a website and then the advice is there as soon as possible, that seems the more appropriate way to go.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister indicate to the chamber in regard to the website where the dedicated website may be made public for clarity for industry so that producers and other industry stakeholders will know where to look?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The expectation is that it would be on the PIRSA website. I am advised that there is a news section there, which is the most likely. We have not, of course, put the name of the website in the bill, as websites tend to change over time. We also have industry communications lists, and they would be advised through that where to find it—the name of the website, etc.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I think the minister has probably answered my next question. Industry have indicated a desire to ensure that they are notified, obviously, very swiftly under these circumstances. Can the minister elaborate or place on the record the process and procedures through which those key stakeholders will be notified?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I think I have answered the question, but I am happy to elaborate a little bit. Communication and swift communication would, of course, be an absolute priority. There are the normal mechanisms: there is the stakeholder mailing lists and so on for emails, and those sorts of mechanisms would be employed.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister please advise the chamber what triggers would activate a declaration of increased risk of exotic disease, and who would be advising the minister in declaring that increased risk of exotic disease?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that both the Australian chief veterinarian and the South Australian chief vet would provide that type of advice. It would depend on the circumstances as to whether that would be one or both. Of course, I would rely on that expert advice.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Will this enable the minister to declare an increased risk in South Australia before the rest of the nation has agreed to an increased risk or emergency under the Emergency Animal Disease Response Agreement?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The answer to the question is yes, and that is considered advisable and prudent so that we can potentially protect our own markets or our own livestock by anticipating any types of mechanisms or actions that may be required without having to wait for, for example, a national declaration.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: This is in regard to section 43(2)(b): 'the property is of a kind prescribed by the regulations'. My question to the minister is: are the regulations already in effect?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: No, those regulations need to be developed if this amendment bill is passed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I thank the minister for that answer. My next question would be: what kinds of property would be expected to be included in those regulations?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The answer is that that would apply to the type of property that we currently have the ability to destroy or otherwise affect where currently there is the need for consent or a warrant. This change enables action to be taken without that consent or warrant when the situations are appropriate.

In the regulations, we would expect, for example, to put perhaps a dollar value limit on the amount that could be destroyed. As an example, I would imagine in most cases it would not be appropriate to destroy a large aircraft, which would be worth many tens of thousands of dollars or more. It would have to be a very extreme circumstance for that to be the case, so it might be

appropriate to place a dollar value that would prevent that kind of an action. In terms of the property, it is envisaged to be the same sort of property that we currently have the ability to destroy, but only with consent or a warrant.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I do believe this is my last question. In relation to protection from liability, I notice that under this clause it states that protection from liability is in relation to a notifiable disease, a notifiable contaminant or an exotic disease. Can the minister explain what the purpose is of including 'notifiable disease' and 'notifiable contaminant' in this clause, rather than just limiting it to 'exotic disease'?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The entire act refers to notifiable diseases and notifiable contaminants, etc., so this clause is to be consistent with the rest of the act.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 15) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:47 the council adjourned until Wednesday 16 November 2022 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***ADULT ADOPTIONS**

105 The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (7 September 2022). Can the Minister for Child Protection advise:

1. How many adult adoptions have occurred each year from 2017 to 2021?
2. How many adoptions of South Australian children have occurred each year from 2011 to 2021?
3. How many applications for adoptions have been received in South Australia each year from 2011 to 2021?
4. How many children in state care have been adopted by their guardians from 2019 to present?
5. How many expressions of interest have been received by the Department for Child Protection for the adoption of children in state care by their guardians from 2019 to present?

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

Adult adoptions granted in South Australia:

Year	Number of adoptions
2016-17	-
2017-18	-
2018-19	1
2019-20	5
2020-21	9
TOTAL	15

Source: DCP Adoption Team historical data

*Note: Adult adoptions came into effect in December 2018 (Adoption Act 1988)

Adoption orders granted in South Australia:

Year	Local adoptions
2010-11	2
2011-12	-
2012-13	2
2013-14	1
2014-15	2
2015-16	2
2016-17	3
2017-18	1
2018-19	2
2019-20	1
2020-21	2
TOTAL	18

Source: AIHW Adoptions Australia data collection

South Australian adoption applications:

Year	Number of applications
2010-11	22

Year	Number of applications
2011-12	29
2012-13	19
2013-14	17
2014-15	26
2015-16	22
2016-17	24
2017-18	18
2018-19	10
2019-20	12
2020-21	21
TOTAL	220

Source: DCP Adoption Team historical data

*Note: This data includes step and adult adoption applications

As at 23 September 2022, three children who were in care have been adopted by their guardians since 2019.

There have been 18 recorded inquiries from carers/guardians to the Department for Child Protection (DCP) regarding the adoption of children in state care.

SARDI'S WEST BEACH HEADQUARTERS

142 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (28 September 2022).

1. What is the total budget allocation for 2022-23 and over the forward estimates for capital for SARDI's West Beach headquarters?
2. What is the total project cost for the upgrade of SARDI's West Beach headquarters?
3. What is the time line for completing the upgrade of SARDI's West Beach headquarters?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

The total budget allocation for the upgrade redevelopment of the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre is \$16.079 million.

It is expected that the upgrade will be completed by mid-2023.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

159 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (28 September 2022).

1. How international education in South Australia will be supported to ensure future growth?
2. What policies has the government developed to achieve future growth?

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

1. The government is continuing to support the growth of international education in South Australia through its ongoing support and financial commitment to StudyAdelaide, in its role of leading the state's international education destination marketing strategy and student engagement programs.
2. Following the machinery of government transition of international education from the Department for Trade and Investment to the Department for Industry, Innovation and Science, the government is establishing a Higher Education and International Education Policy Unit to enable an integrated approach to policy for these critical and interrelated sectors.

RENTER'S RIGHTS

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (5 May 2022).

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

The Malinauskas government appreciates the critical importance of housing affordability and shelter and acknowledges that there are currently many pressures affecting access to rental accommodation.

I have asked the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, responsible for administration of the Residential Tenancies Act 1995 (act), for advice on a range of issues currently affecting the residential tenancies sector, which will inform the government's consideration on the best way forward for South Australia.

Any proposed reforms to address these issues will be subject to broad consultation with the sector, providing an opportunity for interested parties to make a submission.

The government also provides a range of services to protect and support renters including the Housing Safety Authority that administers the Housing Improvement Act 2016 (the act) to ensure residential premises meet minimum standards for health and safety. The Housing Safety Authority inspected the home referenced in the question and acted in accordance with the act. The government also funds RentRight SA that provides advice and advocacy for renters.

HOMELESSNESS

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (18 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 promised more than \$180 million for housing and homelessness at the 2022 election.

This includes \$177.5 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 and conduct a maintenance blitz on 3,000 homes. 150 of the new homes will be built in regional areas.

The 400 new homes will include a dedicated 50-unit complex with onsite supports to help people exiting homelessness. The onsite supports are backed by a commitment of \$4 million over four years and we have also provided an additional \$6 million to Catherine House, St Vincent de Paul and the Hutt St Centre to boost homelessness supports in the CBD.

The Albanese federal Labor government has also committed to a \$10 billion Housing Futures Fund that will deliver 30,000 social and affordable homes over five years and I look forward to working with federal Labor to ensure that South Australia maximises outcomes from this initiative.

We are reviewing the Emergency Accommodation Program that is currently spending almost \$10 million per year on motel accommodation for people with nowhere else to go. While this program provides critical shelter, parents with children need cooking facilities and places for children to play that motel rooms can't offer.

The Malinauskas Labor government has also committed to establishing a task force to examine the housing challenges faced by older women.

The building industry is facing historic challenges—many brought about by the Liberal Party's HomeBuilder scheme that gave out \$25,000 grants with no requirement for funds to support more accessible or affordable housing. These grants simply made already expensive homes even more unaffordable and have caused massive delays for tradies to undertake other work. In view of this, we are exploring innovative housing options that can be delivered faster and with less reliance on traditional industry supply chains.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

In reply to **the Hon. L.A. CURRAN** (7 July 2022).

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

SAPOL cannot establish any definitive statistical link between a major festival and sexual or other harassment. SAPOL reports statewide crime statistics on a monthly basis, which can be located through DATASA's internet page at DataSA/Organisations/South Australia Police/Crime Statistics.

SAPOL's Emergency and Major Event Section provides coordinated, consistent, and professional emergency and event management expertise within SAPOL and to external partners.

SAPOL assess all known public events to assist with predetermining a SAPOL response. SAPOL's Licensing Enforcement Branch (LEB) contributes to the safety of public events through working closely with event organisers and/or licensees to ensure compliance, providing advice in the planning phase of a major event and attending events to monitor crowd behaviour and take action to prevent or respond to offences.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (7 July 2022).

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

SAPOL cannot establish any definitive statistical link between a major festival and sexual or other harassment. SAPOL reports statewide crime statistics on a monthly basis, which can be located through DATASA's internet page at DataSA/Organisations/South Australia Police/Crime Statistics.

SAPOL's Emergency and Major Event Section provides coordinated, consistent, and professional emergency and event management expertise within SAPOL and to external partners.

SAPOL assess all known public events to assist with predetermining a SAPOL response. SAPOL's Licensing Enforcement Branch (LEB) contributes to the safety of public events through working closely with event organisers and/or licensees to ensure compliance, providing advice in the planning phase of a major event and attending events to monitor crowd behaviour and take action to prevent or respond to offences.

NATIONAL THREATENED SPECIES DAY

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (7 September 2022).

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

1. There are no legislative requirements under the National Parks and Wildlife Act (NPW Act) or its regulations, to do anything specific to help protect a species once it is listed as threatened. The NPW Act establishes the legal framework for proclaiming conservation reserves which, among other things, protects wildlife habitats across the state. Schedule 1 of the Native Vegetation Act 1991 is linked to the threatened species schedules of the NPW Act so that habitats of threatened species and habitat offset requirements are taken into account in native vegetation clearance applications.

The NPW Act also imposes penalties where a person is convicted of an offence in relation to animals. These penalties escalate according to the number of animals involved in an offence.

2. On-ground management and monitoring of listed threatened species is undertaken by regional staff of government land management agencies, environmental NGOs, private landholders and community volunteers.

Some high priority nationally threatened species have national recovery plans and/or recovery teams that guide management, monitoring and reporting. The national recovery plans are a mandatory requirements of the national Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Some high priority South Australian threatened species also have conservation action plans and teams undertaking management and monitoring. The state action plans are not mandated under South Australian legislation, regulation or policy.

Listed threatened species are taken into account in the Department for Environment and Water's (DEW's) fire management planning and state development assessment processes. Population monitoring is a part of these planning processes. Notwithstanding these important activities, the majority of South Australia's listed threatened species currently have no targeted management or monitoring.

3. The labor government has committed to improving the protection and recovery of biodiversity in SA by providing:

- \$6 million to fund heritage agreements on privately managed properties to help protect threatened species and their habitats and prevent further species becoming threatened.
- \$3 million for Friends of Parks groups to work in national parks on weeding, planting, seed collecting and other nature restoration activities that will help to protect many of our threatened species.
- \$1 million to employ state landcare coordinator(s) to support volunteer groups and run small grant programs that will among other things support threatened species.
- \$2 million for citizen scientists to help protect nature and be involved in the recovery of threatened species.
- \$3 million to establish a Biodiversity Coordination Unit within DEW to:
 - work with university researchers on tackling pests, weeds and abundant species.
 - Biodiversity monitoring.
 - using science to protect nature (through supporting a high-level expert panel on biodiversity conservation).
 - targeted species recovery (specifically through coordination of a taskforce to bring back birds in the Mount Lofty Ranges).

- Landscape coordination (working with landscape boards to ensure science is applied and shared statewide).

The government will also introduce a biodiversity act demonstrating its commitment to biodiversity conservation in this state.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (7 September 2022).

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

1. The department is undertaking a range of projects and plans to reduce workplace stress including:
 - Implementing a 'respectful behaviours' policy, which includes the management of bullying and harassment.
 - Development of a campaign to raise awareness and provide information to staff about mechanisms for speaking up and escalation of issues.
 - Reducing workplace stress through increasing resources and workforce.
 - Consultation on rostering management to ensure quality patient care and work-life balance for the workforce.
 - SA Health contributes funding to Doctors Health SA, a key organisation in ensuring timely medical care and appropriate referrals for psychological support.
 - Supporting and promoting mental health via access to Employee Assistance Programs (EAP) program, peers offering peer support programs and information about various mental health and wellbeing resources via a dedicated psychological health intranet page.

2. Hayden Stephens and Associates and SASMOA have announced an investigation into possible class action against SA Health for unpaid overtime for junior doctors. To date, no action has been launched in South Australia.

3. No. The Department for Health and Wellbeing (DHW) would need to understand the precise terms of the claim in order to assess potential financial impacts and opportunities to settle those claims.

4. DHW is unaware of any formal litigation commenced by doctors for payment of unpaid entitlements in the past 12 months.

Local management, DHW and Shared Services follow-up on issues raised by doctors and any other staff about issues related to their pay. We seek to ensure that staff are paid accurately, and any issues are resolved in a timely manner.

As Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, I have been advised:

SafeWork SA has advised that under section 19(1) of the Work, Health and Safety Act 2012 (SA) a person conducting a business or undertaking (PCBU) has a duty, so far as it is reasonably practicable, to protect workers from the risk of harm from work-related stress.

Workers might be exposed to a combination of psychosocial hazards in a workplace; some may always be present, while others only occasionally. PCBUs should understand what these risks are and how they can best control them.

At a national level, the model work health and safety (WHS) law include regulations on psychosocial hazards. A new model code of practice on managing psychosocial hazards at work has also been developed to provide practical guidance to PCBUs on how to manage workplace risks to psychological health.

This code of practice has been endorsed by the government and South Australia's Work, Health and Safety Regulations will be amended to incorporate the model WHS Regulations.

SafeWork SA has commenced the process for making the code of practice an 'approved' South Australian code of practice.

In addition, members of the Collaborative Partnership for Workplace Health and Wellbeing in South Australia, a group committed to working collaboratively towards improving workplace health, safety and wellbeing across South Australia, are due to launch a healthy workplace advisory service in late September.

This group have been tasked with helping employers to create a workplace program for healthy workplaces. One of the roles of the advisory service will be to provide a triaged service which can assist workplaces in establishing a plan for a healthy workplace, this may involve addressing matters such as suicide prevention.

I have not sought my own advice about the potential financial payout of any litigation against the Department for Health and Wellbeing. The department has a delegation which means it is responsible for the management of any monetary claims against it and, as such, this is appropriately a matter for the Minister for Health.

COVID-19 VACCINE, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (7 September 2022).

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

SA Health abides by the freedom of information legislation when responding to FOI applications, and strives to process freedom of information applications and issue determinations in line with the legislated timeframes.

GREAT WINE CAPITALS INDUSTRY FORUM

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (27 September 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

The wine industry is subject to the commonwealth's Wine Australia Act 2013, under which wine authentication, and protection from fraud, is managed under the through the Label Integrity Program.

REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

In reply to **the Hon. L.A. CURRAN** (27 September 2022).

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

The Department for Health and Wellbeing is currently working in partnership with PIRSA, Wellbeing SA, local health networks, Country SA Primary Health Network, emergency services, Department for Human Services, Department for Education, and other key stakeholders to increase preparedness for the mental health and wellbeing impacts of biosecurity risks. This includes improving access to mental health and wellbeing promotion and prevention initiatives, improving access to mental health information, and access to mental health supports for people in regional and rural South Australia.

The government has made a significant commitment to expanding the capacity of the mental health system, with an increase in specialist mental health services in the community and additional inpatient beds in country. In addition, the state and commonwealth bilateral agreement on mental health and suicide prevention focuses on improving access to mental health and suicide prevention services through collaboration and integration between state and commonwealth-funded services. This includes the implementation of new initiatives such as the statewide Head to Health phone line and two Head to Health walk-in mental health centres in country South Australia.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing will continue to work in partnership with the regional local health networks and Country SA Primary Health Network to ensure that state-funded specialist mental health services and commonwealth-funded primary mental health services are accessible for people in regional areas, noting that biosecurity risks can have long-term mental health impacts and therefore requires long-term mental health planning.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (27 September 2022).

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

Ambulance ramping, and the follow-on impacts to patients in the community, is not acceptable. The state government is committed to reducing ambulance ramping within its elected term, as its highest priority.

WINE INDUSTRY

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (28 September 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her questions and provide the following response:

Project 250

I am advised:

The South Australian government has a formal partnership with the South Australian Wine Industry Association, supported by a \$1 million commitment over the next four years from July 2022 until June 2026.

This is the fourth version of a partnership to support the wine industry which was first signed back in 2010. Some guidelines for the current deed have been adjusted at the request of industry to reflect the current priorities including market development.

The industry and market development program includes a range of activities that will support business skills development and ongoing business improvement of South Australian winery businesses.

Project 250 will also support initiatives at a state or regional level that continue to improve the capability and capacity of the wine industry across a range of areas – from viticulture to customer service.

Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program

I am advised that Project 250 is a separate partnership agreement and funding is not linked to the Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program.

I am advised that the Department for Trade and Investment are responsible for delivering the Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program.

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 September 2022).

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

South Australia has committed to the National Water Initiative including implementing a 'user-pays' approach to cost recovery for water planning and management.

Water planning improves our knowledge and understanding of climate impacts on water availability, which helps businesses and communities plan for the future.

Water users benefit from effective water management including protecting their access to water from other developments and holding a water licence that can be traded and mortgaged, potentially enabling access to billions of dollars of investment capital.

The Landscape South Australia Act 2019 provides extensive provisions regarding expenditure and revenue for the annual activities of landscape boards in both annual business plans and annual reports. This includes the requirement to document the water levies raised in their landscape regions and expenditure in their annual reports.

Since the introduction of the Landscape South Australia Act 2019, land and water levies are capped and there has not been any increase to land and water levies above CPI.

COVID-19 VACCINATIONS

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (28 September 2022).

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

COVID-19 can have serious complications including acute respiratory failure, acute cardiac injury, blood clots, pneumonia, among many other severe outcomes. Vaccination against COVID-19 offers the best protection against severe outcomes.

The COVID-19 vaccines available in Australia have been assessed for safety and effectiveness by the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA). The TGA undertakes ongoing surveillance and monitoring of the COVID-19 vaccines so that any potential safety concerns can be addressed promptly. Additionally, all COVID-19 vaccination directions have had provisions in place that enable a person to apply for a medical exemption and SA Health has a structured process to manage this.

South Australia has had arguably the fewest vaccine mandates of any Australian jurisdiction and these were only introduced for the highest risk settings. Regular assessment of the risk posed by COVID-19 in our community informs the decision regarding whether mandatory vaccination continues, and if so, for which sectors and in what form. As the acute phase of the pandemic draws to an end and as we transition to an ongoing management model for COVID-19, the government is committed to balancing the risk whilst keeping legal requirements to a minimum.

There are no government mandates in effect to the general population.

Currently, the requirement for COVID-19 vaccinations still applies to occupations working in public and private hospitals, disability care, residential aged-care facilities and ambulance services. Directions that were previously in place for primary care and allied health, police, education and fire services have ended.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (28 September 2022).

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

The following table displays the total fees raised by SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) less ambulance cover and pensioner concessions by financial year, 2018-19-2021-22 (in thousands):

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Fees Raised	218,518	236,742	255,661	239,638
less				
Ambulance cover concessions	66,542	69,748	77,078	70,147
Pensioner Concessions	49,464	52,149	56,616	51,678
Ambulance Transport	\$102,512	\$114,845	\$121,967	\$117,813

Rounding variances have been applied against pensioner concessions in this table.

SAAS's annual financial statements are prepared by Shared Services SA and, as such, a standard reporting template that complies with reporting requirements, including the Australian Accounting Standards, is applied.

As the make-up of transport fees is unique to SAAS, this was not picked up in the standard reporting requirements. While the exclusion of this information for the past three years is a matter for the former government, SAAS will work with Shared Services to see if it can be added back into future reports.

STRATHALBYN AND DISTRICT HEALTH SERVICE

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (18 October 2022).

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

As the member is aware, many regional EDs were closed by the former liberal government. Unfortunately, the Malinauskas Labor government has inherited several EDs that have remained closed since that time, which includes Strathalbyn.

The government remains committed to addressing the workforce challenges faced in re-establishing services in Strathalbyn, including working with the federal government to address system-wide issues that can prove a significant barrier for local GPs to provide on-call services to the emergency department.

The Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network is establishing a working group to assess what emergency services are needed to meet the growing demands in the Strathalbyn community and nearby regions, review similar models of care and provide recommendations to the local health network for consideration. The working group will include local GPs, SA Ambulance Service and members of the Strathalbyn community, and is scheduled to meet for the first time this month.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (18 October 2022).

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

1. The total expenditure for the removal of chalking from SAAS Ambulances was \$124,400.56.
2. The total expenditure for the removal of signage from SAMFS Fire Stations was \$1,789.65.

PIRSA SCORECARD

In reply to **the Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO** (20 October 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

I can confirm that the 2021-22 Primary Industries Scorecard is not yet finalised, with critical data for a number of sectors not yet available. It is expected that the report will be finalised for release in the normal timetable.

SEXUAL OFFENCES FINALISED IN THE NUNGA COURT

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (20 October 2022).

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

The Nunga Court was established in 1999. Data is available for approximately the last five years (between 1 July 2017 and 26 August 2022) and shows there were two defendants finalised in the Nunga Court with sexual offences, with both defendants convicted of indecent assault charges under section 56(1) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935.

RECFISH SA

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (19 November 2022).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I thank the honourable member for her question and provide the following response:

I can confirm the grant agreement with RecFish SA to undertake stakeholder representation and advisory activities has been made available to the public on the SA Tenders web site.