

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 5 February 2025

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.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:18): I bring up the 56th report of the committee 2022-2025.
Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid upon the Table:

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

Reports, 2023-24—

Alinytjara Wilurara Landscape Board.
Commissioner for the River Murray on South Australia
Mr Richard Beasley SC
Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board
Green Adelaide Board
Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Board
Kangaroo Island Landscape Board
Limestone Coast Landscape Board
Murraylands and Riverlands Landscape Board
Northern and Yorke Landscape Board
South Australian Arid Lands Landscape Board

Question Time

PUBLIC SAFETY MANAGEMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Minister for Emergency Services regarding public safety and communications.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: There have been incidents, verified by the SAFECOM CEO, of several people not receiving alerts for their correctly registered watch zone on the Alert SA app. In three of these instances, the app was up to date, the watch zones and notification settings were correct, but notifications did not eventuate. According to the developer, the app had gone into hibernation mode after a period of non-use, such as over winter and when there were no alerts. The solution, which worked, was to delete the app and reinstall. The concern is that users of the app may

be unaware if their Alert SA app is not displaying alerts on their phones. My questions to the Minister for Emergency Services are:

1. Can the minister confidently assure this chamber that the Alert SA app is, in fact, alerting all users of incidents that occur in their correctly entered watch zones?
2. What has the government done to advise Alert SA app users that they may not be receiving notifications in correctly entered watch zones?
3. How will the government inform members of the public that their notifications on the Alert SA app are not being received, and how users may be able to fix the problem?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. As it is day seven, I am having lots of briefings so I am happy to look into this a bit further because the safety of our community is paramount. Just as background, since Alert SA was launched in December 2019 I understand it has been downloaded over 441,000 times, so this is an alert app that is utilised, but I am happy to look into the details that you have raised today.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries about the tomato brown rugose fruit virus.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On 12 November in this place, the minister gave a lengthy explanation of the considerations for compensation for the tomato brown rugose fruit virus and noted that signatories to the Emergency Plant Pest Response Deed (EPPRD) were able to access owner reimbursement costs to offset some of the loss associated with the incursion and loss of income. The minister also explained that as the fresh tomato industry was not a signatory to that deed affected growers could not access owner reimbursement costs, that there is capacity for compensation in South Australia but that this was being discussed at a federal level.

SA Tomato, as a nursery and plant propagation business, is covered under the EPPR Deed. They have suffered through loss of trade resulting from the need for quarantine to the point where the business has recently had no option but to close indefinitely. I understand that as a result of the response plan agreed by the national management group on 21 November last year the framework for owner reimbursement costs was agreed. The subsequent assessment and approval process is a responsibility of the state jurisdiction, in this case the Department of Primary Industries.

Yet despite this process being approved in November and the urgent need for this business to receive the assistance agreed and funded by their levies, they have not yet been paid. So my questions to the minister are:

1. Why has it taken so long to organise payment of owner reimbursement costs to SA Tomato, given the business has been subject to section 9 orders since 16 August 2024 and is covered by the EPPR Deed?
2. What is the process for payment of owner reimbursement costs to SA Tomato?
3. When does the minister believe that this payment will be made?
4. Has the minister personally contacted Oriana and Peter Petsios, the owners of SA Tomato, to check on their welfare?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. Being a plant nursery, SA Tomato is represented by Greenlife Industry Australia, which is a signatory to the national Emergency Plant Pest Response Deed. Because they are a signatory to the deed, SA Tomato qualifies for the payment of owner reimbursement costs under the agreed national response plan for tomato brown rugose fruit virus and these costs have been written into and agreed within the national plan.

Consistent with that national response plan, an independent assessor has been appointed, has met with the business and commenced an assessment of the claim. The assessor is talking with Greenlife Industry Australia for assistance in the verification process that is required for the claim. Once the assessor's report is submitted to PIRSA we will be able to ensure, with the help of Plant Health Australia, that it complies with the agreed national claim criteria. Once that is verified the claim can be paid by the South Australian government, with costs then recovered through the normal cost share process across all national affected parties.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: why did it take multiple months for the government to engage the independent assessor?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:29): As I said, the independent assessor is appointed consistent with the national response plan.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: when was the national response plan agreed to?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:29): If I recall correctly, that was in November, but what the Leader of the Opposition doesn't seem to appreciate is that when there is a national response to a national exotic disease, the jurisdictions—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —need to work within that nationally agreed response. If the Leader of the Opposition doesn't understand what a nationally agreed response is, I suggest she does some homework.

The PRESIDENT: Your last supplementary.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Does the national agreement response dictate that the independent assessor could not be engaged for two months?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:30): I am happy to take on notice the specifics of how the assessor was required to be appointed.

VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEMS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of vessel monitoring systems.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In April last year, I asked the minister a question regarding vessel monitoring systems and their potential to be imposed on the marine scale fishing sector in South Australia. The minister in her response said:

I am advised that at a commonwealth level VMS has been a useful tool in giving compliance teams the ability to monitor vessels digitally, leading to efficiencies that can potentially flow through the cost-recovery process. VMS implementation in our state has the potential to reduce the compliance effort required to monitor the commercial fisheries by giving PIRSA a proven tool to be able to monitor vessels more efficiently.

The minister also said:

I understand that PIRSA has recently undertaken a consultation process with each of the commercial fishing sectors where it is proposed that VMS will be introduced. Once I have received and considered the advice from PIRSA on its proposal I will be able to speak further on this matter.

Over the past few months the opposition has received overwhelming feedback from the commercial fishing sector, particularly that of the marine scale fishing sector, that they are completely against the use of VMS, particularly given that they have been informed by the department that the use of VMS will not result in reduction in the licence fee structure to indicate a flow through into the cost-recovery process. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given the minister has now received and considered the advice from PIRSA on VMS, including the consultation feedback from the fishers, does she continue to support her department's bid for VMS and, if so, why?
2. Will the minister rule out increases in costs for fishers for ongoing maintenance and repairs of VMS devices?
3. Why won't the department cover ongoing maintenance and replacement of VMS devices, given that they are being mandated by her government?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for her question. After considering feedback from industry, along with all other relevant information, I determined that it was appropriate that the following South Australian fisheries implement a vessel monitoring system (VMS) as part of their spatial monitoring and compliance programs: the blue swimmer crab fishery; Gulf St Vincent, Spencer Gulf and West Coast prawn fisheries; western and central zone abalone fisheries; and the marine scalefish fishery. The southern zone rock lobster fishery has been granted a two-year timeframe to implement equivalent technology offering the same real-time, offshore, at-sea monitoring capacity.

PIRSA is now working on the rollout of VMS for the applicable fisheries. It's worth noting that VMS is already in use across a number of South Australian fisheries including northern zone rock lobster, southern zone abalone, sardine and giant crab. I am advised that it has proven to be a useful and successful tool in these sectors. I am further advised that at a commonwealth level VMS is considered a useful tool in giving compliance teams the ability to monitor vessels digitally, leading to efficiencies that can potentially flow through to their process.

The implementation cost of the VMS units will be covered by a grant from the commonwealth's Parks Australia, meaning there will be no upfront costs to industry to implement VMS. Ongoing costs with regard to the VMS monitoring program will be reviewed directly against efficiencies observed within the fisheries compliance program. The vessel monitoring system program will be delivered on a cost-neutral basis for fishers. The cost-neutral status of this implementation is inclusive of hardware and installation.

I understand that PIRSA has now released a proposed VMS implementation plan and is engaging with the relevant executive officers to ensure a smooth transition onto the vessel monitoring system. I understand PIRSA has also developed and distributed a 'frequently asked questions' guide to executive officers to assist fishers with any questions they may have regarding the implementation and ongoing management of the program. All fisheries within the scope of the VMS implementation plan are intended to be fitted with a VMS and active prior to 30 June 2025.

VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEMS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): Supplementary: will the minister rule out increases in costs for fishers for ongoing maintenance and repairs of the VMS devices?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:35): Business costs are the responsibility of businesses. Of course, we have had a significant amount of fee relief for various fisheries within South Australia. I guess I would ask the honourable member: is she opposed to appropriate real-time compliance and monitoring?

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: They already comply, Clare.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The Leader of the Opposition is obviously unaware that there is no real-time information currently able to be reported. If that's not something that she supports, it would be interesting to understand her reasons.

VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEMS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:36): Supplementary: would the same decision have been made by this government in the absence of the federal grant that actually paid for the installation of the VMS, and can the minister rule out compliance costs—not implementation, but compliance costs—with the scheme?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, the first part of the supplementary is a hypothetical question; you can have an attempt to answer it. For the second part, I think I would like to hear your answer, if you can.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): I agree, Mr President, that the first half is hypothetical and speculating is not particularly helpful. My advice is also that Seafood Industry SA was supportive of the implementation of VMS and there has also been support in industry, although obviously it is not unanimous. As I mentioned, the implementation will be cost-neutral.

THRIVING COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister please inform the chamber about today's announcement regarding the government's Thriving Communities Program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. As this chamber, hopefully, is aware, the Thriving Communities Program, delivered through the government's Thriving Regions Fund, provides grants of between \$20,000 and \$50,000 for projects that deliver new or upgraded infrastructure and equipment or events with wellbeing outcomes for regional communities. Eligible projects show that they build social capital through increased community participation, improved accessibility or by creating a sense of belonging amongst community members. Past successful projects have included community kitchens, playgrounds, shelters, storage facilities and restoration and upgrades of existing infrastructure.

Late last year, I announced the opening of the most recent round of the Thriving Communities Program, and the round was so popular that it was heavily oversubscribed. Today, I was delighted to announce that the government has allocated an additional \$1.2 million in funding to the greatly successful round. I am so pleased that this funding will assist more community groups in our regions in bringing important projects to fruition. I am also very excited to announce 10 projects that have been successful so far in various communities across the state. The successful projects include:

- the Port Broughton Bowling Club Incorporated, for 'Ramp it up: improving access for all to the Port Broughton clubrooms'. The bowling club has secured up to \$50,000 for this project to make this important community facility more accessible. I am told that this bowling club is used widely by the community and is available to be booked for events, so accessibility is vital;
- the Orreroo Netball Club has been awarded up to \$49,948 for its outdoor youth zone, which intends to provide a space for community members to participate in various outdoor activities, including basketball and soccer;
- the Echunga Memorial Institute Incorporated has secured \$25,180 for an upgrade of rainwater catchment for the institute roof. The institute is the home of the Echunga Post Office, Meals on Wheels, RSL, community noticeboard and *Community Times*. I am told that the institute relies on this rainwater for its running water and functioning toilets;

- the Kulpara Old School Site Committee has secured up to \$50,000 for its project, Nature Meets Community: Kulpara School Site Revamp. This project aims to redevelop an old school site into an outdoor space for community members;
- the Balgowan Progress Association has been awarded up to \$27,058 for the upgrade of the local playground into a safe and modern play space;
- the Nairne Golf Club will receive up to \$37,275 to upgrade its clubrooms and surrounds through upgrades to disabled access;
- the Dunjiba Community Council has secured up to \$50,000 for its food hub infrastructure upgrade. The community food hub in Dunjiba addresses food insecurity challenges in the community. The upgrade will provide safety and amenity updates to improve the hub for volunteers and community members accessing those services;
- the Blinman Men's Shed Incorporated will receive up to \$31,451 for the Blinman Community Hub Project Community Garden. I am advised that this project aims to provide an important community space; and, finally,
- the Prospect Hill Community Organisation Incorporated is receiving up to \$48,656 for rainwater tanks for the community hall and war memorial in Prospect Hill. I am advised the tanks will provide safe and reliable drinking water and additional water resources for the CFS.

I am excited to see these projects come to fruition and also to see the fantastic ideas of other community groups that have put in applications that will be assessed in the coming weeks.

PRISON ASSAULTS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:41): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services on the topic of assaults in prisons.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Might I also congratulate the minister on her elevation. Correctional services data reported in *The Advertiser* on Monday showed that prison assaults on prisoners and correctional officers doubled in the last year, with over 481 prison assaults recorded between 2023 and 2024. Regulation 9 of the Young Offenders Regulations 2023 allows for children as young as 10 years of age in lawful custody to be held in adult facilities in places further than 40 kilometres from Adelaide's General Post Office.

In 2024, child rights progress reports, issued by the Commissioner for Children and Young People, found that children are still being locked up in police cells alongside adults due to the denial of bail. In 2022, the Commissioner for Children and Young People noted in their report that children were held in adult facilities, such as police cells or other watchhouses, at least 2,030 times. My questions to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services therefore are:

1. Given the increase in prison assaults, does the minister believe that adult facilities are a safe environment for children aged between 10 and 14?
2. What action does the minister plan to take to protect vulnerable young people who are being incarcerated?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for his question. Obviously corrections, on my understanding, is based around supporting the adult population. I am happy to get more information around the issues you have raised today and get a briefing in that space, because I would also like to learn more about that as well. I will get a briefing on that matter.

PRISON ASSAULTS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:43): Supplementary: as part of that briefing, will the minister engage with the Commissioner for Children and Young People?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:43): I thank the member for his question. My understanding is that this usually comes under the remit of the Minister for Human Services, so I will be working with her as well. But, again, I will come back to my original answer: I am happy to get further information on this matter.

PRISON ASSAULTS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:43): Final supplementary: is the minister concerned about the welfare of these young people being detained in these facilities, given the significant spate of assaults that are happening in prisons?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Again, it was a very good attempt, the Hon. Mr Simms, but it sort of falls short really of the original answer.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: No harm in trying.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Simms, you are regularly very trying! The Hon. Ms Lee.

CHILD ABUSE IN SCHOOLS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, representing the Minister for Education, about failures to prevent abuse in schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Recently, a half a million dollar lawsuit against the state government was filed by a former student of the Kadina Memorial School accusing the government of negligence and vicarious liability and alleging that the school's inaction allowed teacher Thomas Robert Ackland to continuously abuse him over a number of years. The former student alleges that the school was aware of Ackland's inappropriate conduct as early as April or May 2018 but failed to take adequate action to prevent further abuse.

Following this, a whistleblower and a former staff member of the school has reported to *The Advertiser* that the school had actively tried to discourage conversations about Mr Ackland's abuse of students. The whistleblower also claimed that even after the school learnt of Mr Ackland's actions he was retained in a senior position and that students, parents and police received inadequate support from the school. The whistleblower also said:

I believe it is important to highlight the lack of support provided to victims and families, the silencing of staff and students, and the failure to pass information to police.

And that she was:

...speaking out to ensure the state government and the school were 'made accountable' for their decisions surrounding the case.

My questions for the minister are:

1. Does the government agree that systemic failures within both the school and the Department for Education led to the inaction and silencing of staff and students which allowed the abuse to continue over a number of years?
2. What new policies will the government introduce to ensure that adequate safeguards and accountability processes are put in place to protect students from abuse?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:46): I thank the member for her question, and I will pass it on to the minister in the other place.

APY LANDS, ALCOHOL SALES

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): I seek leave to provide a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding the APY lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: On 16 December 2024, SAPOL reported the seizing of more than 100 casks of wine, bottles of spirits, premixed drinks and beer that was believed to be illegally bound for the APY lands, where alcohol is prohibited. It is understood that an investigation is still underway and no arrests have been made to date. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Can the Attorney update the chamber on the status of the investigation and if any arrests have been made?
2. Has the Attorney-General considered the tightening of supplying and transporting liquor laws in order to make the necessary arrests for illegally bound alcohol to restricted areas, and if not why not?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is a very important question. As the honourable member points out in her question it is illegal to possess or supply alcohol in the APY lands. All six major communities—going from the highway, Indulkana, Mimili, Fregon, Ernabella, Umuwa, Amata and Pipalyatjara—are dry communities, as are the homelands and smaller out-communities across the APY lands.

I am certain that the police are taking whatever action they can in relation to the incident. It was very well publicised in relation to alcohol that, as I recall, was thought to be bound for the APY lands. Certainly there are actions that are regularly taken in relation to trying to restrict alcohol from the APY lands.

One action that was taken in recent years was in relation to the closure of the township of Mintabie. Mintabie was an exclusion, as I know you well know, sir, from your time on the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. Mintabie was a very small community where mining had previously occurred for opals, but very little mining was occurring. Evidence on a report that was accepted by both the former Labor government and the former Liberal government was that it was apparently a point where both alcohol and drugs were being supplied to the APY lands. Mintabie, as a township that did not need a permit, has now been closed down.

In relation to supply of alcohol to the APY lands, I know the liquor licensing commissioner has in the past regularly spoken to Aboriginal elders to look at what restrictions are in place at places like Port Augusta and Coober Pedy, where people travelling to and from the APY lands regularly stop. There has been a tightening over recent years in relation to the sale, and particularly the amount, of alcohol that can be bought in those sorts of towns.

APY LANDS, ALCOHOL SALES

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): A supplementary: does the Attorney have confidence in the current legislative framework that is in place, or does he think that further changes need to be made?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her question. If there were suggestions put forward we would be absolutely open to looking at those suggestions. It is currently illegal to have alcohol in the APY lands and, as the recent publicity shows, it is enforced by the police.

As I also said, there are schemes available outside legislative change, like changing the ability for alcohol to be supplied in areas that the authorities know can be points where alcohol is purchased to be brought into the APY lands. So yes, there is that ability, as currently happens under the liquor licensing regime, to attempt to restrict supply. However, if there are further legislative suggestions we are more than open to looking at those.

BUTLER, MR BRIAN (WILLIAM)

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council of the recent passing of Aboriginal leader Mr Brian (William) Butler?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question about William Brian Butler, known to most as Brian Butler, a truly remarkable Aboriginal leader.

It is with deep sadness that I mark the passing of Mr Butler in December 2024. Mr Butler, a Luritja and Eastern Arrernte man from Central Australia, dedicated his life to advancing the rights and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Born in 1938 on Bagot reserve in the top end of the Northern Territory, Mr Butler was sent to Saint Francis Boys Home in the Semaphore area of Adelaide, where he formed connections with remarkable individuals such as Charlie Perkins, Gordon Briscoe and John Moriarty.

Mr Butler's contributions to our nation were both profound and far-reaching. For over 60 years he was front and centre of numerous campaigns, in particular to raise awareness and support for the stolen generations and their families and communities. Early into his career of lifelong advocacy, Mr Butler recognised the limitations of government institutions in addressing Aboriginal issues and Aboriginal disadvantage, and he established the South Australian Aboriginal Child Care Agency. Its primary purpose was to recruit Aboriginal foster parents to take in Aboriginal children, aiming to place children with members of their extended family or another Aboriginal family where that was not possible.

He played a significant role in advocating for the Australian Human Rights Commission's National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children. This would culminate in the 1997 'Bringing Them Home' report.

During 2021 Mr Butler and Mr John Bond published *Sorry and Beyond Healing: the Stolen Generations*, which tells the story of Mr Butler's life and the tragedy of children stolen as part of the stolen generations. The foreword to Mr Butler's biography was written by former Australian Prime Minister the Hon. Dr Kevin Rudd, who also attended the Adelaide book launch via video link from the United Nations. This speaks to the manner and respect afforded to Mr Butler, and his advocacy on behalf of Aboriginal people within South Australia and nationally.

His lifework serves as a reminder of the progress we have made and the challenges that still lie ahead. As we mourn his loss we also celebrate his remarkable achievements, and reaffirm our commitment to the principles he fought so tirelessly to uphold. Mr Butler's passing is a great loss to the South Australian community generally and to the Aboriginal community specifically.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELLING

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:53): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services, representing the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, a question about country of origin labelling on Australian seafood.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: This week it was reported in *The Australian* that there are growing fears and concerns amongst those in the seafood industry that the federal Labor government plans to overlook its election commitment to implement requirements for all hospitality venues to indicate the country of origin of the seafood on their menus, a scheme all states signed up to late last year after some 20 years of lobbying and advocacy.

A key election promise for the Albanese government, the commitment has enormous ramifications for the South Australian seafood industry, which is, as we know, a crucial component of our state's economy and has been a key body in terms of advocating for mandatory seafood labelling. In that article, the Chief Executive Officer of Seafood Industry Australia, Veronica Papacosta, issued a warning to the government that not implementing the scheme:

...would be a critical loss to the Australian consumer who needs to have the ability to locate Australian seafood...Australians being able to access Australian seafood is almost a quintessential right and we haven't had that ability in food service until now. We hope the Albanese government fulfils its promise before the election.

My question to the minister is: in light of the very critical role that South Australia played with respect to the agreement underpinning the changes at a national level, what are we doing to ensure the implementation and enforcement of the scheme in SA in a timely manner?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her ongoing advocacy in this space on behalf of the seafood industry. I am so used to Minister Scriven talking about anything in the sea. As the honourable member is aware, our seafood industry is an integral part of the South Australian economy, providing first-class produce for people around the world and employing thousands of South Australians.

As the minister representing the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs in this place, I can confirm for the honourable member that the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs has confirmed that South Australia remains committed to introducing new information standards on country of origin labelling in the Australian Consumer Law. I understand that on 24 November 2023 state and territory and commonwealth consumer ministers voted to include the new information standards in the ACL.

I am also advised that under the new standards all hospitality businesses will need to label their menu and other food advertisements according to the A model. Menu items with the fish harvested in Australia will need to be labelled with the letter A. Menu items with fish harvested outside Australia will need to be labelled with the letter I to indicate that the seafood is imported, and menu items containing both Australian and imported fish will need to be labelled with the letter M to indicate that the item has mixed origins.

I am advised the standards will apply to any menu item that contains all or part of a fish. The definition of a fish and the fish items also includes other seafoods such as shellfish, eels, jellyfish and the eggs or larva of these animals. I understand the most recent update the minister has received from the CBS confirms that the goal to implement the information standards from 1 July 2025 remains in place.

I understand that the commonwealth and territory regulators are currently deliberating on the best way to implement the planned new information standards and manage compliances and undertake an education campaign, and the minister is certainly keen to see these measures implemented in a timely manner.

PRISON VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing questions to the Minister for Correctional Services regarding violence in prisons.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yesterday, the minister indicated that she was aware of assaults against correctional officers reaching record highs. My questions, therefore, are:

1. What proportion of charges laid in 2023-24 against inmates for assaulting correctional officers have led to convictions?
2. Has the minister met with representative bodies to discuss concerns about workplace safety?
3. Has the minister personally met with any of the correctional officers who have been allegedly abused, and, if not, what steps has she taken to inform herself of their experiences and concerns?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:59): I thank the member for her question. In regard to safety, obviously I want to learn as much as I can in this space. I have already reached out to the unions that are involved in this area. There are two unions that look after

our correctional services—one that looks after our privatised areas and one that looks after our public—and I have reached out to both those organisations. Obviously, I am also having conversations with the department as well in this space.

CADELL DAIRY

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Will the minister inform the council about her recent visit to the Cadell dairy?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for her question. Since taking on this role, I have been very keen to get out and about and see firsthand the work our agencies are doing to keep our communities safe. On Saturday, I travelled to Cadell Training Centre. As members would know, Cadell is a low-security prison, which focuses on rehabilitation of prisoners, and equips prisoners with practical skills they can use and utilise outside of prison.

Cadell is a working farm, producing olives and citrus, and provides milk and cream to South Australian businesses. Construction of the new David Oates Cadell dairy was completed, I understand, last year with a \$12 million state-of-the-art facility replacing the original dairy from 1960. It incorporated the full process of dairy production from paddock to gate, being both a dairy and a production facility in one complex.

I understand the dairy has approximately 290 cattle or, as the community at Cadell like to call them, the ladies, and 24 men work to milk approximately 110 cows, morning and afternoon, and producing almost 2,000 litres of milk a day. It was incredible to meet some of the team, and to see the pride they take in their work. I am grateful to Aaron for being an excellent tour guide, and for explaining how the transition from the old dairy to the new facilities has completely changed how they work. I am advised the dairy supplies milk and cream to Adelaide Women's Prison, Mobilong Prison and Port Augusta Prison.

The upgraded complex ensures a more streamlined and efficient dairy production, as well as future growth opportunities for prisoners' training and education. Being able to work in the dairy and learn new skills improves confidence and brings a new sense of purpose and builds self-discipline in prisoners who work these shifts. They are able to manage ongoing responsibilities, such as quality assurance and animal welfare, and it also enhances their literacy skills.

In relation to the construction of the dairy, I understand 18 prisoners worked alongside the main building contractor to construct it, and 9,800 prisoner working hours were used to complete the project. The prisoners involved worked toward a Certificate II in Construction Pathways, and I understand utilised these skills to learn in the classroom and a live building site. They were engaged in a wide range of building-related activities, including demolition, painting, plastering, and landscaping—all skills that will serve them upon release, and aid them in gaining future employment opportunities.

This government is committed to improving prisoner rehabilitation and making South Australia a safer place to live by improving community safety and aiming to reduce reoffending rates. The training on offer at Cadell is part of the Work Ready Release Ready program, to which this government has committed an additional \$6.3 million, I believe, to expand this program.

The Report on Government Services released yesterday shows that South Australia is leading the nation with the lowest rate of repeat offending in the country. I understand in the last financial year the recidivism rate fell 1 per cent to 35.8 per cent compared to the national average of 52.5 per cent, with almost half of the DCS prisoners engaged in education and training, nearly double the national rate. I understand nearly 85 per cent engaged in job-ready activities.

CADELL DAIRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:03): Supplementary: how much are inmates paid for their labour, and where do the proceeds of any profits go?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for her question. I understand that there is a range of opportunities to gain income, and I am happy to take that question on notice.

CADELL DAIRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:04): Supplementary: where do the proceeds of any profits go?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:04): I am happy to take that on notice.

SAND DREDGING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister responsible for the Adelaide beach sand management trials.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The arrangements for the MC Dredging & Port development Pty Ltd for the dredging that was carried out for the sand management trials contains a clause—and I refer the minister to page 10, 3.2, Turbidity Management (S-291)—which states:

The Licensee must;

- 3.2.1 take all reasonable and practicable measures to prevent or minimise environmental harm that may be caused by turbidity resulting from dredging and dewatering (works); and
- 3.2.2 ensure that where a water quality management plan has been implemented, provide all water quality monitoring data (including raw turbidity data documented in the approved spreadsheet template) to the EPA upon request, or at completion of the works.

My question to the minister is: has the data been provided, and will it be made public?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think the simple answer is I am not aware of any instance where any condition that the EPA has imposed upon that dredging trial has been breached, but I am happy to go away and bring back an answer for the honourable member if there is any concern that anything has been breached, but certainly I am not aware of it.

SAND DREDGING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): Supplementary: has the EPA requested the data?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:06): Again, I am not aware there has been any noncompliance with any aspect of contingents set down by the EPA, but I am happy to go and check.

SAND DREDGING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Supplementary question: will the Attorney make that data publicly available?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:06): As I have said, I am not aware of any breach of any of the conditions set down by the EPA. But as I said, I am happy to check, and if there have been any concerns raised, I am happy to bring something back.

AERIAL FIREFIGHTING UNITS

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services regarding aerial firefighting units, and add my congratulations to her elevation to minister.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: It has recently come to the attention of the opposition that in March 2024 an aerial firefighting unit stationed in Mount Gambier was sent to Adelaide for what was initially described as minor pump repairs. However, upon arrival it was determined that the unit required a mid-life rebuild. Nearly a year later, the rebuild has not occurred. Reports indicate that parts from this unit have been removed and used on other units. We are now informed that it won't be returning to service into Mount Gambier until March 2025.

Aerial units allow the Metropolitan Fire Service in Mount Gambier to conduct below-ground rescues and cliff rescues. It can also effectively fight fires that require water to be applied at height, such as those at timber mills or CBD buildings, where such intervention is crucial in slowing the spread of fire. Given that Mount Gambier has been without an aerial firefighting unit for nearly a year now, my questions to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services are:

1. Why wasn't a replacement unit redirected from a metropolitan area?
2. What actions can the minister immediately take to ensure Mount Gambier is supplied with an aerial appliance?
3. What steps will the minister take to ensure regional areas are properly equipped with vital emergency service appliances?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:08): I thank the member for his question. You have highlighted the importance of aerial support, and I am happy to look into this further. Obviously, this is a very particular case that you are referring to. I have had the great pleasure of reaching out to many in our community both in the MFS and the CFS, and I am always keen to hear from both sides of the story, so I will do just that in this instance as well.

PENOLA FIRE TOWER

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Forest Industries. Will the minister update the council about the recently opened Penola fire tower and the role it will play in protecting the state's forest assets in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:09): I thank the member for his question. I am very pleased to update the chamber with news of the Penola fire tower, formerly named Penola North. Construction has now been completed and it is in full operation. This is the final part of a partnership between the state government and the forest industry, which has seen an overall investment of almost \$5 million in landscape-level fire detection that will help protect the forest estate and over 21,000 direct and indirect jobs that the industry supports and, of course, all residents in the region, who face the threat of bushfires during our summer seasons in particular.

I understand the original Penola fire tower was over 100 years old and had been deemed simply not safe enough to operate and so needed to be dismantled and rebuilt. The new tower was constructed in partnership with local Limestone Coast businesses and delivered in collaboration with the Green Triangle Forest Industries Hub and OneFortyOne Plantations. Unlike the fire towers at Comaun, Mount Benson, The Bluff, Furner, Mount Burr, Carpenter Rocks, Lucindale South and Cave Range, which have all been installed with AI ultra-HD 360° panoramic cameras to detect fires early before they spread, this fire tower is being staffed during the fire season at the request of industry.

In December, I had the opportunity to join the hardworking local member for MacKillop along with the Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Forest Products Association in climbing the 13-storey, newly constructed fire tower at the official opening, and I also had the great privilege to undertake the first radio transmission to the fire tower base.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I was concerned that going up the 13 storeys of stairs I may be lagging behind everyone else but I was glad to see that we all kind of just kept on keeping on, and so it did not take too much time to make it up the 13 flights! It was particularly impressive to look out at the top of the tower across the expansive plantation estate that it is protecting. From the top, you are able to view valuable agricultural land as far as the eye can see.

The commissioning of the Penola fire tower marked a significant step towards the industry's fire protection efforts. We know, obviously, that fire protection is important to all, and we are pleased to be working with industry in ensuring our forest and other agricultural commodities are protected from the dangers of bushfires because, as we know, fire does not discriminate.

That is why the state government has invested \$2.34 million in upgrading our fire towers and overall has seen investment of close to \$5 million with the co-contribution from industry. Importantly, the Limestone Coast fire tower system contributes to a broader 15-camera station detection network managed by the forest industry throughout the wider Green Triangle region. I am also pleased to confirm all fire towers are now upgraded and in full operation.

We know that early detection is key, and it is critical to identify and extinguish any potential fires as quickly as possible to protect the community and the region's 176,000 hectares of plantation estate. If a fire were to start in any forest plantation in South Australia, it would present a billion dollar risk to the industry and regional South Australia. Fire also puts at risk the forest's sequestration of over 4.5 million tonnes of CO₂ each year from the atmosphere, which contributes towards a cleaner and greener future.

We know that the South-East like every other region in our state is experiencing drought and dry conditions and that we will need to remain on high alert throughout this current season. I would like to thank both the Green Triangle Fire Alliance and OneFortyOne Plantations for the work they have done in ensuring the completion of the Penola fire tower in time for this current year's season.

PENOLA FIRE TOWER

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:12): Supplementary: the minister mentioned that the fire tower would be manned—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Staffed.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Staffed, thank you, that's the word. By whom? Who has responsibility for staffing it?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:13): It is employed people who staff the tower. I spoke with one of them at the opening and that is done on a roster basis.

ILLEGAL TOBACCO SALES

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Leader of the Government and Attorney-General, who is also representing the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Health, about illegal tobacco.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: This government promised to crack down on illegal tobacco sellers with SA Health's, you can call it 'fag busters unit', of just nine inspectors. While there have been raids with thousands of cartons of illegal cigarettes and tobacco products seized, it is not having any deterrent effect because once the inspectors depart with their haul they just stock up again and start trading immediately under the guise of being legitimate convenience stores. They are outsmarting the authorities. The war is being lost along with billions in tax revenue because our laws and enforcement simply are not tough enough. Legitimate retailers in convenience stores tell me they are fed up reporting these rogue sellers dotted around the city and suburbs as nothing happens. Apart from issuing them with fines, they should be shut down immediately with cease trading orders.

Two weeks ago, convenience stores were raided in Rundle Street; two, Rundle East Convenience and Rundle City Convenience, were caught selling illegal cigarettes and vapes. Within two hours, they were back at it and still are today. In fact, a short time ago one of my staff went to those stores and, as luck would have it, managed to get cheap, illegal smokes for \$20 and \$17—and here they are.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I think the member thinks it's quite funny but it's actually quite a serious issue. They will even sell individual cigarettes, most likely to homeless smokers and young people. At Ultimate Convenience in Bank Street, the staff member was also able to seek out a cigarette for \$1—easy-peasy—vapes for \$50, but now a more disturbing product is about to hit our shores and there are no laws in place to prevent them being sold to smokers of all ages, although they cannot be legally imported without permits.

'Heat not burn' tobacco sticks are developed by Philip Morris and British American Tobacco. They claim they are safe products but they are really designed to keep people addicted. It works by an electric current in a cylinder heating rather than burning tobacco, so no ash and no smoke, unlike vapes which vaporise nicotine fluid. They are selling quicker than Taylor Swift tickets in 50 countries. Here's how Philip Morris describes them:

They provide adult smokers, who would otherwise continue smoking, with a better alternative to cigarettes through our scientifically-substantiated products.

The jury is out on whether they are safe. My questions to the ministers are:

1. With no success in stopping these rogue traders, will the government now look at tougher laws to suspend or prevent those premises from trading?
2. Is the health minister investigating the sale of these new tobacco sticks, and what can be done about them when Philip Morris and BAT seem to have found a way to skirt around laws in the UK and other countries?
3. What are the health minister and Premier planning to do with a bill passed in this place to make it illegal for young persons born after 2007 ever being able to legally buy tobacco and related products?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will take large parts of that on notice and bring back a detailed reply for the honourable member, which I think the question deserves.

I know that in relation to the sale of illegal cigarettes and vapes this government has taken some pretty decisive action. There has been, if my memory serves me correctly—and I will check it when I bring back the answer—in excess of \$16 million, something like \$16.3 million invested in enforcement to crack down on illegal tobacco and vape sales. I know, as the honourable member said in his question, the relatively small compliance unit in Health now has much more substantial resources within Consumer and Business Services to look at compliance issues.

We have seen very well-publicised raids by the police on some of these premises. We have seen much more excessive use of violence in the Eastern States in relation to illegal tobacco, and I certainly know there have been meetings with legitimate retailers airing their concerns, as the honourable member has indicated, and there have been meetings with legitimate retailers and members of the government which have led to some of the action that has been taken.

In relation to new forms of nicotine, I will pass those questions on to the health minister as well, but I think it's fair to say—and I have discussed this a number of times with the health minister—that he is extremely proactive in taking action against nicotine and cigarettes. I know the member for Kurna, the Hon. Chris Picton, has over many, many years helped shape policy at the forefront in previous roles that he has held as Chief of Staff to a federal health minister in relation to plain packaging and other initiatives.

I would give the health minister a great deal of credit for the work that he has done over a number of roles that he has held across his time, not just working in the South Australian parliament as health minister but in the federal parliament, to reduce the horrific health effects that nicotine has on the Australian population. It is something he has taken very seriously and been at the forefront of over a number of years. I am happy to bring back more details about what this government is doing after consulting with my colleagues the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs and the health minister.

ILLEGAL TOBACCO SALES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:19): Supplementary: in addition to the \$16 million, can the Attorney, in bringing back an answer, also confirm that there is a new regulatory regime scheme on foot to address many of the issues concerning illicit tobacco and e-cigarettes?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:20): I thank the honourable member and I can assure her I will bring back a detailed suite of actions that the government has taken, including an increase in penalties in some of these areas as well.

ILLEGAL TOBACCO SALES

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:20): I have a supplementary arising from the original response from the minister. I thank the Attorney-General for his response and I warmly endorse his comments about the health minister, the Hon. Chris Picton, and his campaign.

The PRESIDENT: All this is very nice, but ask your supplementary question.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Is the minister concerned, and should he be concerned, that the moment the 'fag busters' leave the store, within two hours they are starting to sell illegal cigarettes again? What can be done to stop that?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. I think all members of the community are concerned when people engage in illegal activity, which includes the supply or selling of illegal tobacco products. As I say, I am happy to take on notice the details of the original questions, which included what the member alluded to—essentially, the phoenixing of people who have been put out of business. I will have to get advice on that, but I certainly will and I will certainly bring back an answer for the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

CHILD PROTECTION, BABY REMOVALS

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: On 29 January 2025, it was reported that former deputy chief executive of the Department for Child Protection, Adam Reilly, said he:

...realised, after giving evidence at the hearings for the Aboriginal children's commissioner, and when I apologised to Aboriginal parents, the shift towards me was stark and it was very apparent that the values that I hold were not welcome.

After giving evidence, the shift in terms of my treatment changed dramatically.

My question is: does the government agree with Mr Reilly's apology given to Aboriginal families whose babies had been removed at birth?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. That is not in my portfolio area. I am not aware of the circumstances around those comments. I am happy to talk to the Minister for Child Protection and see if there is something that can be said. Often in these matters there is little that can be said, but if there is something that can be said I will bring back a response.

CHILD PROTECTION, BABY REMOVALS

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:22): Supplementary: as the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, does he agree with Aboriginal families whose babies had been removed at birth being apologised to, and does he condone the 'shift in terms of...treatment'?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:22): I thank the honourable

member for her question. As I say, I am not familiar with the individual that the honourable member refers to, but I am happy to see if there is anything that can be brought back.

ASBESTOS VICTIMS MEMORIAL DAY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:23): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Can the minister tell the council about the Asbestos Victims Memorial Day service held in November last year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for his question. I note his interest in this matter and I have seen him on Asbestos Awareness Day at various services that have happened around South Australia in years gone by, so I know he has a deep commitment in this area.

I was privileged to be able to attend, along with a number of members from this chamber and from the other place, the annual Asbestos Victims Memorial Day service at the end of last year. It is held on the last Friday of November each year in Pitman Park and provides an important opportunity for people to come together and commemorate the many thousands of workers in South Australia and across the country who have died from asbestos-related diseases. This service was hosted by the Asbestos Victims Association, a not-for-profit organisation that supports people and their families living with asbestos-related disease. Their work includes running free seminars and educating the community about the dangers of asbestos exposure.

While Australia was one of the first countries to ban the use of asbestos, the fight is far from over. Even today, decades later, asbestos-related diseases continue to kill far too many people each year. The decades of widespread use means asbestos remains present in many homes, products and public spaces. As a result, the need to educate people about the danger of asbestos products still remains.

Last year, the government saw significant national action to prevent the spread of dust diseases caused by engineered stone benchtops and, knowing the grave damage that asbestos and asbestos-related diseases cause, governments responsible took no hesitation in banning the use of engineered stone benchtops, knowing that they cause very significant and similar lung diseases. Nevertheless, there is much more to be done and I thank all the individuals, particularly the organisations involved, for the work they do supporting victims of dust diseases and protecting the community.

Matters of Interest

TET FESTIVAL

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:25): I rise to speak about the Vietnamese Lunar New Year, known as Tết. This year the Lunar New Year fell on Wednesday 28 January 2025, and it is the Year of the Snake. For the Vietnamese community in South Australia we celebrated Tết festival at the Vietnamese Community Centre in Athol Park on the weekend of 1 and 2 February. I have spoken in this chamber previously about the meaning of Tết, and today I would like to speak about this year's Tết festival celebration in South Australia.

Tết is the most important festival in Vietnamese culture. I felt immense pride and joy as a Vietnamese Australian to celebrate Tết at the community centre. The celebration is a beautiful reminder of our rich heritage and the enduring spirit of our community. I am especially proud of our younger generation of Vietnamese Australians who took the lead in organising this event. Their dedication, creativity and hard work was truly inspiring. They have not only embraced our traditions but also infused them with new energy and ideas, ensuring that our culture remains vibrant and relevant.

This year's Tết festival held extra significance as we mark 50 years since the Fall of Saigon, as well as 50 years of Vietnamese settlement in Australia. A couple of performances at the Tết festival brought both joy and sadness to me as a boat person. The first performance was a song called *Thank you Australia*, composed and sung by Dorothy Nguyen. The song expresses the appreciation felt by many Vietnamese Australians, along with their love for this beautiful country. This

song was first performed at the unveiling ceremony of the Vietnamese boat people monument in Adelaide four years ago.

The second performance told the story of the 50-year journey of Vietnamese people to Australia. It began with the peaceful and thriving Vietnam prior to 1975, to telling of the suffering of war and its after-effects, resulting in millions of Vietnamese boat people forced to escape their homeland to find peace and freedom in other countries like Australia.

Tết is a time for family, reflection and renewal. It is a time to honour our ancestors, celebrate our achievements and look forward to the future with hope and optimism. Through these celebrations we maintain a strong connection to our roots, passing on our values and traditions to the next generation. It is essential to preserve our cultural heritage, and events such as this play a crucial role in doing so. Festivals provide an opportunity for us to come together as a community to share our stories and to celebrate our identity. They remind us of the importance of unity, resilience and the enduring spirit of the Vietnamese people.

I want to thank all the volunteers, performers and sponsors who contributed in organising this year's Tết festival. Special thanks goes to Khuyen (Quin) Tran, the President of the Vietnamese Community in South Australia, as well as committee members Tony Tran, Tien Pham, Le Quan Chuong, Phan Holly Le and Nhung Jennifer Nguyen. I know I speak on behalf of many in saying that all your efforts are deeply appreciated and your commitment to our culture is truly commendable.

As we welcome the Year of the Snake let us continue to support and uplift each other, celebrate our achievements and look forward to a future filled with prosperity, happiness and success. In closing, I wish all honourable members and your families good health and much happiness for the New Year of the Snake. Chúc Mừng Năm Mới.

NATIVE BIRD HUNTING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:30): I rise to address South Australian hunters' growing concerns over the government's restrictive regulations imposed without due process. Recently, I have been made aware of the increasing costs and compliance being placed on duck hunting as the latest example.

An inquiry into the hunting of native birds was addressed by a select committee of this council on 9 March 2023. It confirmed that hunting in South Australia was well regulated. It also noted that there were community views both for and against hunting of native birds, and took those community views into account. The committee made 11 recommendations to improve animal welfare outcomes, regulation and the oversight of bird hunting. This select committee did not make any recommendation that the hunting of native birds should be banned altogether, nor did it recommend that relevant fees be substantially increased so significantly that it becomes unaffordable.

Hunting organisations have expressed concern that in contravention of the findings and intent of the select committee changes being imposed on bird hunters are excessively onerous and may exclude some people from participating. This includes reduced permitted species for hunting and huge increases in fees for permits. So while the government and Minister Close may not have taken the measure of banning hunting outright they have imposed restrictive measures and costs around duck hunting, some may say in an attempt to ban hunting by stealth.

Hardhead and pink-eared duck hunting has been banned, and the hunting of mountain duck has been restricted without releasing any scientific justification for the need to do so. Permit fees are projected to increase from approximately \$50 per adult in 2024 to \$250 in 2029. This represents a 400 per cent increase without an explanation or reason why such a steep increase might be justified. These changes have been made without any consultation with interested parties, and this will make South Australia the most expensive state to carry out duck hunting in.

This is a repeat of the complete disregard that the Labor government showed for due process with its banning of bow hunting. In that case a parliamentary select committee conducted in 2021 made several recommendations for improvement, none of which were that bow hunting should be banned outright. The government ignored the recommendations of the select committee and banned bow hunting by proclamation. This was done without consulting key stakeholder groups, including the Conservation and Hunting Alliance of South Australia.

Hunting activities have benefits both for participants and for the regional economies where hunting takes place. The select committee reported that benefits include the value of game as a food resource, the intergenerational sharing of the skill and cultural value of hunting, and the physical and mental health benefits for people participating in outdoor activities. Hunters often take part in conservation programs, and the funding raised through the sale of permits supports environmental programs.

Hunting organisations have concerns that the increases in fees—the huge increases in fees—and the restrictions will reduce revenue from hunting permits, therefore reducing investment in environmental programs. There are also fears that some may simply ignore new restrictions and participate regardless. That is not an outcome that anyone wants.

If Labor is to make standard practice of ignoring parliamentary select committee reports it is not only a waste of time and money but an abrogation of the democratic process of government and this parliament. Rather than serving the people through proper processes, this government appears more focused on imposing its ideology on the electorate, disregarding due procedure and failing to consult key stakeholders. This actively undermines trust and faith in government and the democratic process.

The covert implementation of these measures is a deceptive attempt to ban hunting by stealth. This disingenuous approach imposes severe restrictions, significantly limiting hunting enthusiasts' ability to participate in their pastime.

To be clear, the issue at hand is not just whether hunting has been dealt an unfair blow. It is that a government should not impose its own dogma in contravention of the due processes of democratic government. Whether you like duck hunting or not, that is something we should all be concerned about.

HUTT ST CENTRE'S ASPIRE PROGRAM

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:35): I rise this afternoon to speak on a matter that will be of importance to all South Australians who care about the homelessness crisis, and that is the future of the Aspire Program being run by the Hutt St Centre in Adelaide. This program is not just about providing hope to those who experience chronic homelessness. It also serves as a testament to our state's commitment to social justice, community wellbeing, and the fundamental human right to a safe and stable home—yet the future of this program still hangs in the balance.

The Aspire Program is designed to support individuals aged 18 to 55 who are experiencing chronic homelessness in metropolitan Adelaide. It offers medium to long-term case management, with the goal of helping participants achieve sustainable housing, employment and community connections. The program operates through three critical stages: stabilisation, re-engagement and monitoring. Each of these are tailored to address the unique needs of the participants.

The Aspire Program, I understand, has demonstrated remarkable success in reducing the use of government-funded services such as hospitals and emergency accommodation. Participants have significantly decreased their reliance on these services, leading to substantial service reduction for the government. Moreover, many participants have secured stable housing and employment, showcasing this program's effectiveness in changing lives. This is the kind of program we need to see more of from government.

The Aspire Program is a partnership between the Hutt St Centre, the South Australian government, and various community housing providers. This collaboration ensures that participants can receive the best possible support and resources. I understand the program's initial funding through a social impact bond is an example of its innovative approach and its commitment to achieving measurable outcomes. However, private investment through the bond ceased in June 2024 and now the program is entirely reliant on funding from the South Australian taxpayer: that is, funding by the government. That makes sense, of course, because there is a broad community benefit that flows from funding a program like this.

The key aspect of the Aspire Program is the 'Housing First' principle, which prioritises quickly moving people experiencing homelessness into suitable and permanent housing. This approach has proven to be highly effective, as stable housing provides the foundation for addressing other life

challenges. It is really hard to get long-term work, it is really hard to be able to access the support you need, if you do not have a roof over your head. That is fundamental.

The Aspire Program is accessible to individuals who meet specific criteria, ensuring that those most in need receive support. The program's staged referral and intake process allows for a manageable and sustainable approach to assisting up to 524 referrals between December 2021 up to June 2027, but there is a need for ongoing funding.

The Aspire Program is not just a temporary solution but a long-term investment into the wellbeing of our community. Continued government funding is essential to maintain and expand this vital program across the state. Supporting the Aspire Program will not only address the immediate needs of those experiencing homelessness, it will also invest in a brighter, more inclusive future for all South Australians.

I understand that the Aspire Program is calling for an additional \$3.8 million over the next five years, on top of the current government funding, to ensure that they can really meet the need. Mr Acting President, I submit to you that this is vitally important at this time. We know that our state is in the midst of the worst housing crisis in generations, and I fear that it is only going to get worse unless we see meaningful action from state and federal governments.

Of course, the Greens have been pushing for an increase in the investment in social and affordable housing that we need. We are going to have discussions today about what we can do to activate vacant housing and ensure that some of those are moved onto the long-term rental market. We need to look at rent prices, which are skyrocketing out of control.

The Greens are going to continue to push for action on those things, but we also need to ensure that there is funding for programs that work. The Aspire program is a program that works and is getting meaningful results for people who are experiencing homelessness and so we cannot afford to lose it. Rather than forcing this program to keep going cap in hand to the government year after year for bits of piecemeal funding, I urge the government to provide the funding that is required to provide certainty to this vital service so that we can ensure it meets the needs of this community.

AUSTRALIAN SIKH GAMES

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:40): As someone closely connected with the Sikh community in South Australia, I am very proud that the Sikh Games has been named the Adelaide City Council's Community Event of the Year. Every Easter, this remarkable mix of sport and culture, held on rotation around Australia, gets bigger and stronger, but Adelaide's hosting of the multisport event took things to a whole new level in 2024.

Nominating the Sikh Games for the award was one of the easiest tasks I have had in the past year. I cannot speak highly enough of the truly multicultural event. It brought together more than 150,000 people, many of them visitors from interstate and even overseas, for a peaceful celebration of sport and culture. They watched 4,000 athletes from around the world participating in 14 sports, including cricket, world football, touch football, athletics, netball, basketball, volleyball, hockey, athletics and even golf. Several of these sports—cricket and hockey in particular—have developed a great sporting rivalry between India and Australia. In Adelaide, it does not take much to encourage people to go to live sport, and the good natured rivalry for these contests was part of the magic.

Then there is the remarkable sport of kabaddi, which Australians have already taken to their hearts and is a sport which attracted huge attention here last year. Outside of the Indian community, most people have not even heard of kabaddi, but they left wanting to see more of it. Played on a field, kabaddi at first glance looks like a cross between rugby and wrestling, yet it is nothing like those sports. It is a fierce and fast game in which a player has to tag the opposition without being tagged, and it simply captured the imagination of a brand new audience.

I must say it is probably one of the most aggressive games I have watched. I remember one year when it was actually cancelled because of the physical activity between the players, and this year, sitting up on the stage, for whatever reason it burst into quite a physical contest between the individual players, but it was quite a spectacle.

The people I spoke to at the event were mesmerised by the traditional sport. It was one of the great takeaways for the huge crowds across the long weekend. Many of these people were interstate visitors, adding plenty to the local economy. In 2024, the Sikh Games attracted athletes from around Australia, 120 clubs in all, as well as competitors from New Zealand, the UK, Canada, Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong and of course India. The atmosphere at Ellis Park, off West Terrace, and at a range of other sports grounds was electric.

One of the foundations of Sikhism is that they look after the vulnerable and feed the poor. As a tradition, they actually feed not only all those people who come as participants but also those who come as spectators. On this occasion they fed I think about 110,000 people over the four days. They had huge kitchens, huge places to eat and they fulfilled this arrangement with military precision.

Sports were played not just at Adelaide High School grounds but also at North Adelaide Golf Course, Gepps Cross, Parafield Gardens, Victoria Park, Angle Park and Unley. While the competition was fierce, we also witnessed a great sense of community and wellbeing and a welcoming atmosphere at all the sporting contests. Many people were visiting some of our sports grounds for the first time. The combination of outstanding venues, international competition, community and the best of Indian food was unbeatable. The success of the games is a credit to the Australian and South Australian Sikh community.

Putting on the 2024 Sikh Games and making them so successful came down to a great community effort by members of the South Australian Sikh community. President Balwant Singh, Cultural Leader Rajwant Singh and the committee members of Harjinder Singh, Parminder Singh, Sukvinder Singh, Mahanbir Grewal, Harpreet Saini, Isha Nagra and Jazmine Pangly did a remarkable job in bringing the whole event together and so did a wonderful team of local sports coordinators, all members of the Sikh community, in seeing to it that everything ran like clockwork. The Adelaide City Council award is a well-earned recognition of their great work. Perhaps the greatest reward, however, was seeing cultures and communities come together to celebrate what the Sikh population has brought to South Australia.

EDUCATION

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:45): I have had the great honour and great responsibility of recently being appointed as shadow education minister, a role that I am grateful to have the opportunity to perform and also to learn from our former education minister and former shadow education minister John Gardner, who did an exceptional job within this portfolio. His passion for improvements in literacy and numeracy is a legacy that I will continue advocating for.

Education is the foundation of our future. It shapes our children, our communities and, ultimately, the success of South Australia. The focus of education should be on strong literacy, numeracy and problem-solving skills. Our curriculum has become wide and, at times, lacks depth. We need to remove unnecessary elements from the curriculum with a focus on the basics of reading, writing and mathematics. These are the building blocks for success, and whilst not every child's strong suit is numeracy and literacy, the problem-solving skills that are learnt in this process are invaluable.

One area that is becoming increasingly concerning is that the academic results of boys are declining. The root cause of the decline varies for each boy, but it must be addressed. South Australia needs targeted strategies that engage boys in education, ensuring they remain focused, motivated and equipped for their future. For girls, we continue to see many of the same obstacles they have faced for decades. Whilst girls can often be top performers academically, many face wellbeing issues stemming from bullying and anxiety that contribute to attendance issues and issues staying focused in the classroom, many issues that we have seen in the media this week.

Our teachers are the backbone of the education system. The best teachers should be valued and given permanency where possible. Endless contracts are unacceptable. There must also be accountability to ensure every child is receiving quality education. For those who no longer wish to teach, support must be provided to transition into other careers but also provide support for avenues to help teachers who have left the profession and wish to return; to ask questions on why they have

left, and to support them if they wish to return. We have an extreme teacher shortage crisis, and this must be addressed by this government.

The changes to the NDIS will result in foundational support services being provided in schools. The government must ensure this change does not further overload teachers with additional administrative burdens. Support services for children are vital but must not come at the expense of teachers or impact on students' educational outcomes or wellbeing. A teacher's focus should be on teaching, not on endless paperwork.

Mental health challenges among young people are on the rise. Schools need access to strong support services to ensure students are not just academically prepared but emotionally resilient. Investing in these services is crucial to ensuring our children can cope with the pressures of modern life.

But education is not just about academics, it is about preparing students for the real world. Financial literacy, job readiness and life skills must be at the heart of the curriculum. Young South Australians should leave school with relevant practical skills like knowing how to budget, how to manage debt and how to navigate the workforce. Education should open doors, not close them.

Every young person in South Australia, regardless of background, has a right to access meaningful opportunities, whether that be university, trades or direct pathways into employment. Our education system should equip students with the confidence, skills and knowledge to build successful futures.

Cost of living is a huge issue for parents and should not be a barrier for obtaining an education. Parents deserve support and guidance to help their children thrive. Our education system in South Australia should always focus on involving parents, supporting teachers and giving students the foundation they need to succeed. Focusing on the basics, ensuring accountability and prioritising real-world skills will ensure we have an education system that truly serves our children and our future. South Australia needs an education system that works not just for today but for generations to come.

PALESTINE

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:49): I have used matters of interest to speak about Palestine many times since I was sworn into the parliament. I hoped to speak about something else today, but this morning newly elected President Donald Trump held a press conference with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. What was said in this press conference and the ramifications of those words sent shockwaves in the community. I often use my matters of interest to try to reflect the views of the communities that I represent, and I know that what I say today will reflect their fear.

I was recently reminded by friends from the brilliant Glimmer of Hope organisation of the importance of speaking the truth and that the conflict between Palestine and Israel is not only physical, it is also a conflict of narratives. When powerful figures spread misinformation, it is important to stand up and say the truth.

In today's joint press conference, the US President stated that the US would take over the Gaza Strip. He said, and I quote directly, 'We will own it.' He said he envisaged a long-term US ownership of Gaza after the Palestinians moved elsewhere. At the end of the conference, he speculated that Gaza could become the 'Riviera of the Middle East'. He did not rule out sending American troops to make this happen. When asked about whether Palestinians would have the right to return to Gaza if they left during reconstruction, he said, 'Why would they want to return? The place has been hell.'

He has suggested that Palestinians should go to other countries and claimed that the only reason they would want to return to Gaza is that they have no other alternative. Before the press conference, he sat down with reporters and said that the Palestinians had no choice but to permanently leave Gaza as a result of the devastation caused by the war. He said that Palestinians would love to leave Gaza.

Asked how many people he believed should be resettled from Gaza, President Trump replied, 'All of them.' I know what the community will be thinking in response to this. It is support for the ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians from their homeland from one of the world's largest

superpowers. Palestinians want to stay in their homeland. They want to live in peace. The Israeli state has demonstrated over and over again that they do not believe international law applies to them. If no-one is willing to stand up to them, then that belief will become the truth.

Regardless of how many of these plans become a reality, this has set the tone for the future of Gaza and the future of the Palestinian state. President Trump has already indicated that he may also review the American position on Israel's claim to the West Bank. This goes directly against the two-state solution, which Australia and much of the international community supports. This is not a step in the direction of peace.

Prime Minister Netanyahu, who is wanted for war crimes against Palestinians in Gaza, thanked President Trump and told him, and I quote, 'You are the best friend that Israel has ever had in the White House. All this in just two weeks, one can only imagine where we will be in four years.'

For 15 months the Gaza Strip has been decimated. For over 70 years the Palestinians have been denied their right of return to their homeland. They have been denied this right through explicit violence and a campaign of terror. In response to today's press conference, the Palestinian envoy to the UN, Riyad Mansour, said, 'Our homeland is our homeland, if part of it is destroyed the Palestinian people selected the choice to return to it. And I think that leaders and people should respect the wishes of the Palestinian people.'

Since the news of the ceasefire, we have seen videos of thousands of people walking back through destroyed neighbourhoods to return to their homes and villages. We have seen videos of people reuniting with their loved ones, collapsing in tears of joy. We have seen videos of people falling to their knees and kissing the ground. Gaza is their home; even if destroyed, even if flattened, it is owned by the Palestinians.

AUKUS DEAL

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:54): I rise to speak on a related topic in fact. I think not for the last time we will be reflecting upon what the leadership of Donald Trump means for our nation. It is often said in politics that if you want a friend, you should get a dog. Well, little did we know that some of our friends in politics are there because of a dog.

AUKUS is a dog of a deal: 49 per cent of Australians post the election of Donald Trump have responded to the Independent and Peaceful Australia Network (IPAN) survey saying that they want us to take a second look at the dud deal of AUKUS. Fortunately for South Australians and Australians, there is an opportunity right now to have your say. In South Australia, you can go to the YourSAY website and have your say and that is open to all South Australians until March. At a federal level, there is a similar process online.

I want to reflect today on what Australia has really signed up to with AUKUS and how we got here. In fact, we do not really know how we got here. We know it was a deal done in the dead of night and we know that 'that fellow Down Under', as Biden called Morrison way back then, was a very useful, some might say, idiot in the whole process. We also know that we have made friends with the AUKUS agreement at the expense of our relationship with countries like France, and yet we have tied ourselves to somebody like Donald Trump, who is threatening Canada and Mexico with illegal tariffs, threatening Canada with annexation, says he has not even read Project 2025, yet two-thirds of his initial executive orders reflect those 900 pages of Project 2025.

Indeed, we are here in Australia as the tail being wagged by a dog of a deal. I want to share a story not just with the council today but with the people of South Australia that is now reflected in former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom Boris Johnson's recently published autobiography, and it is why AUKUS really is a dog of a deal because actually it was all about a dog according to Boris Johnson. I am not sure that I will be the first person or the last person to describe AUKUS as a dog of a deal but as then Prime Minister Boris Johnson reflected, it is a very accurate description. To quote from BoJo's memoir:

When Scott Morrison explained the idea of AUKUS to me, it was clear there was one big problem: it must begin by breaking off a massively lucrative submarine deal for the French and going with the Anglosphere.

He goes on:

So the big question was: would Biden be willing to collaborate on a project—no matter how ultimately beneficial to America and the world—if at first it meant pretty massively cheesing off the French?

One has to ask if Johnson, in writing this, had any reservations? Well, not a bit. In fact, he himself says in his autobiography, 'I had, myself, not the slightest inhibitions.' And why? He goes on to speak about his love for the French but his frayed relationship with French President Emmanuel Macron. Johnson goes on in his autobiography to list several instances where Macron and he clashed on an interpersonal level over Boris Johnson's dog. I quote the autobiography:

We put on a flypast and a guard of honour in Horse Guards—which was only spoiled by Dilyn [the name of the dog] having hysterics in the Downing Street garden. 'Is zat your duerg?' said Macron incredulously.

Which Boris has spelt with 'zat' and 'duerg' (for the benefit of Hansard), upon which former Prime Minister Boris Johnson was incredibly offended because he had offered him the honour of holding Dilyn himself, which he had mysteriously declined.

We should have declined the AUKUS deal. When you read about where our so-called leadership came from in putting this together in the dead of night, how there has been no conversation with the Australian people, how we have absolutely tied ourselves to these leaders of some ill repute—indeed, with friends like this, who needs enemies? I think we are our own biggest enemy unless we stop this dud deal.

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND GOVERNANCE (ESG) IN PRIMARY PRODUCTION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:00): I move:

That the report of the committee be noted.

The role of the Natural Resources Committee is to investigate and report on the protection, improvement and enhancement of the state's natural resources, and the extent to which an integrated approach to the use and management of natural resources, based on the principles of ecologically sustainable use, development and protection is possible.

The committee also inquired about the degree to which the objectives for the rehabilitation of the River Murray are being achieved pursuant to the River Murray Act 2003. On 16 November 2023, pursuant to section 15L of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Natural Resources Committee resolved to commence an inquiry into environmental, social and governance (ESG) with particular reference to:

- what is environmental, social and governance;
- what is the process employed or undergone by entities to craft ESG frameworks;
- what is the current status of ESG initiatives in South Australia, interstate and internationally relative to entities using the framework, reporting standards and measuring impacts;
- what are the pressures and opportunities for primary producers in South Australia regarding ESG;
- what does an ESG leader in primary production in SA look like;
- what are the pathways to get it there?; and
- any other relevant matters.

The committee received six submissions and held 10 hearings from 22 February to 27 June 2024. It obtained evidence from representatives of South Australia's peak industry bodies, a state government department, experts from academia, and research and policy institutions. Environmental, social and governance is a holistic approach to sustainability. In a primary production context, it considers primary producers' performance as stewards of nature, relations with employees, customers, communities, and other actors in the supply chain, and the practices and processes in the leadership structures.

The process of transitioning to ESG principles necessitates the following actions:

- (a) primary producers and relevant stakeholders working together;
- (b) having a standardised set of measures;
- (c) improving primary producers' ability to fulfill ESG requirements; and
- (d) balancing environmental stewardship with profit maximisation.

The current level of ESG compliance in the international, Australian and South Australian arenas suggest that ESG is more than just a buzzword in the sustainability landscape. Frameworks, standards and regulations that assess businesses, including primary producers, ESG performances, demonstrate this. While South Australia's primary producers' recognition and adoption of ESG principles are at differing levels of development, primary production industries in South Australia are undoubtedly committed to sustainability as demonstrated by the extensive commodity specific blueprints or action plans that guide their practices and performances.

South Australian primary producers are currently confronted with increasing demands from international, interstate and state entities to present ESG credentials despite the need for standardised ESG metrics and reporting schemes. Consequently, farmers find themselves overloaded and uncertain about the requirements and delay or resist their transition to ESG. The current scenario also opens ESG measures and reporting to manipulation by entities themselves and performance auditors. The dissimilarity in primary producers' capacity and maturity in ESG compliance adds to the pressure on primary producers.

The evidence received by the committee, however, noted opportunities amid these challenges. One of these opportunities is South Australian farmers' extensive and longstanding stewardship of the environment, making them well-equipped already to demonstrate sustainability practices. This places farmers in an advantageous position relative to ESG compliance and reporting.

Other favourable circumstances for South Australian primary producers regarding ESG are current initiatives at the federal and state levels. One is the Australian Agricultural Sustainability Framework. It is an outcome-based rather than a practice-based approach to ESG-aligned sustainability reporting. The AASF is a shared-values approach towards sustainability that uses an ESG lens; however, it is not an ESG reporting system.

Another opportunity for primary producers is the Australian sustainable finance taxonomy currently being developed. The agricultural sector is one of the priority areas for this taxonomy and it is hoped to guide many primary producers reporting on sustainability, including ESG, to financial institutions. Furthermore, tools to account for or assess natural capital and product traceability innovations capitalise on farmers' providence and are opportunities for South Australian farmers.

South Australia's dairy, grain and wine industries are advancing towards ESG. This movement is exemplified in these industries' state action plans and initiatives. Enabling factors toward South Australian primary producers' trajectory towards ESG are (a) standardised ESG metrics, (b) data digitisation, (c) information and experience-sharing platforms, (d) federal and state level policies that promote and support the primary production sector's sustainability credentials and performance, and (e) conveying the sustainability narratives of these industries.

Overall, ESG as a sustainability approach goes beyond the expectation that South Australia's primary producers be sustainable in their practices towards the environment. ESG demands that primary producers also be accountable to animals, people, consumers and communities, and that this be embedded in their governance structures. However, the increasing demand to show ESG credentials to relevant global, interstate and state markets, despite the lack of standardised ESG measures and reporting systems, puts pressure on South Australian farmers' transition to ESG. It overwhelms farmers because compliance involves cost and necessitates capacity building.

There are, however, favourable conditions for South Australian primary producers that could ease the transition. The most important of these opportunities that ongoing ESG-related initiatives and innovations are predicated on is primary producers' well-established providence of the environment. Lastly, ESG leadership within primary production requires action towards standardising ESG measurements and reporting systems, learning and sharing ESG experiences across the

sector, legislative levers and communicating ESG narratives at international, interstate and state levels.

I wish to thank all those who gave their time to assist the committee with this inquiry. I commend the committee members—Sarah Andrews MP, Mr David Basham MP, the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC, the Hon. Ben Hood MLC and Ms Catherine Hutchesson MP—for their contribution to the report. All members worked cooperatively on the report. I would also like to thank the previous committee Presiding Member, the Hon. Leon Bignell MP, and also the current Presiding Member, Ms Dana Wortley MP, member for Torrens.

I would also like to thank our staff: Mr Patrick Dupont, parliamentary officer until 21 January 2024, and Mr Shane Hilton, parliamentary officer from 22 January 2024. I would like to pay particular acknowledgement to Dr Jennefer Bagaporo, our research officer, who put all the very complex information into a report that, hopefully, some can actually understand. There were also seven recommendations which will, naturally, go to the minister, who will respond in due course.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. L.A. Henderson.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE TIMBER INDUSTRY IN THE LIMESTONE COAST AND OTHER REGIONS OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:10): I move:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

I rise today to discuss the findings and recommendations of the select committee's report on matters relating to the timber industry in the Limestone Coast and other regions of South Australia. The timber industry is a pillar of our regional economy, providing essential jobs sustaining local businesses and playing a crucial role in environmental stewardship. However, as this report has made clear, the industry faces pressing challenges that demand leadership: bold and decisive action.

The committee's work was a long and complex process marked by numerous delays, some due to external factors. As this chamber is aware, the committee was established by the former shadow, now Minister for Primary Industries and Forest Industries, back in 2019. Unfortunately, a report was unable to be finalised prior to the 2022 election, and a short interim report was instead tabled.

This is an important body of work that, in the opposition's view, needed to be finalised to ensure that the voices of the industry were heard, and that the government of the day was given a set of recommendations in response to industry concerns. Throughout the period of this parliamentary session the committee has held extensive consultation, receiving submissions from industry representatives, and has carefully reviewed all the evidence to ensure our findings were robust and comprehensive. I take this opportunity to thank all those individuals, businesses and associations who provided evidence to the committee. The evidence we received has provided the committee with a good understanding of the issues facing the industry and potential pathways forward for the long-term sustainability of the industry into the future.

One of the most significant findings of the committee was the pressing issue of log supply for domestic processors. Dating back to 2019, many processors expressed concerns that large volumes of sawlog were being exported, leaving local industries struggling to secure enough material to sustain operations. Evidence presented to the committee suggested that domestic processors were often disadvantaged in tendering processes, with long-term contracts favouring export markets over local manufacturing.

The committee found that a lack of transparency in the plantation lease agreement was exacerbating the issue, as domestic processors suggested they were unable to fairly compete with available timber resources. This raised concerns about compliance with the original sale agreement of forest rotations, which had conditions intended to prioritise domestic processing. The compliance of the sale and lease agreements were a key focus of the committee's investigation. Testimony from industry stakeholders revealed differing interpretations of the agreement's conditions.

While OneFortyOne Plantations, a major leaseholder, asserted they were fulfilling their contractual obligations, evidence from domestic processors and other industry representatives

suggested otherwise. The committee found that compliance mechanisms could be improved, and that greater oversight and independent auditing could ensure that the terms of the sale were being upheld in the best interests of the South Australian timber industry.

Another critical issue explored by the committee was water availability. Water is a shared resource that plays a vital role in sustaining ecosystems and supporting industries, including the forest sector. The availability of water is essential for the growth of the forest, as it influences tree health, productivity and resilience to environmental stressors, such as drought and disease. The forest industry relies on consistent water access for processors, such as tree cultivation, harvesting and manufacturing wood products.

However, as water demand increases across various primary industries, such as agriculture, mining and energy, ensuring equitable access becomes crucial. A fair distribution of water resources helps maintain balanced economic growth while protecting ecosystems and sustaining rural communities. Effective water management policies must prioritise sustainable usage, collaboration and conservation to ensure that all sectors have access to this essential resource.

The committee found that a comprehensive review of water allocation policies was necessary to ensure that all industries, including forestry, agriculture and viticulture, had equitable access to this vital resource. The economic potential of the timber industry is vast, but it is currently underutilised. The committee's findings demonstrate that additional wood fibre based industries could significantly boost South Australia's economy. Retaining more logs for domestic processing could create up to 1,950 jobs and generate \$15 million in value-added benefits annually. However, challenges, such as labour shortages and the need for greater investment in training and apprenticeships, must be addressed to fully realise this potential.

The lack of a clear investment strategy for domestic processing also means that many businesses struggle to secure the necessary capital to expand their operations and compete with export-driven forestry practices. The export of logs from the Limestone Coast has been a divisive issue in the past. Industry players during early evidence raised concerns that exports reduced availability for domestic processors, impacting local economic growth. The committee found that data on exports was difficult to obtain due to the inconsistencies in the classification of sawlogs and pulp logs.

Witnesses from the forestry sector highlighted that market forces often dictated log sales but local processors countered that better regulatory controls could ensure a steady supply of sawlogs for South Australian mills. Log availability for South Australian processors remains a pressing issue. Long-term contracts are crucial for domestic processors to maintain financial stability and ensure a reliable supply. Some processors have expressed concern about transparency and tendering processes and export parity, underlining the need to look at reforms in these areas.

Environmental and water resource management is another critical consideration. Forestry operations play a key role in carbon sequestration, which is vital for South Australia's sustainable goals; however, concerns have been raised about the ability of the industry to grow among limited water resources, prompting calls for a thorough review of water licensing laws. Agricultural representatives emphasised that the timber industry's water use must be assessed alongside broader land use strategies to ensure that South Australia's natural resources are managed sustainably. Additionally, the presence of non-native tree species such as Tasmanian blue gum must be carefully managed to protect biodiversity and maintain ecological balance.

The industry holds immense potential for growth, yet several barriers hinder expansion. Regulatory challenges, high land costs and water restrictions have limited opportunities for development; there is no doubt. However, the potential for value-added production remains strong. Initiatives such as establishing pulp mills and biomass energy projects could drive innovation and investment, strengthening the sector and ensuring its long-term viability.

Collaboration between government and industry is crucial to removing barriers and unlocking these opportunities. Establishing new plantations is essential to enhance log availability. However, the long maturation period of timber means that proactive planning is essential. Without immediate intervention there is a real risk that South Australian processors will continue to struggle against competition for access to quality timber resources.

To address these challenges and capitalise on growth opportunities the committee has put forward a series of ambitious yet achievable recommendations. First, the committee calls for an independent examination by the Auditor-General into the compliance of the sale of forward rotations of forests. This audit should focus on community service obligations and conditions of sale and lease to ensure transparency and accountability, reinforcing public confidence in the process.

To enhance data accuracy on timber exports the South Australian government should pursue a national forest industry code of conduct. This will ensure greater transparency in export reporting and standardise the classification of sawlogs and pulp logs, eliminating inconsistencies that have hampered clear industry oversight.

A comprehensive review of water allocation policies is necessary to ensure fair access for all industries, including forestry, agriculture, horticulture and viticulture. The state government must collaborate with primary production stakeholders to create a balanced water-sharing framework that safeguards long-term sustainability but also ensures that South Australians and the broader community are fed, are clothed and are housed.

The findings of this report present both significant challenges and remarkable opportunities. We stand at a crossroads, and the choices we make today will determine the future of South Australia's timber industry. By implementing these recommendations we can forge a resilient, competitive and sustainable industry that benefits local communities, strengthens the economy, and supports our growing population.

On behalf of the committee I would like to take this opportunity to extend our sincere gratitude to both the previous and current members of the select committee for their dedication and perseverance throughout this long process. I would also like to acknowledge the hardworking committee staff on behalf of committee members: committee secretary Emma Johnston and research officers Bernard O'Neil and Dr Merry Brown, whose diligence and commitment have been instrumental in compiling this comprehensive report.

Let us move forward with vision, with confidence, and a shared commitment to shaping a thriving future in the timber industry in South Australia.

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

Motions

WEST BEACH MARINE LIFE DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:21): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes the multiple and significant deaths of larvae and oyster spat at South Australia Research and Development Institute (West Beach) facility in October and November 2024;
2. Recognises also the significant deaths of both barramundi fingerlings and broodstock from an adjacent private business during the same period;
3. Notes that the operational phase of the Labor government's Adelaide Beach Management Review Implementation Project began on 3 October and ended on 30 November;
4. Acknowledges that internal pathology testing revealed no pathological explanation for the deaths; and
5. Calls on the Minister for Primary Industries to appoint an independent investigator to thoroughly examine all aspects of the fish deaths, including the private business and SARDI facility inlet pipe location, and any possible seawater quality impacts.

The loss of fish at the SARDI facility in West Beach late last year was widely reported. Approximately 300,000 juvenile snapper and between 75 per cent and 100 per cent of the stock of POMS-resistant oyster spat was lost. Documents released under FOI revealed that a private company, which was a tenant on the site, lost at least 180,000 young fish and brood stock.

There is significant public interest in this issue, as the lost snapper was destined for the snapper restocking program. The loss of 300,000 juvenile snapper represents approximately nine months of restocking, given the numbers being released at that time. The snapper restocking

program plays a vital role in sustaining the fish population, supporting the health of marine ecosystems and ensuring the long-term viability of both commercial and recreational fisheries.

By replenishing depleted stocks, such programs help maintain biodiversity, protect the balance of marine food webs, and support the livelihoods of communities that depend on fishing. However the success of these efforts hinges on the survival of snapper larvae, which are highly vulnerable during their early developmental stages. High mortality rates amongst larvae—which can be caused by factors such as environmental changes, predation or disease—can significantly undermine restocking efforts, reducing the number of juveniles that reach maturity and ultimately threatening the program's ability to restore healthy population levels. Ensuring the survival of larvae is therefore critical to achieving the ecological and economic goals of snapper restocking initiatives.

South Australian oyster growers say that the mass deaths of marine life at the SARDI research facility will set their breeding lines back by approximately 12 months. The spat in the breeding lines were being developed to be resistant to Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome (otherwise known as POMS), a disease that kills oysters in a matter of hours and which was first discovered in Australia in 2010.

The POMS-resistant breeding line at SARDI is crucial for safeguarding the oyster industry against POMS. This breeding program represents years of dedicated research aimed at developing oyster strains that enhance resilience to POMS, ensuring the sustainability and economic viability of the industry. However, the recent deaths of oyster spat at SARDI poses a significant setback to this vital work. The loss not only delays progress in strengthening disease resistance but also threatens the availability of recent stock for oyster farmers, particularly exposing the industry to renewed vulnerability. Rebuilding these breeding lines will require time and resources, highlighting the critical need for robust biosecurity matters and continued investment in research to protect against future disruptions.

There has been no clear reason given yet for these fish deaths. Laboratory pathology reports recovered under FOI show that there was no evidence of a pathogen. Water testing records did not reveal any abnormal changes in water properties and the absence of an obvious pathogen leads to conjecture in the documents that some type of 'unknown toxic insult' has occurred.

Whilst the snapper, barramundi and oyster are individually managed within the facility, all tanks are supplied via a common water supply. As all tanks are small and juvenile fish were similarly impacted, it seems likely that a common factor caused the fish mortality, and the only factor in common was the water supply.

We cannot ignore the fact that the timing of these fish deaths correlates with the government's beach dredging trial that was conducted between 3 October and 30 November. Part of the trial was conducted along the coast offshore of the SARDI aquaculture facility. Email conversations recovered under the FOI process reveal conversations with SARDI staff clearly questioning DEW staff about the timing and location of this dredging trial at West Beach, where both the dredging site and the sand deposition sites were close to the water inlets for the SARDI facility.

It is clear through that correspondence that people within the department are questioning whether the dredging trial may have had a role in these deaths. It has been stated to the opposition through whistleblowers that an odour of rotten egg gas was evident at this time, which often suggests the presence of hydrogen sulphide.

Hydrogen sulphide can be toxic to small and juvenile fish in low concentrations in water, and hydrogen sulphide can be released from decomposing anaerobic plant matter, such as seaweed. All of the above factors suggest that some sort of influence from the dredging trial conducted by DEW at West Beach that led to fish mortality cannot be ruled out.

The public cost and delay to the fish and oyster restocking program means that it is in the public interest to find the cause of these fish kills. Given the scale of the losses and the potential implications for South Australia's marine industries, an independent investigation into the deaths of larvae and oyster spat at SARDI is essential.

The snapper restocking program and the POMS-resistant oyster breeding lines are critical to the sustainability and economic health of the fishing and aquaculture sectors. The unexplained

deaths of these vital juvenile stocks, compounded by similar losses in an adjacent private business, raise serious concerns that cannot be adequately addressed through internal reviews alone.

The correlation between the timing of these deaths and the government's own dredging trial near the SARDI facility further underscores the need for the impartial inquiry. It is important to find out what went wrong and that will not happen with a government department investigating itself, or with one government department investigating another government department.

An independent investigation will ensure transparency, hold relevant parties accountable and help identify any environmental or operational factors that contributed to this incident. This is not only necessary to restore confidence among industry, stakeholders and the public but also to safeguard the future of vital restocking programs that support South Australia's marine ecosystems and its economy.

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

BIOSECURITY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:28): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises the importance of biosecurity to South Australia, in particular with regard to the state's primary industries, and the potential impact on production.
2. Acknowledges the significant and ongoing concerns from industry sectors regarding Biosecurity SA's preparedness and response capability.
3. Calls on the Minister for Primary Industries to:
 - (a) establish an independent review into the Department for Primary Industry and Regional South Australia's response to the tomato brown rugose virus incursion, and its capacity and capability to deal with future pest and disease incursions; and
 - (b) table the report of the review as well as the government's response upon completion.

South Australia has an enviable biosecurity status. Thankfully, we are free of many diseases, pests and pathogens that are causing problems throughout North America, Europe and Asia. This is not just because we are a state on an island nation but because we have effective biosecurity measures. However, with an increase in global and personal travel, the risk of biosecurity incursions is continuously increasing.

Effective surveillance, early detection and rapid control are key to preventing the spread of animal and plant diseases. Prevention offers a much greater return on investment than containment of an incursion or, in the worst case, protection of assets should a pest or disease become endemic. That is why an effective response to an initial incursion is vital, as is ensuring that our biosecurity capability is continuously improving in response to the ongoing challenges.

So far, the recent and well-publicised outbreak of the tomato brown rugose fruit virus has led to millions of dollars in losses for major South Australian tomato growers. The incursion is still being addressed, and there is more work to do before there can be confidence that it is eradicated, and the threat is over. The businesses subject to quarantine orders have been unable to operate as work to eradicate the virus continues. A nursery business unable to trade during the quarantine requirements has shut its doors indefinitely with the loss of 30 jobs in total.

We have heard from farmers who have been negatively impacted by the biosecurity measures put in place, and while there is an understanding of the requirements for control of the current incursion, there is widespread frustration at what many see as a slow and confused response beset with poor communication. Growers have repeatedly complained to the opposition about slow return times for test results to enable market access, and businesses subject to quarantine orders have been refused official test results, with one business resorting to finding out test results via an FOI request. There are many complaints about confusing or incomplete instructions, with key communication lacking.

The minister has been questioned in both parliament and via the media multiple times regarding the department's ability to roll out equipment and staff in order to ramp up capacity of any

required testing; however, the execution of this response has not given confidence to the tomato or nursery industry that it has been well managed or that any future incursions can be well managed.

The policy document from the government, namely South Australia's Biosecurity Policy 2024-25, states six areas of priority focus, and makes the commitment that, and I quote:

As South Australia works towards modernising Biosecurity legislation to protect South Australia, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions will commence the development of South Australia's Biosecurity Strategy. The Strategy, expected to be released in 2025, will ensure South Australia has a flexible and responsive biosecurity system.

While the approach in this document seems laudable, industry representatives from a number of different sectors have raised concerns that the government and the current department structure do not have the proficiency nor operational strength or resources to respond to biosecurity threats, nor the effectiveness and expertise required to manage such situations. There seems to be a disconnect between a government plan and the reality of the application of that plan regarding an incursion response.

It is essential that the biosecurity preparedness of this state is efficient, effective, and agile. While the loss of business and the destruction of infested crops is unavoidable due to such biosecurity outbreaks, it is essential that the response contains the spread, minimises losses, and engenders confidence in the jurisdictions in charge. The recent problems suffered by growers during the tomato brown rugose virus incursion mean that many who have been impacted have little confidence in the government managing this or future incursions. Primary producers must be given confidence that response to threats such as avian influenza, foot-and-mouth disease or *Xylella fastidiosa* will be effectively and professionally managed.

An independent investigation into the government's response to a disease incursion is crucial for ensuring transparency, accountability, and restoring confidence within the affected industry. By conducting an impartial review, potential missteps, inefficiencies, or lapses in protocols can be identified without bias, fostering trust among stakeholders that the process is thorough and objective.

This accountability not only helps hold decision-makers responsible for their actions but also provides valuable lessons for improving future responses. Furthermore, transparent findings can reassure industry participants, partners, and the public that the government is committed to addressing shortcomings, implementing necessary reforms, and safeguarding both plant and animal health and economic stability.

Ultimately, such investigations are vital for rebuilding confidence and maintaining the integrity of government institutions, and the industries they regulate, and the minister must commit to such an investigation.

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

GAMBLING ADVERTISING

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:34): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes the Malinauskas government has returned train services to public ownership;
2. Recognises that public trains, buses, and trams are key spaces where children, young people, and other vulnerable individuals are regularly exposed to advertising;
3. Recognises that the availability, exposure and accessibility of gambling products can either exacerbate or mitigate gambling harm, and that restricting advertising can help minimise this risk;
4. Notes the recent commitment of the New South Wales government to ban gambling advertising on state-owned and controlled assets, including internal and external advertising on trains, buses, trams and associated infrastructure, following a broader ban introduced by the Victorian government in 2017;
5. Acknowledges that reducing gambling advertising would have positive social and economic benefits for the South Australian community; and
6. Calls on the Malinauskas government to take decisive action to reduce gambling harm by banning gambling advertising on public transport spaces across South Australia.

This speech really could have written itself off the back of a Malinauskas government press release and a policy which followed it. I will read from that initial press release which welcomes the banning of junk food advertising:

The Malinauskas Labor Government is taking action to tackle obesity by becoming the first State to ban junk food advertising on public buses, trains and trams.

From 1 July 2025, images of unhealthy products such as chocolate, lollies, confectionary, desserts, ice creams, soft drinks and chips will not be permitted on Adelaide Metro buses, trains and trams.

Obesity has overtaken tobacco as the leading risk factor contributing to disease burden in Australia. In 2024, overweight and obesity attributed to the burden of over 30 diseases and accounted for 8.3 percent of total disease burden in Australia.

These are all very important figures. It continues:

Around 63.1 per cent of adults and 35.2 per cent of children across South Australia are overweight or obese.

Modelling indicates that if no action is taken, the number of South Australians living with overweight or obesity is expected to grow by an additional 1,900 children and 48,000 adults over the next five years...

South Australian children are regularly exposed to unhealthy food and drink advertising. Data from Cancer Council SA shows that almost 80 per cent of food and drink advertisements on South Australian buses promote unhealthy food and drinks.

This new policy—

of the Malinauskas Labor government—

demonstrates the government's commitment to reduce children's exposure to unhealthy food and drink advertising on assets it manages and owns. The government will be considering additional measures to further respond to this public health issue in 2025.

If we take that, in terms of the evidence-based policy which has come from this measure which we have supported, and apply that equally to gambling advertising, you will find many of the same benefits for our community. The policy statement on food and drink advertising that the government has come up with could just as easily apply to the harm that is caused by gambling in this state and indeed across the nation.

Whilst we commend the government 100 per cent for its move in terms of banning junk food advertising, I am pleading with them to take the precise same measure in relation to gambling advertising, given that our trams, trains and buses have been the subject of lots of discussion lately in terms of coming back into government hands.

I think this is a very timely move and also follows on from a very similar recent announcement of the Minns government, which in January of this year announced the state's move to ban gambling advertising on public transport in New South Wales. That ban would apply to publicly owned and controlled assets, including internal and external advertising on trains, Metro buses, light rail, train stations and ferry terminals. The ban in New South Wales extends to the casino, lottery, online betting advertising—in effect, all forms of gambling advertising. The New South Wales government will now work with those contract holders in terms of advertising to implement the required changes over the coming 12 months.

It also follows an earlier move in 2017 by Victoria to do precisely the same and that was part of sweeping reforms to tackle poker machine harm specifically in that jurisdiction, but of course included the banning of advertising on trams, trains and buses, etc., in that state. So whilst we are leading the nation in terms of our junk food advertising ban here in SA, I am pleading with this government, and indeed this chamber, to support this motion which would make us the third state behind Victoria and New South Wales to do precisely the same when it comes to gambling advertising harm.

I do not need to repeat the fact that I have repeated in this place over and over again in terms of the harm that is caused as a result of gambling. Again, if we just take from those messages that have been repeated by the government here and in Victoria and, indeed, New South Wales in relation to the benefits of these bans, we do not need our public assets covered in gambling-related advertising. It is just not necessary. Everyone knows where the Casino is, if that is where they choose

to go. You cannot miss a poker machine venue in this state for the love of anything really. The signs are so big and in your face—the big neon lights and signs and so forth.

We know that this government has had a reluctance to do anything about it because of its own addiction to the extraordinary revenue that we reap from poker machines in this state. Of course I am not just talking about poker machines; I am talking about all forms of gambling advertising. We know the sorts of campaigns that have been led in terms of online betting advertising that is just about everywhere now, and I note that there is another bill before this place to deal with that.

I would hasten to say that the preventative health portfolio of the honourable health minister probably thinks that this is a good fit in terms of the support for banning gambling advertising, given that we know that there are very similar impacts and serious impacts on people's health and wellbeing as a result of gambling. We just do not need them and there is absolutely no reason why the government should be accepting money, payment, from those who promote gambling on its public assets.

I will keep it short today. I think it is very self-explanatory. I think if anyone picks up the government's media release dated Saturday 4 January by the Hon. Chris Picton where it says 'Bus stops here for junk food advertising', wherever you see 'junk food advertising' replace it with 'gambling advertising'. I think if you pick up the policy document that accompanies that media release by the government of South Australia, also dated 25 January, 'Restriction of unhealthy food and drink advertising on South Australian government transit assets', again, under policy statement, background, policy goal, policy objectives, policy directive and policy approach, just replace the words 'junk food advertising' with 'gambling advertising' and the logic in this motion will speak for itself.

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

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LEGAL PROFESSION REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:44): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015 and the Legal Practitioners Act 1981. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I have another release here which I could also read in full which would summarise the need for these reforms, except this time the media release is actually signed off by the chief judicial officers of the court, who thank the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity for undertaking and reporting on the review of harassment in the South Australian legal profession and the important work which will guide ongoing efforts to put an end to harassment in all its forms.

The bill that I am introducing today seeks to implement the legislative reform recommendations from the commission's 2024 review of harassment into the legal profession. The review followed the 2021 inquiry into harassment within the legal profession. While the equal opportunity commissioner, Ms Jodeen Carney, noted that there have been positive steps forward since the initial review, it was noted unlawful behaviours remain prevalent and victims continue to distrust complaints bodies and pathways—the subject of another debate we had in this place yesterday, particularly in relation to the chilling effect on victims in terms of actually making complaints in the first place.

The findings from the 2024 review continue to be deeply concerning. More than half of the survey respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace over the past three years, with one in two also having witnessed that sort of behaviour. Alarming, almost 73 per cent of those affected were women. Bullying was the most frequently reported behaviour affecting nearly two in five respondents, discrimination was experienced by one in five and sexual harassment was reported by three in 20. Harassment overwhelmingly occurred in

the victim's workplace, but two in five who reported experiencing sexual harassment said it happened at work-related events. Bullying was most commonly reported in offices, social media or during legal proceedings.

The latest review has provided us with 14 recommendations for reform, and while some require further consultation or fall outside the legislative sphere, this bill addresses the clear legislative reform needed to establish better protections and improve accountability. Clause 7 amends the Legal Practitioners Act 1981 to empower the Legal Practitioner Conduct Commissioner to impose interim conditions on a practitioner's certificate where the commissioner determines that the practitioner poses a serious risk to others, that restrictions are necessary to protect public health and safety or that such action is in the public interest.

Currently, while complaints can be lodged through a more user-friendly online portal, the commissioner cannot take interim steps to mitigate risks while an investigation is ongoing. That is a critical element of this bill. In contrast, health practitioners are always already subject to immediate action powers in similar circumstances where there are risks. Victims have recorded feeling frustrated that while their complaints were being investigated the harassers remain unrestricted in the workplace. The bill provides a necessary safeguard to address that gap.

Clause 8 of the bill amends the Legal Practitioners Act to ensure that the South Australian Bar Association has similar reporting obligations as those that already apply to the Law Society of South Australia. This is intended to make sure that certain reports of suspected bullying, discrimination, sexual harassment by barristers or about barristers are, indeed, referred to the commissioner. Additionally, when a referral is made by the bar or the Law Society, the complainant must be informed of the referral and any subsequent action unless they have expressly stated they do not wish to be contacted further.

The Law Society indicated it is generally supportive of the proposal to keep complainants informed, in its response to the most recent review, so this amendment seeks to address concerns raised during the review where individuals who lodge complaints with the Bar Association were actually unaware of whether their complaints had been referred to the commissioner or not. That is not a good outcome for somebody who finally comes up with the courage to go and make one of these complaints, only to be left in the dark about what happens to it post making that complaint. It is only reasonable that reporting obligations be consistent across both the legal professional bodies.

Further amendments address ongoing reports of inappropriate conduct by members of the judiciary, both current and former. The review found that 20 per cent of respondents who reported bullying, 10 per cent who reported discrimination and 9 per cent who reported sexual harassment identified a judicial officer as the perpetrator, and we have precedents now in this jurisdiction of successful prosecutions with respect to the same.

These figures are deeply troubling. I have previously spoken about how courageous it is for anyone to come out and make such a complaint, particularly when you are complaining against a member of the judiciary. The facts are that only 5 per cent of victims reported their experience to an external complaint, with just 1 per cent lodging a sexual harassment complaint, and one of the key reasons cited for this low reporting was fear of repercussions.

Disappointingly, this government failed to show leadership on this issue yesterday—just yesterday—in this place when it refused to commit to extending absolute privilege to complaints such as these made to the appropriate oversight bodies. That same chilling effect that the Attorney spoke of yesterday in this place under a different piece of legislation needs to be addressed appropriately, and that is what these amendments intend to achieve, because the lack of action otherwise absolutely fails those victims who are (a) afraid to speak out or (b) find the courage within themselves to make a complaint in the circumstances.

Clause 5 of the bill implements recommendation 12, requiring the Judicial Conduct Commissioner to establish judicial conduct guidelines to ensure both the legal profession and the public have a clear understanding of the expected standards of conduct and the consequences for breaches. We do not have any such enforceable guidelines here at the moment. One review respondent described judicial counselling as nothing more than a fireside chat; meanwhile, Victoria

has already adopted judicial conduct guidelines based on those published by the Council of Chief Justices of Australia and New Zealand, and the review recommends that we do precisely the same.

Finally, clause 3 of the bill addresses recommendation 13, empowering the Judicial Conduct Commissioner to investigate allegations of misconduct against former judicial officers. The act currently requires mandatory dismissal of complaints against alleged perpetrators who are no longer serving on the bench. This creates a perverse incentive for resignation as a means to evade scrutiny, an outcome that can be both unjust and deeply unfair to victims.

In the event that the Judicial Conduct Commissioner elected not to proceed with an investigation, all records would be transferred to the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner, who would then be able to determine whether further action is warranted under the amendment. It provides a safeguard; should a former judicial officer return to legal practice, any outstanding complaints could still be investigated.

The bill does not claim to complete the work that remains to be done, by any stretch, in addressing harassment, discrimination and bullying in the legal profession, but I think now at a national level, especially given what we have seen transpire in the High Court over recent years, and at a state level in terms of what we have seen transpire here in our own jurisdiction, it is absolutely critical that we get on with the job of fixing this.

There is no point in having a commissioner who does all this work, lifts the bandaid, shows us what the problems are—and that removes a whole lot of pressure from the judiciary itself in terms of that culture—and then does nothing about it. So the bill seeks to ensure that we actually now do something about it by implementing those four recommendations at the very least.

It is a necessary step towards protecting victims, ensuring accountability and making real progress in eliminating unacceptable behaviour from our legal workplaces. It is in line with other sorts of things that we have tried to do in this place and others, and I hope that the government, the opposition and the crossbench can see sense in ensuring that that important body of work we have asked the commissioner to do results in the passing of these really important reforms.

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

Motions

PLANTATION FOREST INDUSTRIES

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (16:56): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that 2025 marks the 150th anniversary of plantation forest industries in South Australia;
2. Notes that our state's forest industries comprise 100 per cent plantation forests and employ directly or indirectly over 21,000 South Australians, as well as sequestering 4.64m tonnes of CO₂ and producing timber that is used across almost every other industry in our state; and
3. Acknowledges the fundamental importance of forest industries to South Australia and the significant contributions made by those who work within them.

I have often spoken in this place about matters in which South Australia has led the nation—in social movements, in legislative reform, in industry and innovation. Today, I am very pleased to make a contribution that begins with the recognition of another great example of this state's national leadership.

South Australia is the birthplace of the nation's plantation forest industry: 2025 marks 150 years since the state embarked on the building of this crucial sector. The occasion of this milestone anniversary presents an opportunity to reflect upon the history and vital importance of South Australia's forest industries to our economy, to our environment, to our regional communities and to our broader South Australian community.

People probably do not think about the fact that the work of the forest industries can be found all around us, but I have found that it is nearly impossible to name an industry in South Australia that is not underpinned in at least some way by wood and fibre. From the pallets that are so widely used to transport consumer products to retail shelves, to the fibre used for cardboard packaging, the paper

and pulp products like tissues and toilet paper, to the wooden posts used in agricultural production, from dairy, livestock and grain to our globally distinguished wine industry, and even to the sawdust and compost that our poultry and horticulture industries rely on, timber and fibre are remarkable in their ubiquity across our industries and our daily lives.

With the beginning of European settlement, both timber and agricultural land were required in increasing abundance. The widespread practice was to clear native trees from lands so that crops could be planted and stock could graze, while timber cutters supplied necessary wood for the developing colony. Native trees were initially both plentiful and accessible. But, by 1870, people such as Surveyor-General George Goyder had taken note that the impacts of significant deforestation were becoming increasingly apparent across the colony's land. Goyder took his concerns to the parliament and the resultant Forest Trees Planting Encouragement Bill, 1873 provided that in certain areas and under certain conditions the government would pay landowners £2 for every acre they planted with forest trees.

The true moment of inception for our plantation forest industries came in 1875, when the South Australian government established the first forest management organisation called the Forest Board, in part to protect and regenerate native vegetation. The first trial planting took place the following year at Bundaleer in the Mid North. This marked the practical beginning of plantation forestry in our state and in Australia.

Other plantings soon followed at Wirrabara, also in the Mid North, and in Mount Gambier. The conditions in the part of the Green Triangle that spans our South-East were quickly found to be much more suitable to growing plantation timber. The eventual success of radiata pine as a plantation species has supported the expansion of our forest districts over the decades to a number of areas across the state. Today forests are found in the Green Triangle, Kuitpo, Mount Crawford, Second Valley, Bundaleer and the Mount Lofty Ranges.

Forestry has helped us build and furnish our homes and workplaces. It has given us everyday essentials such as paper, tissues, toilet rolls and cardboard boxes and continues to pursue innovations toward future products and technologies. The forestry sector will remain just as critical for our future generations as we aim towards a net-zero economy, reducing single-use plastics and exploring opportunities in biofuels and bioenergy.

Our forest industries contribute almost \$3 billion to the South Australian economy each year, with around 21,500 South Australians employed either directly or indirectly. South Australian forestry was responsible for 35 per cent of Australia's locally produced house framing and interior sawn wood; 25 per cent of the nation's particle board; 48 per cent of the packaging and industrial grade timber; 60 per cent of Australia's agricultural timbers, such as poles, posts and fencing products; and 25 per cent of Australia's compost and growth media that put food on the nations table. Forestry is also cited as the only primary industry that absorbs more carbon dioxide than it emits, with 4.64 million tonnes of carbon dioxide sequestered each year from the atmosphere.

I want to pay tribute to the South Australian Forest Products Association, the peak industry body representing the entire value chain of forest industries in South Australia to all levels of government. The Forest Products Association represents members involved with all elements of the value chain, from the sustainable establishment and management of plantations to harvesting and haulage, processing of timber resources and manufacture of products and bio products.

I commend the association; its CEO, Nathan Paine; the board; and its members for their work in policy development and advocacy and the collaborative approach they take to working with government in pursuit of outcomes that offer benefits to industry, to our economy and to our broader community. Their work in advocacy and policy makes a significant impact.

The Malinauskas government is proud to be delivering on its election commitment to establish the Forestry Centre of Excellence in Mount Gambier. Established as the first of its kind in South Australia to develop the capability to enhance the Green Triangle's economic prosperity, generating more jobs and investment in the region, the centre will drive innovation in forestry and wood fibre, discover new opportunities and explore new ways to maximise resource value. I look forward to the centre's official opening.

Meanwhile, the celebrations of the forest industries' 150th anniversary will commence. It will be my pleasure and privilege to kick off the yearlong festivities alongside forestry leaders, key stakeholders and fellow members of parliament at this evening's Parliamentary Friends of Forestry event. In anticipation of a great evening I recognise and thank my co-host, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti. Agreement across the political spectrum in relation to the crucial importance of forest industries to our state can only be a good thing for the South Australian community.

In paying respect to this vital sector's long history, I extend my recognition and my thanks to all who now contribute to the success of South Australia's forest industries: the Forest Products Association leadership, its board and each of its members along with the 21,000-plus South Australians whose work continues our state's proud history of excellence and innovation in forestry and fibre. I commend this motion to the chamber and urge members to support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. L.A. Henderson.

Parliamentary Committees

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:03): I move:

That the report on the operations of the committee, 2022-2024, be noted.

May I first thank the former committee secretary Peter Dimopoulos for his tireless work in his time as secretary—it was a pleasure working with him; secondly our new committee secretary, Emma Johnston, who has taken on the committee and for all of her hard work; and of course our Hansard team, who ensure every word is heard. Our work as parliamentarians is not possible without the support of our administrators.

To the committee members, a big thankyou for your participation and hard work on this committee: the Hon. Mira El Dannawi, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Laura Henderson, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Reggie Martin and the Hon. Frank Pangallo, as well as former members the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos and the Hon. Stephen Wade. I would also like to thank other members in this chamber who have attended different meetings: you are always welcome to attend. Finally, it would be remiss of me not to thank the many witnesses, departments, agencies and those behind the scenes who prepare the work and answer our questions. You are contributing to transparency in our state, and we thank you for your time and effort.

On 28 March 2007, the Legislative Council's Budget and Finance Committee was first appointed pursuant to a resolution of this council. Since then the committee continues to be re-established at the beginning of each parliamentary term. The first terms of reference lays out the intent of the committee:

That a committee, to be called the Budget and Finance Committee, be appointed to monitor and scrutinise all matters relating to the state and the financial administration of the state, any related policy matter and other related matter.

Why is this committee so important? The government of the day is entrusted to manage this great state's finances and administration. As opposition and crossbench it is our job to hold the government to account and to monitor and scrutinise the operations of all government agencies.

This year, Budget and Finance unveiled some significant concerns across many departments. One standout that comes to mind was when Rik Morris stated, 'there was never a promise to fix ramping.' Another, which has been an ongoing concern and which has been raised in recent times, is the white elephant that is the hydrogen plant experiment. Somehow the almost \$600 million project has had an increase of over 50 staff with no increase in budget. One that still baffles me was the Health CEO Robyn Lawrence—

The Hon. B.R. Hood interjecting:

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Yes—who said that an almost \$1 billion overspend in Health was not a budget blowout. Most frustrating are the serious delays at times of some, but not all, departments: some are better than others when it comes to providing answers to questions on notice.

I look forward to receiving the answers to questions on notice on hydrogen—that are some months late—in due course. The purpose of the committee is to keep our state transparent—

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Yes, I will not be—and for those who get paid by the taxpayer to be held to account. I look forward to continuing to chair this committee, with our first meeting in 2025 with the Department of Treasury and Finance, scheduled for next Monday 10 February.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GROCERY PRICING IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

(Continued from 27 November 2024).

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (17:07): I will be exceptionally brief. I just wanted to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Labor Party, to thank the Hon. Mr Simms for forming this grocery pricing committee and to thank the members on it: the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Mira El Dannawi.

This committee was conducted in good spirits and collaboration, and I think it did some great work grilling a number of witnesses, obtaining some very useful information and coming up with a number of useful recommendations worthy of consideration. However, I will just note that there was a dissenting statement from the Hon. Mira El Dannawi and myself regarding one of the issues. Apart from that all the other recommendations are certainly worthy of consideration.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (17:08): I will try to speak as briefly as the Hon. Mr Martin on the findings of the Select Committee on Grocery Pricing in South Australia. It is safe to say that our farms and primary producers are the backbone of South Australia. They are some of the best in the world, working through droughts, rising costs and tightening margins to keep food on our tables, so I really thank the Hon. Roberts Simms for bringing this select committee to the council.

I will just touch on a couple of things. The committee did find that there was a lack of transparency around grocery pricing and that it was a factor in contributing to higher prices. We heard evidence from AUSVEG SA, which represents the state's vegetable growers, that margins for farmers are shrinking yet retail prices are continuing to rise, with some growers reporting markups of some 3 to 600 per cent between what they are paid at the farm gate and what consumers are charged at the checkout.

We also heard that many producers and growers were feeling pressure from category buyers, and while they were working on efficiencies within their own businesses, they were then getting pressure put on them to lower their prices for what they would be selling to those big supermarkets, which was troubling to hear.

We also heard from some regional people down in my home patch of Mount Gambier, and I sincerely want to thank the Salvos and Foodbank, and Lynne and the team at Foodbank Mount Gambier, who do such a great job in ensuring that those who are struggling are getting the food that they need and that there is some food security for them, most especially in the regions.

We do need to back our farmers. They do deserve fair prices, and everyone in our community deserves access to affordable, healthy food. South Australians deserve a grocery market that works for them, not just for the major supermarkets, so again I thank the members of the committee. I thank the Hon. Rob Simms for bringing it to us, and I am glad that, for the most part, we have agreed on all of those recommendations.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:10): I rise today to speak briefly in support of the report of the Select Committee on Grocery Pricing in South Australia. It was a privilege to be on this select committee. I would like to thank the diligent committee Chairperson, the Hon. Robert Simms, for his excellent leadership and passion on this important issue. I also want to thank my fellow committee members the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Mira El Dannawi and the Hon. Ben Hood

for their valuable contributions. A special thank you, of course, to the hardworking committee secretary, Leslie Guy, and research officer, Dr Margaret Robinson, for their support and comprehensive work during the inquiry stage and in preparation of the final report.

With the current cost-of-living crisis impacting everyone in our community, it is perhaps no surprise that the committee found that there is a lack of transparency around grocery pricing in South Australia and that this is a factor contributing to the high prices which are placing increased pressure on South Australian families. The committee also found that there is a significant power imbalance between big retailers and primary producers and that a lack of competition is contributing to higher grocery prices, particularly in regional areas.

I thank all the witnesses who took time to share their knowledge and experience by presenting themselves before the committee. The submissions that the committee received from all the stakeholders and businesses have provided important findings to enable members to work collaboratively in coming up with a set of sensible recommendations that are tabled in this report.

A number of site visits were conducted. It was an insightful site visit to the Woolworths distribution centre and Foodbank Food Hub in Mount Gambier. I thank all the management team and volunteers of those organisations who hosted our visit and for spending valuable time with the committee to discuss the significant cost-of-living issues facing metropolitan and regional community members.

I encourage all members to read the report and recommendations of the committee, and I urge the government to seriously consider all the recommendations, particularly the consideration of additional cost-of-living relief, additional support to charities and support agencies that provide access to low-cost food, and the potential for a payroll tax exemption for fresh produce businesses and primary production food businesses to reduce costs to industry and encourage competition. With those remarks, I commend the report.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:13): I thank all members for their contribution: the Hon. Mr Martin, the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Ben Hood. In addition, I thank the Hon. Mira El Dannawi for her contribution to the committee. As other members have observed, I think this committee was an example of actually what this chamber does well, and that is all of us of different political perspectives coming together to confront a challenging problem.

Of course, there is no greater problem facing the people of our state at the moment than the cost-of-living crisis. It is front and centre for so many South Australians, and so many people in our community are doing it tough at the moment, in particular when it comes to being able to put food on the table for their families, so grocery prices are a really important issue for us to confront as a parliament. We know of course that it requires leadership from politicians in Canberra. That was one of the things that was identified in the report. But there are also some things that can be done here locally within our jurisdiction, and the recommendations of the report speak to that.

I want to thank all of the members who engaged with the committee for the collaborative and collegial way in which they engaged. In particular, I want to thank the Hon. Ben Hood for his work in assisting us in Mount Gambier and finding people for the committee to meet with. That was very helpful, and I do appreciate that. I look forward to being able to engage with the government around the recommendations in coming months, but also there are things that the opposition and indeed all members of the parliament may wish to take up as we head towards the next state election. I look forward to engaging with members around the recommendations.

Motion carried.

Motions

SHORT STAY ACCOMMODATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire and report on the short stay accommodation sector in South Australia with particular reference to:
 - (a) the role of short stay accommodation in contributing to the rental affordability crisis;

- (b) the social and economic impacts of short stay accommodation on South Australian communities;
 - (c) the potential to regulate the short stay accommodation sector;
 - (d) the effectiveness of regulatory models adopted in other jurisdictions, both nationally and overseas;
 - (e) potential taxes or levies that could be applied to short stay accommodation and long-term vacant residential property;
 - (f) incentives that could be provided to home owners to transition properties listed on short stay accommodation platforms onto the long-term rental market;
 - (g) other strategies that could be adopted to activate residential property that is vacant long term; and
 - (h) any other related matters.
2. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

(Continued from 27 November 2024.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:15): I thank the Hon. Robert Simms for moving this motion to establish a select committee on the short stay accommodation sector in Australia. Short-term rentals, popularised by platforms like Airbnb, have revolutionised the accommodation industry worldwide. However, this transformation has also sparked significant policy debates and regulatory challenges.

In Australia, the debate over regulations on the short stay accommodation sector continues to evolve, reflecting broader global trends. The debate over short-term rental regulations is multifaceted, including economic, social and community considerations. Given the housing crisis we are currently facing in South Australia, the terms of reference for this proposed select committee will allow elected members to look at all options that may be available to address housing affordability and supply. Such a select committee will provide the opportunity to investigate the impact of short stay accommodation on the housing market.

From my understanding, South Australia is currently one of only two states that have no formal oversight of the short stay accommodation sector. I believe a select committee to examine and inquire into potential options for regulating the sector and look to the effectiveness of regulatory models in other jurisdictions will be useful, particularly for members to hear from a wide range of stakeholders, for them to present their diverse views and present the parliament and government with information that will guide any potential policy reforms in relation to the short stay accommodation sector. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:17): I rise to give a few brief comments in regard to this. I think the Hon. Ms Lee has summed up the economic reasoning behind why we might need a committee such as this. I certainly support looking into what we see around those economic factors, which you can also see when you walk down a lot of suburban streets in Adelaide and, indeed, when you go out into the regions and you walk down the streets of those towns. The fact is that short stay accommodation makes up a large proportion of what we see on your average street. When you go doorknocking, from time to time you might find that no-one is home. Sometimes no-one has been home for quite some time, despite the fact that the gardens are watered.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I will not even acknowledge such comments, the Hon. Ms Lensink. You are better than that. The fact is the garden is watered, it looks in good condition, yet of course no-one is there. I think this is a growing concern for a lot of neighbourhoods, certainly in the suburban districts of Adelaide. It does, however, have a component for regional towns, which want to encourage the kind of tourism that short stay accommodation can bring, so there is an economic argument to be made for both sides.

I look forward to seeing that played out in person so that when I do doorknock people, the Hon. Ms Lensink, they will be home and we can have those conversations about what a great job

the Malinauskas government is doing by acknowledging select committees just like this and voting for them.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:19): I will be short on this. I preface what I am about to say by declaring I have a conflict of interest in that I actually do have what is classified as a short-term holiday rental and have had that for a number of years, and that is in fact part of my superannuation. It is a holiday rental and has been operating as a holiday rental for many years. It was actually purchased as part of my retirement plans, and I am sure many others who have these short-term rentals have done exactly the same thing. So I declare that I do have an interest and, as a result of that, I will be abstaining from voting on this motion. I think that is only the fair thing to do. If there are other members in here who are in a similar position, I would urge them to also abstain and declare their conflicts of interest.

A couple of things I want to say about them. I do not object to the inquiry by the Hon. Robert Simms. It is probably worth having a look and seeing what the extent of it is and if there are any solutions that the committee can come up with that the government can also have a look at. I have no objections to them having a look at it. The objections I do have, though, are the calls for governments to take more control over the properties that people own. It is just becoming more prevalent in recent years where government ideology, government policy, government legislation, is now overriding the rights of property owners and their right to determine what they want to do with their own investment.

People spend a lot of money buying their property. Buying a home is the biggest single investment that a person could possibly make. Today it is an even bigger challenge for people buying a home because prices have gone up so much. That means people have to borrow an enormous amount of money to be able to pay off that loan. I do not know how people can borrow more than a million dollars and expect that they are going to pay that off over the term of the loan, unless they work a couple of jobs or have other sources of income, because the average worker would probably be lucky to earn \$3 million over a lifetime. But, as I said before, I do object when governments start to dictate to property owners and landlords what they should do with their own properties, and I think that becomes a disincentive for investment in property.

We saw that with the introduction of the land tax by the Marshall Liberal government. Despite the warnings, they did not heed them and, sadly, the land tax reforms at that time were opposed by the Labor Party when they were in opposition. I was in opposition to it right from the start because I could see the damage it was going to cause in relation to the availability of rentals in South Australia. Lo and behold, what happened? Of course, the moment that came in, the enormous responsibilities that suddenly fell on property owners who may have had their properties in trust or whatever and the costs involved in that just became too much and we saw hundreds, if not a couple of thousand, maybe more, properties that were used for the rental market suddenly sold off by the landlords, the property owners, because they had had enough.

Many of those property owners were mum-and-dad investors who, again, invested many years ago with the intent that it was going to build their retirement savings when the time came for them to retire from their jobs. But as a result of that and the implications of this tax—and I met many of these property owners—they got out. They decided no, it is too hard, here is government again imposing this tax that is making it even more difficult.

It was also a disincentive to aspirational people who wanted to build some kind of wealth during their working days and look to the future. Again, it was wiped off the floor and we saw thousands of homes being sold and, of course, the property market boomed. It became hot—and still is hot now—and as a result we are seeing fewer rentals being made available because what had happened was that people had decided to buy the properties to live in. There were many who wanted to buy property for their families. Of course, we had the other whammy of immigration numbers that hit enormous levels last year, almost 600,000 people coming into Australia.

I do not know how many came into South Australia but I believe the figure is around 60,000 to 70,000. That created more pressure on people finding accommodation and housing and of course that brings up the price. After the COVID epidemic, the emergency ended and now overseas students

have been welcomed back into South Australia and other parts of the country and, again, there is going to be a demand for accommodation for them.

It is just this perfect storm that has been created, and I will also blame governments for it—previous governments as well. This current Labor government is now trying to address the mistakes, the failures of policy by previous governments in not making enough land, green space available for developers to build their development projects around the metropolitan area and beyond. I think they call it the ring of development. There is a ring that surrounds the Adelaide metropolitan area and other areas, and previous governments did not want to expand beyond that and allow more housing development to go on.

You cannot just blame the influx of disruptors like Airbnb, Stayz and others for causing this problem—they did not. It was actually a problem caused by governments. Airbnb, Stayz and all the others I think seized on a great opportunity to make some money, some capital out of their idea of, again, using short-term rentals for people to utilise as holiday accommodation.

When you look at short-term accommodation, it tends to be cheaper than it is to hire a hotel room. That is probably one of the attractions of Airbnb, and it is also the location of where they are. They could be somewhere in the city, they could be in the suburbs. It may not be facing an idyllic beach somewhere in the state. Many short-term accommodation places are located in popular tourist locations.

It would be a bit unfair to then impose restrictions on those property owners, particularly on the number of nights or days that they would be able to make those properties available for short-term rental. It would put an imposition on them, who probably have a mortgage to pay off, and would deny them the opportunity to be able to earn some kind of income that may be related to their retirement savings. They might have a superannuation scheme that owns the property and derives its income from there.

There are other complex factors around all this. I think the other one that tends to be missed is the impact it could have on tourism. We have seen tourism numbers in South Australia increase in recent years, particularly after COVID, and, again, people would then utilise short-term rentals to find accommodation rather than go to hotels.

I notice there was an article today in *The Advertiser* by the Executive Chairman of Commercial General Adelaide, Jamie McClurg—a very successful developer, and I tip my hat to Jamie for what he has achieved in South Australia. He makes some good points in this article, 'Holiday homes a tradition, but Airbnb is Un-Australian'. He suddenly has latched on to the fact that people are unable to rent a house in the long-term and he focuses on where he says there have been:

...7,772 homes removed from the long-term rental market in favour of short-term stays, more than triple the available long-term renting stock...

I am not sure where Jamie got his information that those 7,772 homes were removed from the long-term rental market and put towards short-term stays. Certainly, a significant number probably were, but I would not think they all were. He says:

Renting a holiday house has been part of Aussie culture for decades but this is now beyond a joke.

I cannot understand why he thinks it is beyond a joke. Jamie himself built a development of holiday homes at Normanville, South Shores. You may see it on your travels going down south. Of course, I would not be surprised if many of those properties in that development are used for short-term stays.

I think that this discussion tends to move away from the ability of people to try to plan either for retirement or plan a safe investment. It tends to be anticapitalist and it is almost the typical ideology you would expect to hear from the Greens, where they seem to think that this could well be a solution to this crisis. The crisis was caused by government inaction and failure of their own housing policy. We can see that today. They are scrambling to now have developments underway in various parts of Adelaide, north and south and wherever, in order to meet the needs of people in our community. Homes are going up, but at a rather slow rate. I think on average it takes nine to

12 months just to build one home, and this government wants to build thousands of them in a particular period. It is not going to happen.

Then you have the other problem of the lack of infrastructure and the lack of forward planning—again, one of the biggest and worst failures of policy. You can take it back to the fact that it was privatisation of the E&WS department, which then became SA Water, and that has led to the situations that we have today.

Previously, under government control, the E&WS department were able to manage engineering and water supply. That was their job: to go out and install the sewerage pipes, the water pipes and whatever into expanding suburbs and do all that. Of course, the moment it was partly privatised and went into the hands of SA Water, which decided to corporatise it all, they took their eye off the ball and now we are presented with this problem in places like Angle Vale and also at Riverlea and elsewhere, where the infrastructure is not there and people have to have their sewage and their greywater trucked out every day. It is just a ridiculous situation.

In closing, as I said, the reason that we have this crisis today is not because of disruptive platforms like Airbnb and others, it is because of the failure of governments in this area, and now they are trying to scramble to find ways of putting people in. It will have an impact on tourism when you do this. It will have an impact on prices.

Mr McClurg made some comments today—he makes some good points about mandatory registration schemes, that platforms must be held accountable for ensuring compliance and receipt of occupancy certificates, which is not a bad idea. He then says that short-term rental properties should be required to obtain appropriate zoning approvals. I do not know what he means by that, because short-term rental properties are dwellings, they are houses—why should they obtain certain zoning approvals?

He makes a point about a minimum stay threshold to reduce high turnover transient stays, 'A maximum use threshold, say, eight weeks of the year. Think traditional Aussie summer vacation renting.' So what he is saying is that the only time you can rent out these places, that you might have bought as your investment for your retirement through your superannuation scheme, the only times you can earn a quid out of it is in summer vacation. The rest of the year, bad luck, give it to—I do not know.

When people want long-term leases, it would be for a year at least, minimum. Now of course we have new rental laws that again are placing impositions on landlords about leases, where they now have to give reasons to renters when they are going to cease the contract with their tenants. Now you have to give reasons for that, whereas previously it was up to the landlord, the property owner, to make a decision when and where to end a lease. You have taken that right away from landlords as well.

It could not work eight weeks of the year if people are reliant on these holiday homes for income to supplement their savings, their superannuation. He then says 'enforce the same safety and accessibility standards as hotels'. Okay, there are new requirements under the planning code for new homes or whatever, but we actually are talking about homes, we are not talking about hotels, so why do they need to comply with that? So I think that's a bit over the top.

Of course, you know what will then happen if you impose restrictions on short-term rentals in dwellings and whatever: there is going to be more demand on hotels and the prices of hotels are going to increase. If you have looked at trying to book a hotel anywhere in South Australia or interstate these days, it is quite expensive. You are lucky to find a room, certainly during peak periods, under \$200 or \$300 a night, and that is not exactly five-star accommodation—it would be rated much less. I am certainly not opposing the honourable member's reasoning in having the inquiry, and I look forward to seeing what the results of that are going to be. But, as I said, I will be abstaining from the vote after declaring my interest.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:38): I do not need to declare a conflict of interest for being a property owner, but certainly as a consumer of short-term stays I find them incredibly convenient for a range of reasons as a holiday option, as do I am sure a lot of Australians since the platforms have come to Australia—I will speak more to that in a moment. I think the issue of data collection

and the capacity of this committee to access good quality data, get information from the platforms themselves and from various sectors, is going to be incredibly important, because we do hear lots of things thrown about in the public domain which might or might not be true. People reach conclusions based on their particular opinion of the market and the impact short stay rentals have had on the markets. I think I am going to be a member of the committee, and I will just flag that as an early matter that I think is incredibly important for us to get to.

Of course, if we are talking about housing and the current housing crisis we are in, as some speakers have already touched on, the key issue there is supply. The short-term rental market may be one component of that. It will be very important to establish how significant that is, but I do also note—to the broader issue of housing and housing supply—there is an inquiry through the Economic and Finance Committee into housing availability which has a range of terms of reference, which this could indeed fit into as well. The Hon. Jing Lee spoke, I think, to other economic issues, particularly with her understanding of tourism and those sorts of impacts.

I think I have heard the honourable mover of the motion equate at times the number of Airbnbs—well, indeed, it is the first term of reference—with its contribution to the rental affordability crisis. I think that is a particular question that we are going to need to prosecute very, very carefully. I do not wish to pre-empt what his particular views and outcomes in mind might be or if he was to form or already have a view that paragraph (a) is a non-contested issue—that it is contributing to the rental affordability crisis—and what impact that is going to have more broadly on regulation of issues. But the terms of reference, I note, are broader than just paragraph (a), which is the role of short stay accommodation in contributing to the rental affordability crisis.

As part of that discussion the conversion of long-term rentals to short-term rentals is of particular note. We as a committee will, I assume, hear from various sectors, particularly those that are involved in building or renting properties themselves. I note they are a very different product, and the two aspects to that are that on short-term platforms people essentially are seeking holiday properties; also, I think part of what has driven some of this debate is from when the ABS data was published a couple of years ago—the number of so-called vacant properties, which included a lot of holiday homes which are probably used by particular people themselves for their own exclusive use or for family and friends and the like and also those that are on the short-term rental market.

So location is one issue. I do note my understanding—and I stand to be corrected, and this will be part of the interesting exercise we will need to drill down to as the committee goes on: the correlation between holiday locations such as the south coast, Port Lincoln and the like versus areas where housing is most needed. At the moment the housing shortage is probably in every region in South Australia. It has not been so in the past, prior to COVID.

The other issue about the long term versus short term is the presentation, of course. While it may seem that on the sums if you own a property and you want to put it on the short-term market you can make a much higher income, there is much more work and presentation and servicing that is required to go into that versus long term where there is that stability and regular inspections as required by statute but nowhere near the sort of work that is required in short-term rentals. One of the issues that has been flagged is the issue of regulation. I have not had it raised with me that there is any particular crisis in terms of regulation of the industry, but I guess that is something that we will be looking at going forward.

One issue that I have had raised with me in the last couple of years was a particular case. It was an isolated case but it was an apartment building where long-term residents had been very negatively impacted by other property owners using their apartments within there for short-term guests and there was a particular issue that involved, for one of them, having to get assistance from the police and so forth because the guests were engaged in allegedly illegal activities. Whether that was a question for the strata corporation of the building is also something that I think is worth examining. With those remarks, I look forward to hearing the evidence and our deliberations following that.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:45): I thank honourable members for their contributions, and in particular I thank the government for their support of the inquiry. Indeed, I presume from the opposition's comments that they are also in support, so I thank members for that. Just to be clear, I

want to touch on some of the themes the Hon. Frank Pangallo raised. It is certainly not my view that this is the only cause of the housing crisis. I do not think anyone has suggested that.

My reason for proposing this inquiry is that it may be playing a role. I asked my office on 21 January to look at the number of properties that were listed on the long-term rental market on websites like realestate.com.au and to compare those to the number of properties that were listed on short stay accommodation like Airbnb. The results of that were, I think, quite disturbing. What they found was that there were only 2,524 properties listed as long-term rental on that date versus more than 9,000 properties that were advertised on short stay accommodation websites like Airbnb.

Some will argue: is there a cause and effect? I would like to understand what is the relationship. Why is there such an over-representation of short stay accommodation versus such a shortage of long-term rental. I know from conversations I have had with people in the Port Lincoln area that there were a lot of people in some regional communities during COVID that, because there was a ban on overseas travel, moved properties that had been previously listed on the long-term rental market onto short stay accommodation.

My office found the issue much more pronounced in terms of the disparity between long-term rentals and short stay accommodation in some regional areas. For instance, on the Fleurieu south coast, there were more than a thousand properties listed on short stay platforms during the period that we examined versus just 19 long-term rentals in that area. I am really keen to look at these factors and look at what can be done.

I will certainly go into any committee with an open mind in terms of looking at what options there are. I am very keen to hear from key players. The Hon. Frank Pangallo has referenced an article in today's paper by Jamie McClurg. Thanks to the honourable member I no longer have to read the article; he has gone through it in great detail. Mr McClurg may well be somebody who we choose to hear from, along with the city council, which are taking action on this, and a range of other stakeholder groups. I thank members for their support and look forward to being able to sink my teeth into this this year. I think it is a really interesting area and one that is worthy of parliamentary inquiry.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. Dennis Hood, the Hon. Justin Hanson, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Tung Ngo, and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on 4 June 2025.

Motion carried.

Bills

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (RESPONSE TO REPORTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 February 2024.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:50): I rise to speak in support of the Parliamentary Committees (Response to Reports) Amendment Bill 2024, ensuring transparency and accountability should be listed by this Labor government as a top priority. The need for this bill, though, clearly shows that they have utterly failed in this regard.

First, it was answering questions on notice within a respectable time—something we still battle with constantly. Now it is ignoring the hard work of parliamentary committees and members of the public, many of whom have exhausted themselves physically and emotionally on inquiries, many of which deal with sensitive or difficult topics, by not responding to tabled reports.

Conversations with staff from multiple shadow minister offices have revealed a repeated pattern of contempt across the spectrum of Malinauskas cabinet ministers. As an opposition, we are appalled at the level of disrespect that the government has shown time and time again. It is time that this government is held to account, and that is exactly what this bill intends to do. Across the board we are pushing to ensure that the government cannot get away with ignoring the real issues that impact everyday South Australians.

The Premier and his ministers continuously avoid genuine problems raised within this parliament through committees and by concerned citizens, instead deciding to focus on the bright lights of shows and events in an effort to detract the public from ever-growing debt, deficit and dysfunction within government departments.

The Hon. Rob Simms has introduced this amendment bill in an effort to address the poor habit of Labor government ministers not acknowledging or responding to parliamentary committees' tabled reports, and the opposition agrees with the measures contained herein. This amendment bill legislates a mandated response from the government of the day to parliamentary committee reports.

Within my own shadow portfolios, and indeed the committees that I have joined or been on, I can point to tabled reports which have been ignored by this current government. This includes the parliamentary committee into bird hunting, then extending more broadly across the cabinet, as with the parliamentary committee into public and active transport, as the Hon. Robert Simms mentioned in his second reading speech, to the agreement of my colleague the Hon. Ben Hood. Substantial effort and time goes into committees by members and staff, as well as those witnesses willing to speak up or write submissions as evidence. It is utterly disrespectful for the relevant minister to disregard the committee and their report.

If this government wants to be open and transparent with the public, and indeed this government absolutely should be open and transparent with the public, then I ask why is it that the crossbench and the opposition, yet again, have to remind them not only of what is standard practice but really what is the lowest benchmark in terms of due diligence? It is beyond disappointing that, just like we saw with questions being taken on notice, it is taking a motion or legislation to correct the despicable arrogance of this current Labor government.

In summary, I want to place on the record that perhaps a future conversation may need to be had as to whether the four-monthly way to respond to a tabled report is somewhat lenient, but I am happy for that conversation to be had once this legislation has passed both chambers, as indeed it should pass both chambers. Something urgent needs to be done to address this government's failure to respond to the work of many committees and, indeed, the parliament and the work of many individuals right across South Australia. As such, the opposition supports the current measures in this bill and we commend it to the chamber.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:54): I rise to make a brief contribution in support of the Parliamentary Committees (Response to Reports) Amendment Bill 2024. The bill seeks to amend the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, to require the relevant minister to respond to recommendations of a parliamentary inquiry within four months of the report being tabled. Currently, reports from select committees are not subject to the response timeframe from the government, allowing ministers potentially to ignore their recommendations indefinitely if they choose to.

This makes a mockery of the select committee process and begs the question of why members of parliament and members of the public should use their valuable time and tremendous efforts engaging in select committees to identify policy solutions that the government can simply ignore. It can be seen as disrespectful and even insulting to the individuals, organisations and businesses that take the time to write submissions and appear as witnesses in an effort to share their experience, expertise, needs and aspirations with parliamentary committees.

This bill will not force the government's hand to accept or adopt the recommendations put forward by select committees, but it does require the relevant minister at the very least to read, engage with and respond to the recommendations of a committee report. I believe this bill will strengthen the level of ministerial accountability and provide greater respect and fairness for matters of importance to the people of South Australia. I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:56): I rise to speak briefly on behalf of the government on the Parliamentary Committees (Response to Reports) Amendment Bill 2024. At the outset, I indicate that the government will not oppose the passage of the bill through the council today and will further consider our position on the matter in the other place.

In South Australia, it has long been the case that ministers must respond to standing committee reports within four months of receiving the report from the relevant committee. Government agencies put significant work into considering the recommendations made by standing committees and supporting ministers in providing a response. To extend this requirement to select committees would require additional work by these agencies, particularly given the number of select committees.

So far this term, I am advised, there have been 22 select committees established across the two houses. However, we acknowledge the intent of the Hon. Robert Simms in introducing this bill and the important matters often raised by select committee reports. We will continue to consider this matter while the bill is before the House of Assembly should it successfully pass today.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:57): I thank all honourable members for their contributions: thank you to the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Russell Wortley. I appreciate the support of all parties for this. I note the government's position that they will not be opposing the bill, and I appreciate that.

As has been articulated by the Hon. Jing Lee, this bill does not force the relevant minister to implement the recommendations of a select committee. I think that is a very important point to note. All it requires is that they provide a report in parliament on their response. That can be as simple as saying why a recommendation cannot be implemented or simply noting a recommendation, but it is wanting to ensure that the relevant minister has read and engaged with the substance of the report.

It is a particularly relevant debate this week. It is two years since the public and active transport committee handed down its report—two years, and we are still waiting for any response from the relevant minister. I think that does underscore why a reform such as this might be necessary, because two years without a callback in terms of action on the recommendations is disappointing. Members of parliament obviously put a lot of work into these committees. More importantly, members of the community actually invest their time and energy into our committee process.

As the Hon. Nicola Centofanti noted, it can be challenging for members of the public to appear before these committees, particularly when they are talking about sensitive matters. If they are doing so, I think the least that they can expect of their elected representatives is that the government of the day at least engages with the content of the final report and indicates what elements can be taken up.

I think that is the least that the community is entitled to expect of their elected representatives. If you have gone to the effort of appearing before a parliamentary committee and making a submission, you do not think that the minister is going to simply take the committee report, stick it in a top drawer somewhere and let it sit there and gather dust. You would want the minister to respond.

I note the Hon. Russell Wortley has referenced the number of committees that have been running during this term of parliament. Many members of the crossbench and others have offered in this place to address committee reform. It is an ongoing discussion. There is always the potential to look at how we can do committees better. I do not think that should be used as a reason to not take action and to not have the relevant minister engage with the recommendations of the report.

I hope that this does start a conversation around how ministers can engage more effectively with these committees. I should just say in closing that there are many ministers in the Malinauskas government who I think do this really well, who engage openly with parliamentary committees, who are interested in the recommendations and who seek to take action on things. It is not a problem that affects everybody, but I think legislation is a good way of dealing with this, because it means that at least you have a set standard in place that operates across the board. I think that always makes sense.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (18:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BIOSECURITY BILL*Final Stages*

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the House of Assembly desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

No. 1—Page 171, after line 23, insert schedule:

Schedule 2—Dog Fence Board

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Interpretation

- (1) In this Part, unless the contrary intention appears—
- board* means the Dog Fence Board;
- Crown land* means Crown land as defined in the Crown Land Management Act 2009;
- dog fence* means the primary dog fence, or a secondary dog fence, established under this Act or the repealed Act;
- inside a dog fence* means—
- (a) in relation to the primary dog fence—land that is within the portion of the State bounded by the primary dog fence, the eastern border of the State and the coast of the State; or
- (b) in any other case—land within the State to which entry by wild dogs is further restricted by a secondary dog fence;
- local board* means a local dog fence board established under Part 5;
- outside a dog fence* means—
- (a) in relation to the primary dog fence—land that is outside the portion of the State bounded by the primary dog fence, the eastern border of the State and the coast of the State; or
- (b) in any other case—land within the State outside of an area to which entry by wild dogs is further restricted by a secondary dog fence;
- primary dog fence*—see clause 9;
- ratable land* means ratable land under clause 18;
- repealed Act* means the Dog Fence Act 1946;
- secondary dog fence* means a dog fence other than the primary dog fence;
- wild dog* means—
- (a) a dingo or a dog that is any cross of a dingo; or
- (b) a feral dog.
- (2) For the purposes of this Schedule, a fence is dog-proof if, in the opinion of the board, it is so constructed and maintained so as to provide an effective barrier against the movement of wild dogs.

Part 2—Dog Fence Board

2—Members of board

- (1) The board consists of not less than 5 and not more than 7 members appointed by the Minister of whom—
 - (a) 1 will be a person nominated by the Minister; and
 - (b) 3 will be persons nominated by Livestock SA Incorporated, subject to the following requirements:
 - (i) each person must be an occupier of ratable land;
 - (ii) at least 1 person must be an occupier of ratable land located in an area on the western side of the State identified by the regulations for the purposes of this provision; and
 - (c) 1 will be a person nominated by the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Landscape South Australia Act 2019*, being an occupier of ratable land but not a Public Service employee; and
 - (d) if the Minister so determines, 1 or 2 additional persons nominated by the Minister.

- (2) The Minister must appoint a member of the board as the board's presiding member.
- (3) If a nominating body referred to in subclause (1) fails to make a nomination within 60 days of being requested by the Minister to make the nomination, the Minister may appoint a person to the relevant position.
- (4) The appointment of a member must be notified in a manner determined by the Minister and will take effect from the date specified in the notification.

- (5) In this clause—

occupier of ratable land means—

- (a) an occupier of land that is ratable land under clause 1 8; or
- (b) an occupier of land in relation to which a contribution has been declared under clause 2 1 to be payable for the current financial year,

and includes a shareholder of a company that is an occupier of land referred to paragraph (a) or (b).

3—Term of office

- (1) Except as provided under this Act, a member of the board will hold office for a term, not exceeding 4 years, specified in the instrument of appointment.
- (2) A member of the board is, at the expiration of a term of office, eligible for reappointment.
- (3) A retiring member who is not reappointed will hold office until their successor is appointed.

4—Remuneration

The remuneration payable to a member of the board under Schedule 1 Part 2 clause 3 is payable from the funds of the board.

5—Conflict of interest

A member of the board will not be taken to have a direct or indirect interest in a matter for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995* by reason only of the fact that the member has an interest in a matter shared in common with those engaged in or associated with animal or plant control generally or primary industry generally, or a substantial section of those engaged in or associated with animal or plant control or primary industry.

6—Removal from office and vacancies

- (1) The Minister may remove a member of the board from office—
 - (a) for breach of, or non-compliance with, a condition of office; or
 - (b) for mental or physical incapacity to carry out duties of office satisfactorily; or
 - (c) for serious misconduct which, in the opinion of the Minister, makes it undesirable that the person should remain a member of the Board; or

- (d) if serious irregularities have occurred in the conduct of the board's affairs or the board has failed to carry out its functions satisfactorily and the Minister considers the board should be reconstituted for that reason.
- (2) The office of a member of the board becomes vacant if the member—
 - (a) dies; or
 - (b) completes a term of office and is not reappointed; or
 - (c) resigns by written notice addressed to the Minister; or
 - (d) is found guilty of an indictable offence; or
 - (e) becomes bankrupt or applies to take the benefit of a law for the relief of insolvent debtors; or
 - (f) is absent from 3 consecutive ordinary meetings of the board without leave of the Minister; or
 - (g) is removed from office by the Minister under subclause (1).
- (3) In the event of a vacancy in the office of a member of the board, the Minister may take steps to fill the vacancy.

7—Meetings

The board must meet at least 4 times in each calendar year.

8—Staff

- (1) The board may appoint a secretary and such other employees as are necessary for the purposes of the board as such remuneration as the board from time to time fixes.
- (2) An employee of the board is not a Public Service employee.
- (3) Schedule 1 Part 3 clause 7(1) and (2) do not apply in relation to the staff of the board.
- (4) Without limiting any other provision, an arrangement under Schedule 1 Part 3 clause 7(3) may provide measures or proceedings for the recovery of rates or charges under this Schedule may be taken on behalf of the board by staff of a government department, agency or authority and measures or proceedings so taken will be presumed to have been taken by the board.

Part 3—Provisions as to dog fences

9—Primary dog fence

- (1) A dog-proof fence known as the *primary dog fence* must continue to be maintained in the northern areas of the State for the purpose of preventing the entry of wild dogs into the pastoral and agricultural areas of the State.
- (2) The Minister may, by notice made on the recommendation of the board, declare that a fence, or the site of a fence, is the primary dog fence, or the site of the primary dog fence.
- (3) The Minister may, by notice made on the recommendation of the board—
 - (a) vary a notice previously made under this clause;
 - (b) without limiting paragraph (a), authorise the alteration, moving or removal of a part of the primary dog fence.
- (4) The Minister must, before making a notice under this clause, consult with an owner of part of the fence, and any separate occupier of the land, to which the notice relates (to the extent determined by the Minister).
- (5) The Minister must ensure that a notice under this clause is published in a manner determined by the Minister.

10—Secondary dog fences

- (1) For the purpose of further restricting the movement of wild dogs within the pastoral and agricultural areas of the State, further dog proof fences (*secondary dog fences*) may be established and maintained in the area inside the primary dog fence.
- (2) The Minister may, by notice made on the recommendation of the board, declare that a fence, or the site of a fence, is a secondary dog fence, or the site of a secondary dog fence.

- (3) The Minister may, by notice made on the recommendation of the board—
 - (a) vary or revoke a notice previously made under this clause;
 - (b) without limiting paragraph (a), authorise the alteration, moving or removal of a secondary dog fence, or part of a secondary dog fence.
- (4) The Minister must, before making a notice under this clause, consult with an owner of the fence or part of the fence, and any separate occupier of the land, to which the notice relates (to the extent determined by the Minister).
- (5) The Minister must ensure that a notice under this clause is published in a manner determined by the Minister.

11—Construction work

- (1) If, in order to—
 - (a) construct, move or complete a portion of a dog fence, it is necessary to move or complete a fence on any land; or
 - (b) make dog-proof a part of a dog fence situated on land, it is necessary that the fence be altered for that purpose,the board may, by notice given to the owner of the fence or the occupier of the land, require the owner to alter the fence or the occupier to construct, move or complete a fence (as the case may be), within the time and in accordance with the directions specified in the notice.
- (2) If a person (the *liable person*) fails to comply with a notice under subclause (1), a person authorised by the board may enter land and carry out the work required by the notice.
- (3) The board may charge the liable person for the reasonable costs and expenses incurred by the board in taking action as provided by subclause (2).
- (4) The amount payable to the board is a debt due to the board.
- (5) The board must not issue a notice under subclause (1) except after consultation with the owner of the fence or an occupier of the land (as the case may require).

12—General authorisation

- (1) The board may carry out work, or approve the carrying out of work, for the purposes of this Part.
- (2) The board may enter into an agreement for contributions to be made to the board, or by the board, towards the cost of work carried out under subclause (1).
- (3) If—
 - a) the board carries out work to alter or replace an existing part of a dog fence with another fence that would, as part of a dog fence, be under the same ownership; and
 - b) the fence to be altered or replaced is in disrepair and, in the opinion of the board, in such a condition, or on such land, that it is not reasonably practicable to make it good as dog-proof fencing,

the board may recover the cost of the work from the owner of the existing part of a dog fence as a debt due to the board by the owner.

13—Duty of owner to maintain dog fence and destroy wild dogs

- (1) The owner of any part of a dog fence—
 - (a) must at all times keep it in a dog-proof condition and properly maintained as a dog-proof fence; and
 - (b) must, for the purpose of keeping it in that condition and so maintained, cause it to be inspected at intervals of not more than 14 days; and
 - (c) must take all reasonable steps to destroy all wild dogs in the vicinity of the part of a dog fence owned by the owner by shooting or trapping the dogs or by laying poisoned baits for them; and
 - (d) must take any other action, or comply with any other requirement, prescribed by the regulations.

- (2) An owner of any part of a dog fence who fails to comply with subclause (1) is guilty of an offence.
- Maximum penalty: \$10,000.
- (3) If the board is satisfied that an owner of any part of a dog fence has failed to comply with subclause (1), a person authorised by the board may enter land and carry out the necessary work for the purpose of—
- (a) maintaining or inspecting the dog fence; or
 - (b) making the dog fence dog-proof; or
 - (c) destroying wild dogs in the vicinity of the dog fence.
- (4) The board may charge the owner for the reasonable costs and expenses incurred by the board in taking action as provided by subclause (3).
- (5) The amount payable to the board is a debt due to the board.

14—Powers and duties of board as to dog fences

- (1) The board has the following powers and duties with respect to dog fences:
- (a) the board must ensure that all dog fences are properly maintained and are at all times dog-proof;
 - (b) the board must ensure that dog fences are properly inspected;
 - (c) the board must ensure that wild dogs are destroyed in the vicinity of a dog fence by the owners of the dog fence.
- (2) For the purposes of this clause, a person authorised by the board may, at any reasonable time, enter and remain on land on which a dog fence is substituted.

15—Dog fences on Crown land

- (1) The board may—
- (a) for the purpose of completing or replacing a portion of a dog fence, erect a fence on any Crown land; or
 - (b) make dog-proof any fence on Crown land; or
 - (c) maintain a fence on Crown land.
- (2) The board may, for the purpose of carrying out any work authorised under this clause—
- (a) authorise a person, at any reasonable time, to enter and remain on Crown land;
 - (b) enter into any arrangement with the occupier of Crown land.

16—Payments to owners of dog fences

- (1) The board must, in each financial year, pay to each owner of part of a dog fence an amount, not exceeding a prescribed amount of each kilometre of fence, to enable the owner to maintain and inspect that part of the fence and to destroy wild dogs in the vicinity of that part of the fence.
- (2) For the purpose of determining the amount to be paid under subclause (1), the board may fix differential rates of payment in respect of different parts of a fence.
- (3) If any part of a dog fence is owned jointly by 2 or more owners, the board must pay the amount referred to in subclause (1) to such owners as the board is satisfied will undertake the liability of carrying out the work referred to in that subclause, and the board may require the joint owners to enter into an agreement relating to that liability.
- (4) Subclause (3) does not derogate from clause 13 or 14.
- (5) An amount paid to an owner must be applied by the owner for the purpose of the maintenance and inspection of a fence and the destruction of wild dogs in the vicinity of the fence.
- (6) With the consent in writing of the board, the owner may apply any such amount or any part of it for the payment of interest payable in respect of any capital liability incurred by the owner in respect of a fence.

- (7) A consent may be given under subclause (6) for a period and on conditions fixed by the board.
- (8) The board may pay an amount payable under this clause in instalments.
- (9) An amount paid to an owner under this clause must be applied during the financial year in respect of which it is paid or during such other period as may be directed in writing by the board and in accordance with any other directions in writing given by the board at the time of payment to the owner.
- (10) If an amount is payable to the board by the owner, that amount must be set off against any amount payable to the owner under this clause.
- (11) If satisfied that an owner will not properly carry out the duties imposed on the owner under this Schedule, the board may refuse to pay to the owner the balance of the amount payable to the owner under this clause or any other amount payable to the owner under this clause.
- (12) The board may, by notice in writing given to an owner to whom an amount is paid under this clause, require the owner to supply to the board within the time specified in the notice a statement in writing showing how any amounts so paid have been expended during the period specified in the notice and during the financial year in which the notice is given or during the preceding financial year.
- (13) A person who fails to apply an amount in accordance with subclause (5) is guilty of an offence. Maximum penalty: \$10,000.
- (14) A person who fails to comply with a requirement under subclause (12) within the period specified in the notice is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: \$5,000.

17—Ownership of dog fences

- (1) Subject to subclause (2), if part of a dog fence stands or is erected or constructed on land comprised in a Crown lease, the lessee of the land under the lease will, for the purposes of this Part, be taken to be the owner of such part of the fence on that land as is not vested in a local board.
- (2) If a dog fence divides contiguous land of adjoining owners, the owner of the land inside the dog fence will, for the purposes of this Part, be taken to be—
 - (a) the owner of the land on which that part of the fence is situated; and
 - (b) the owner of so much of that part of the fence as is not vested in a local board.
- (3) If a part of a dog fence adjoins the area in relation to which a local board is established, the ownership of that part of the dog fence is vested in that local board.
- (4) However, the Minister may, by instrument made on the recommendation of the board and with the agreement of the relevant owner of the land—
 - (a) where subclause (3) applies—vest the ownership any part of the fence vested by that subclause in the owner of the land on which the fence is situated, or in the board; or
 - (b) in any other case—vest the ownership of any part of a dog fence in the board.
- (5) The Minister may, by subsequent instrument made on the recommendation of the board, revest any part of the fence vested by subclause (4) in a local board or any other person.

Part 4—Financial provisions 18—Rates on ratable land

- (1) The board may, by notice published in the Gazette, declare that any holding of more than 10 square kilometres of land that is situated within an area inside a dog fence specified in the notice is ratable land and, by further notice, amend or vary that notice.
- (2) The board may, with the approval of the Minister, by notice published in the Gazette, declare in respect of each financial year—
 - (a) a rate on ratable land; and
 - (b) a minimum amount payable by way of rates.
- (3) The rate must be expressed as an amount per square kilometre of ratable land, not exceeding the prescribed amount per square kilometre.

- (4) If the amount of rate payable by a person would be less than the minimum amount for the time being declared under this clause, the amount payable by the person is the minimum amount.
- (5) In this clause—
holding includes 2 or more parcels of land that—
 - (a) are used as a single enterprise; and
 - (b) are occupied by the same person or persons, whether or not the parcels of land are contiguous.

19—Special rate in respect of local board areas

- (1) The board may, by notice published in the Gazette, in respect of each financial year, declare a special rate on any holding of more than 100 hectares that is situated within an area in relation to which a local board is established.
- (2) The special rate must, unless the Minister and each occupier of land on which the special rate is declared agree otherwise, be expressed as an amount per square kilometre of the land on which it is declared, not exceeding the prescribed amount per square kilometre.
- (3) The amount collected or recovered by the board in consequence of the declaration of a special rate under this clause, less the cost to the board of collection and recovery of that amount, must be paid to the local board.

20—Payment and recovery of rates and special rates

- (1) The board must, as soon as practicable after the declaration of a rate or special rate under this Part, serve on the occupier of ratable land or on the occupier of land on which the special rate is declared, as the case may be, a notice stating the amount the occupier is liable to pay by way of rates or special rates, as the case may be.
- (2) Subject to subclause (3), the amount of the rate or special rate is due and payable on the expiration of 28 days from the day on which the notice is served under subclause (1).
- (3) The board may, in such cases and with such conditions as it thinks fit, extend the time for payment of a rate or special rate.
- (4) A rate or special rate imposed under this Part is, when it becomes due and payable, a debt due to the board and may be recovered by the board in a court of competent jurisdiction.

21—Contributions by councils as alternative to rating by board

- (1) Subject to subclause (2), the board may, with the approval of the Minister and the Treasurer and after consultation with the Local Government Association of South Australia, by notice published in the Gazette—
 - (a) declare a council, other than a council whose area is comprised of or includes ratable land under clause 18, to be a participating council for the purposes of this clause; and
 - (b) before 31 December in any year, declare that a contribution for the next financial year must be paid to the board by each participating council consisting of—
 - (i) in respect of the portion of the council area that is rural land—a specified percentage, not exceeding 1%, of the general rate revenue to be derived by the council for that next financial year in respect of that rural land; and
 - (ii) in respect of the portion of the council area that is urban land—a specified percentage, not exceeding 0.25%, of the general rate revenue to be derived by the council for that next financial year in respect of that urban land.
- (2) A declaration may only be made under subclause (1) in relation to a council if—
 - (a) the board has taken action in the area of the council (other than action involving the construction or maintenance of an effective barrier against the movement of wild dogs) either—
 - (i) pursuant to clause 13(3) on the basis that the owner of any part of a dog fence has failed to comply with clause 13(l)(c) or 13(1)(d); or

- (ii) to deal with an emergency related to movement of wild dogs; and
 - (b) the board is satisfied that the rates levied under the other provisions of this Part are insufficient or will be insufficient to defray the board's costs of taking such action; and
 - (c) any contribution to be paid pursuant to the declaration is calculated to defray no more than those costs referred to in paragraph (b).
- (3) The board may, by further notice published in the Gazette, amend or vary a notice under subclause (1).
- (4) Subclause (2) applies to the amendment or variation of a notice in the same way as it applies to a notice making a declaration under subclause (1).
- (5) The board must cause notice in writing of a declaration under subclause (1)(b) to be served on each council to which it applies not later than 31 December of the year in which the declaration is made.
- (6) A council to which a declaration under subclause (1)(6) applies must pay the contribution specified in the declaration to the board for the credit of the Dog Fence Fund not later than 31 May in the financial year next following the making of the declaration.
- (7) In this clause—
- rural land* means land that is ratable land under the *Local Government Act 1999* and does not lie within a municipality or township within the meaning of that Act;
- urban land* means land that is ratable land under the *Local Government Act 1999* and lies within a municipality or township within the meaning of that Act.

22—Charge payable by occupiers of land outside dog fence

- (1) This clause applies to land of 1 occupier, being land situated outside a dog fence, that is divided from land of another occupier by the dog fence.
- (2) The board may levy a charge on the occupier of land to which this clause applies in respect of any financial year.
- (3) The charge must be calculated by multiplying the length of that part of a dog fence that is adjacent to the occupier's land, expressed in kilometres, by a rate determined by the board.
- (4) The rate must not exceed the prescribed amount per kilometre.
- (5) The board must—
- (a) before it changes the rate under this clause—consult with Livestock SA Incorporated and obtain the approval of the Minister; and
 - (b) if it has approval to change the rate—declare the new rate by notice published in the Gazette.
- (6) The charge may be imposed by notice served on the occupier of land.
- (7) Subject to subclause (8), the amount of a charge under this clause is due and payable on a day specified in the notice of the charge (which must be at least 28 days from the day on which the notice is served on an occupier of land).
- (8) The board may, in such cases and with such conditions as it thinks fit, extend the time for payment of a charge under this clause.
- (9) A charge under this clause is, when it becomes due and payable, a debt due to the board and may be recovered by the board in a court of competent jurisdiction.
- (10) Amounts received by the board under this clause must be paid to the owners of those parts of a dog fence that are contiguous to land occupied by persons against whom the charges are levied.
- (11) Payments under subclause (10) must be proportioned amongst the owners according to the length of dog fence that divides their land from the land occupied by the persons charged under this clause, and are in addition to other payments that may be made by the board under other provisions of this Schedule.

23—Subsidies

The Treasurer must, out of money to be provided by Parliament for the purpose, as soon as practicable after the commencement of each financial year, pay to the board—

- (a) a subsidy at the rate of \$1 for every dollar of the rates and contributions by councils declared by the board for each such financial year and payable in respect of each such financial year; and
- (b) a subsidy, at the rate of \$1 for every dollar paid, or to be paid, in a particular financial year to the board from a fund under the *Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act 1998* that is prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph.

24—Borrowing and investment powers of board

- (1) The board may, for the purposes of this Schedule, borrow money from the Treasurer or, with the consent of the Treasurer, from any other person.
- (2) Liabilities incurred by the board under subclause (1) with the consent of the Treasurer are guaranteed by the Treasurer.
- (3) A liability of the Treasurer under a guarantee arising by virtue of subclause (2) is to be satisfied out of the Consolidated Account which is appropriated by this clause to the necessary extent.
- (4) Any money of the board that is not immediately required for the purposes of this Schedule may be invested in such manner as the Treasurer may approved.

25—Dog Fence Fund

- (1) The money of the board is to be held by the Treasurer in a fund called the *Dog Fence Fund*.
- (2) The fund will consist of—
 - (a) money received by the board as rates or contributions by councils; and
 - (b) money paid to the board as a subsidy on rates or contributions by councils declared by the board and
 - (c) any other money received by the board.
- (3) The fund may be expended by the board for purposes associated with—
 - (a) the administration of this Schedule; or
 - (b) the operations of the board under this Act; or
 - (c) any other matter approved by the Treasurer.

Part 5—Local dog fence boards

26—Establishment of local dog fence boards

- (1) The Minister may, on the recommendation of the board, by notice in the Gazette, establish a local dog fence board.
- (2) A local dog fence board is established for the purpose of defraying the cost of erecting and maintaining part of a dog fence, or a fence that the board proposes to substitute as part of a dog fence instead of an existing part.
- (3) A local dog fence board will be constituted by persons specified in the notice.
- (4) A local dog fence board will have the powers and duties specified in the notice.
- (5) The Minister may, on the recommendation of the board, by further notice in the Gazette—
 - (a) alter the constitution, or the powers or duties, of a local dog fence board; or
 - (b) abolish a local dog fence board and make provision for incidental matters.

27—Borrowing and investment powers of local dog fence boards

- (1) A local board may, for the purposes of this Schedule, with the consent of the board—
 - (a) borrow money from the Treasurer; or
 - (b) borrow money, with the additional consent of the Treasurer, from any other person.

- (2) Liabilities incurred by a local board under subclause (1) with the consent of the Treasurer are guaranteed by the Treasurer.
- (3) A liability of the Treasurer under a guarantee arising by virtue of subclause (2) is to be satisfied out of the Consolidated Account which is appropriated by this clause to the necessary extent.
- (4) Any money of a local board that is not immediately required for the purposes of this Schedule may be invested in such manner as the Treasurer may approved.

Part 6—Related matters 28—Inspection of fences

- (1) The Minister may arrange for the inspection of a dog fence by a Public Service employee at such intervals as are determined by the Minister on the recommendation of the board.
- (2) For the purposes of subclause (1), a Public Service employee may enter land and remain on land on which the fence is situated.

29—Effect of notice

If a notice required to be given under this Schedule by the board is given to an occupier or to the owner of a fence, that notice will be taken to have been given to any successor in occupation or ownership of that occupier or owner.

30—Recovery of amounts payable to board

- (1) If the board is empowered to recover the cost of any work from a person under this Schedule, the board must first serve notice on the person of the amount of the cost and the amount becomes due and payable on the expiration of 28 days from the day on which the notice is so served.
- (2) If an amount is due and payable by a person to the board under this Schedule, the following provisions apply:
 - (a) the person will, if the amount is not paid to the board within 28 days after the day on which the amount became due and payable, be liable to pay, in addition, a fine of 10% on the amount unpaid by the person;
 - (b) any such fine may be recovered (together with the amount to which the fine relates as a debt due to the board by action in a competent jurisdiction;
 - (c) the amount together with any such fine is until paid—
 - (i) in the case of an amount payable for the cost of work carried out in respect of a fence—a first charge in favour of the board on the land of which that person is owner adjoining the fence or on which the fence is situated; or
 - (ii) in any other case—a first charge in favour of the board on the land in respect of which the amount is payable.
- (3) The board may, in its discretion, on grounds of hardship or otherwise, remit the whole or a part of an amount payable to the board under this Act, or postpone payment or allow payment by instalments.
- (4) In any legal proceedings, an apparently genuine document purporting to be executed by the board and certifying as to any amount payable to the board by a person under this Act is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to be accepted as proof of the matters so certified.
- (5) If an amount is payable to the board by a local board, that amount is to be set off against any amount payable to the local board by way of rates collected or recovered for that local board by the board under this Schedule.
- (6) Unless the board otherwise determines, any fee or duty payable by the board in connection with a charge under this section—
 - (a) will be recoverable by the board from the person whose land is subject to the charge; and
 - (b) will be added to the amount to which the charge relates.

31—Penalty for damaging or removing a dog fence

- (1) A person who, without lawful excuse, damages or does any act or makes any omission of such a nature as to be likely to cause damage to, any part of a dog fence is, whether or not the person is the owner of that part of the fence, guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: \$10,000.
- (2) A person who, without the consent in writing of the board—
 - (a) removes any part of a dog fence; or
 - (b) does any act whereby any part of a dog fence ceases to be dog-proof,is, whether or not the person is the owner of that part of the fence, guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: \$10,000.
- (3) On the conviction of a person for an offence involving the removal of or any damage to any part of a dog fence, the court may, if the convicted person is not the person responsible for the maintenance of that part of the fence, in addition to or in lieu of any penalty that may be imposed under this clause, order the convicted person to pay to the person so responsible such sum as the court thinks appropriate as compensation for the removal or damage.
- (4) For the purposes of this clause, a gate or ramp pertaining to a dog fence will be taken to be part of the dog fence.

32—Leaving gate open

A person who—

- (a) passing through a gateway in a dog fence leaves the gate open; or
- (b) opens and leaves open a gate in a dog fence, is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$5,000.

33—Schedule not to be subject to exemptions

An exemption under section 305 cannot be conferred in relation to this Schedule.

PLASTIC SHOPPING BAGS (WASTE AVOIDANCE) REPEAL BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:05 the council adjourned until Thursday 6 February 2025 at 14:15.

Answers to Questions

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GENDER CLINIC

354 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (27 June 2024).

1. How many natal male children, listed by age, have been patients with the WCH gender clinic as at 31 March 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024?
2. How many natal female children, listed by age, have been patients with the WCH gender clinic as at the above dates?
3. How many natal male children, listed by age, are currently on the waitlist for the WCH gender clinic?
4. How many natal female children, listed by age, are currently on the waitlist for the WCH gender clinic?
5. How many natal male children have been prescribed GnRH analogues or other puberty suppressing medications for gender dysphoria as at the above dates? List according to age.
6. How many natal female children have been prescribed GnRH analogues or other puberty suppressing medications as at as at the above dates? List according to age.
7. How many natal male children have undergone feminizing hormone therapy as at the above dates? List according to age.
8. How many natal female children have undergone masculinizing hormone therapy as at the above dates? List according to age.
9. How many minors have been determined unsuitable to undergo puberty blockers or cross-sex hormone therapy at WCH as at the above dates?
10. How many minors receiving puberty blockers or cross-sex hormone therapy at WCH have known psychiatric comorbidities as at the above dates?
11. How many minors receiving puberty blockers or cross-sex hormone therapy at WCH have known Autism Spectrum Disorder as at the above dates?
12. How many children have been referred to specialists for further cross-sex treatment that the gender clinic is unable to perform as at the above dates?
13. How much in public funding was spent on WCH gender services in FY2020-21, FY2021-22, FY2022-23, and FY2023-2024?

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

1. Table 1

Age:	0-4	5-12	13-15	16-17
2020				
Natal Male (M):	0	14	18	19
2021				
M:	0	15	14	20
2022				
M:	1	35	46	58
2023				
M:	0	38	47	67
2024				
M:	0	30	44	81

Table 1 data includes referrals to the gender clinic and patients receiving ongoing care. Please note, this data cannot be separated within the system.

2. Table 2

Age:	0-4	5-12	13-15	16-17
2020				
Natal Female (F):	1	12	20	29
2021				
F:	0	15	25	27
2022				
F:	0	45	138	92
2023				

Age:	0-4	5-12	13-15	16-17
F:	0	49	148	158
2024				
F:	0	29	101	153

Table 2 data includes referrals to the gender clinic and patients receiving ongoing care. Please note, this data cannot be separated within the system.

3.

Age:	Natal Male:
0-4	0
5-12	5
13-15	7
16-17	9
Total:	21

4.

Age:	Natal Female:
0-4	0
5-12	5
13-15	24
16-17	9
Total:	38

5.

31 March 2020	31 March 2021	31 March 2022	31 March 2023	31 March 2024
The database does not hold complete data for these periods.			10yrs: 1 11-12yrs: 5 13-15yrs: 11 16-17yrs: 13 TOTAL: 30	11-12yrs: 6 13-15yrs: 19 16-17yrs: 14 TOTAL: 39

6.

31 March 2020	31 March 2021	31 March 2022	31 March 2023	31 March 2024
The database does not hold complete data for these periods.			10yrs: 2 11-12yrs: 5 13-15yrs: 15 16-17yrs: 2 TOTAL: 24	11-12yrs: 10 13-15yrs: 12 16-17yrs: 4 TOTAL: 26

7.

31 March 2020	31 March 2021	31 March 2022	31 March 2023	31 March 2024
The database does not hold complete data for these periods.			14-15yrs: 1 16-17yrs: 10 TOTAL: 11	14-15yrs: 6 16-17yrs: 16 TOTAL: 22

8.

31 March 2020	31 March 2021	31 March 2022	31 March 2023	31 March 2024
The database does not hold complete data for these periods.			15-16yrs: 12 17yrs: 12 TOTAL:24	15-16yrs: 20 17yrs: 19 TOTAL: 39

9. It is not possible to obtain this information without an in-depth audit of individual medical records.

10.

31 March 2020	31 March 2021	31 March 2022	31 March 2023	31 March 2024
The database does not hold complete data for these periods.			17	22

11.

31 March 2020	31 March 2021	31 March 2022	31 March 2023	31 March 2024
The database does not hold complete data for these periods.			12	20

12. There have been zero children who have been referred to specialists for further cross-sex treatment that the gender clinic is unable to perform, as at the above dates.

13.

Total cost (dollars)	FY20-21	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24
	753,723	1,176,737	1,326,905	1,501,151

RELOCATION SUPPORT FOR HEALTH WORKERS

359 The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (27 August 2024). Can the Minister for Health and Wellbeing advise:

1. How many health professionals have come to work in South Australia as a result of the For Work. For Life recruitment campaign announced by the Premier on 16 May 2023?

2. Since the announcement of the campaign how many doctors who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$10,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

3. Since the announcement of the campaign how many doctors who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$13,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

4. Since the announcement of the campaign how many doctors who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$15,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

5. Since the announcement of the campaign how many nurses who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$10,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

6. Since the announcement of the campaign how many nurses who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$13,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

7. Since the announcement of the campaign how many nurses who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$15,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

8. Since the announcement of the campaign how many midwives who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$10,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

9. Since the announcement of the campaign how many midwives who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$13,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

10. Since the announcement of the campaign how many midwives who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$15,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

11. Since the announcement of the campaign how many paramedics who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$10,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

12. Since the announcement of the campaign how many paramedics who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$13,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

13. Since the announcement of the campaign how many paramedics who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$15,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

14. Since the announcement of the campaign how other health professionals who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$10,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

15. Since the announcement of the campaign how other health professionals who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$13,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

16. Since the announcement of the campaign how other health professionals who have signed contracts with SA Health have received relocation support up to \$15,000 and what has been the total cost of those relocation incentives?

17. How many health professionals (doctors, nurses, midwives, paramedics, others) paid relocation incentives have come from overseas?

18. How many health professionals (doctors, nurses, midwives, paramedics, others) paid relocation incentives have come from interstate?

19. How many health professionals (doctors, nurses, midwives, paramedics, others) paid relocation incentives have moved intrastate?

20. How many health professionals (doctors, nurses, midwives, paramedics, others) paid relocation incentives no longer work for SA Health?

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

Across SA Health, 141 offers of employment were made directly via the For Work. For Life recruitment campaign.

341 health professionals have received relocation support with a total cost of \$1,783,008.

22 health professional who received relocation support are no longer working for SA Health.

From March 2022 to March 2024, the number of full-time equivalent staff across SA Health increased by 1,432 above attrition.

SA HEALTH

375 The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (27 August 2024). Can the Minister for Health and Wellbeing advise:

1. Under the Code Yellow, what number of country mental health patients on involuntary treatment orders have remained in country hospitals for greater than 24 hours requiring the level 1 treatment order to be reviewed by video rather than in person?

2. How was this directive of Code Yellow communicated to the directors of nursing and hospital staff (all health professionals including doctors, nurses, midwives, paramedics, and others)?

3. Has the Code Yellow now been lifted?

4. What is the status of the Mental Health Act 2009 review and its parliamentary progress?

5. In relation to the Drug and Alcohol Services, why was the number of outpatients' attendances listed in this year's budget almost 6,000 less than the projected figure?

6. What is meant by the allocation of \$1.4 million for the extension of the 'Forensic Mental Health Stepdown Service 'in 2023-24?

7. In relation to the highlights, the first dot point: 'Continues review of the Mental Health Services Plan 2020-25, Can the minister provide update on its progress?

8. The 1.6 million mentioned in the third point regarding the additional accommodation for people living with a psychosocial disability to live independently'. My question to the minister is, can you provide a figure to the number of people who have benefitted from this amount mentioned in the budget or how many people have accessed this?

9. Is the Minister confident in meeting the timeframe for co-designing the new 24-bed Mental Health Rehabilitation Facility at the QEH which the Public Works Committee said would be the end of 2025?

10. The percentage of patients attending emergency departments who commenced treatment within clinically accepted timeframes declined from 92% to 69% this year. What are the reasons for the significant decline?

11. The decline in the percentage of patients attending ED's who commenced treatment within the clinically accepted timeframes for resuscitation (which is immediately) went from 86 per cent to 53 per cent this financial year. How many patients have died or had adverse effects due to failing to receive treatment?

12. Patients overdue for elective surgery procedures as at 30 June, has gone from 62 patients to 169 this year. What is the reason for the significant increase and is this a result of systemic issues?

13. How many private beds have been used by SA Health in the treatment of public patients over the last 12 months?

14. Which private hospitals has SA Health currently got contracts with?

15. What is the current cost as a percentage of National Efficient price to deliver care to a public patient in the private sector?

16. Did you have any conversations with private hospitals during the Code Yellow crisis to further utilise the private system?

17. If so, how much was spent on private beds during the Code Yellow crisis?

18. As part of the Wellbeing SA Strategic Plan 2020-25, have the roles of community resilience officers officially concluded and how will that funding be re-allocated to other regional mental health programs?

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

1. It is usual practice for most people who are made subject to an inpatient treatment order in country South Australia to be reviewed via the telepsychiatry service. This has not changed because of the Code Yellow arrangements.

2. Each local health network and the SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) has its own internal communication processes which have been used to communicate decisions to frontline staff.

3. Yes.

4. Consultation on a discussion paper on the review of the Mental Health Act 2009 closed in January 2024. The feedback has been reviewed and a bill will be released for public consultation in the coming months.

5. The projected figure was based on data available up to 29 February 2024. The attendance figure was based on data available up to 30 June 2024.

6. \$1.4 million was the cost to extend the Forensic Mental Health Stepdown Service, which was a pilot program commissioned in 2022 for an initial term of 12 months, with an option to extend for a further 12 months.

7. The Department for Health and Wellbeing's Mental Health Strategy and Planning Branch continuously considers the Mental Health Services Plan's alignment with strategies and initiatives announced subsequent to the release of the plan in November 2019.

8. Haven Foundation Limited with its consortium partner Mind Australia Ltd will build and operate housing accommodation for 16 individuals with psychosocial disability.

9. The project is progressing in line with the agreed program and is expected to be completed by the end of 2025.

10. The Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network implemented the electronic medical records system (EMR) over the course of the 2023-24 financial year, which unintentionally had a material impact on the reported data quality of their 'emergency department commenced treatment within clinically accepted timeframes'.

This is largely because of clinicians being required to actively select 'commenced treatment' in the EMR system, which was not consistently actioned and lacked a shared definition of when treatment had actually commenced.

Education has been undertaken with clinicians across the network on this function of the system to improve the input of accurate data. In addition, Digital Health SA have also introduced system changes to improve system functionality around recording when treatment has been initiated and ensure better data accuracy in future.

As the issue was one of data quality and reporting, rather than delayed care, there were no actual negative impacts on patient health and outcomes during this period because of this issue.

11. The Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network implemented the electronic medical records system (EMR) over the course of the 2023-24 financial year, which unintentionally had a material impact on the reported data quality of their 'emergency department commenced treatment within clinically accepted timeframes'.

This is largely because of clinicians being required to actively select 'commenced treatment' in the EMR system, which was not consistently actioned and lacked a shared definition of when treatment had actually commenced.

Education has been undertaken with clinicians across the network on this function of the system to improve the input of accurate data. In addition, Digital Health SA have also introduced system changes to improve system functionality around recording when treatment has been initiated and ensure better data accuracy in future.

As the issue was one of data quality and reporting, rather than delayed care, there were no actual negative impacts on patient health and outcomes during this period because of this issue.

12. The increase is a result of increasing demand and/or short notice cancellations due to workforce or patient factors. Yorke and Northern LHN are managing their theatre lists to ensure local demand is met in a timely manner.

13. Local health networks have engaged with the private sector utilising the Patient Services Panel (PSP) since July 2019, the commencement and length of any bed agreement varies depending on the service type and requirements of the LHN enacting the agreement.

On average over 100 private hospital beds each day were used across the public hospital system over the last 12 months.

14. The following private hospitals are on SA Health's Patient Services Panel:

- Ashford Hospital (ACHA)
- Burnside Hospital Stepney
- Burnside Hospital Toorak Gardens
- Calvary Adelaide Hospital
- Calvary Central Districts Hospital
- Calvary North Adelaide Hospital
- Flinders Private Hospital (ACHA)
- Glenelg Community Hospital
- Griffith Rehabilitation Hospital
- North Eastern Community Hospital
- Ramsay Clinic Adelaide
- St Andrew's Hospital
- The Memorial Hospital (ACHA)
- Western Hospital.

Additionally, SA Health has undertaken work with Stirling District Hospital through an exemption to the patient services panel.

15. The department funds local health networks (LHNs) at the national efficient price for all public patients, regardless of whether they receive their care in the public hospital or under local contracted care arrangements.

LHNs enter contracting arrangements with the private sector separately and the price paid is locally determined under those arrangements.

16. The Patient Services Panel Agreement, for outsourcing of public work to the private sector, has been extended to June 2027. The Department for Health and Wellbeing and local health networks continue to have regular conversations with private hospitals, which include medium term contract strategies and additional bed capacity during times of peak demand and system pressures.

17. The Patient Services Panel Agreement, for outsourcing of public work to the private sector, has been extended to June 2027. The Department for Health and Wellbeing and local health networks continue to have regular conversations with private hospitals, which include medium term contract strategies and additional bed capacity during times of peak demand and system pressures.

18. Preventive Health SA continues to provide specific mental health and suicide prevention initiatives including:

- South Australian Suicide Prevention Community Grants. As a priority population identified by the State Suicide Prevention Act and plan, applications received in support of people living in regional, rural and remote South Australia receive priority consideration for approval.
- Supporting South Australian Suicide Prevention Networks to carry out suicide prevention and mental health awareness activities. The majority are located in regional and rural South Australia and well placed to identify emerging local issues and needs to provide relevant and timely suicide prevention, wellbeing and capacity building initiatives.
- Funding research and promoting evidence-based best practice to support the community:
- In collaboration with UniSA, Preventive Health SA has funded research into the impacts of mental distress for men, women and CALD men in farming in South Australia. The associated reports continue to inform the work of Preventive Health SA in supporting South Australians in farming occupations.
- Preventive Health SA is currently working in partnership by way of grant funding to Breakthrough Mental Health Research Foundation for the purposes of supporting a research fellowship for male suicide prevention.
- In addition, other locally produced resources such as Dr Kate Gunn's iFarmwell are promoted to the regional, rural and remote SPNs for distribution in their communities.

LOCAL HEALTH NETWORKS

376 The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (27 August 2024). Can the Minister for Health and Wellbeing advise:

1. What is the current level of vacancies within SA Health broken down by local health network?
2. How many private hospital beds have been used by SA Health in the treatment of public patients over the last 12 months including mental health patients?
3. Which private hospitals do SA Health currently have contracts with for the purpose of utilising their beds for public patients?
4. What is the average wait time across emergency departments across all local health networks?
5. Can you detail how many of those 38,803 SA Health workers were salaried medical officers, how many were nurses, how many were midwives, how many were paramedics, how many were allied health professionals, how many were domestic and other personal care staff, and how many administrative and clerical staff? Can you also provide that same breakdown for 2022-23?
6. Can you detail the number of beds by each local health network and by each medical facility within each local network as at 30 June 2024 and 30 June 2023?
7. How many people died whilst waiting for an ambulance, whilst in an ambulance on route to an emergency department or whilst waiting on the ramp of an emergency department in 2023-24?
8. What caused revenue from fees, fines and penalties jump by 80 per cent in the last 12 months? Can a break down by fee/fine/penalty type be provided?
9. How are hours captured when patients are offloaded from an ambulance into an offload bay at the Lyell McEwin Hospital? Are they captured as hours on the ramp?

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

1. Local health networks are responsible for setting and monitoring the full-time equivalent (FTE) requirements for their respective network.

This includes the careful monitoring of vacancies and ensuring that these positions are filled in a timely manner.

2. Local health networks have engaged with the private sector utilising the patient services panel (PSP) since July 2019, the commencement and length of any bed agreement varies depending on the service type and requirements of the LHN enacting the agreement.

On average over 100 private hospital beds each day were used across the public hospital system over the last 12 months.

3. SA Health has contracts which allow bed purchase arrangements with the following private hospitals through the patient services panel:

- Adelaide Community Healthcare Alliance Incorporated (ACHA) + Healthscope
- Burnside War Memorial Hospital Incorporated
- Calvary Health Care Adelaide Limited
- North Eastern Community Hospital
- St Andrews Hospital

4. ED wait times are available publicly on the emergency department dashboard on the SA Health website.

5. The figure referenced is derived from Treasury and Finance budget data and is not available at health professions level.

6. The number of beds is available publicly on the inpatient dashboard on the SA Health website.

7. The requested information is not captured within existing systems.

8. The revenue from fees, fines and penalties is primarily related to car parking expiation notices associated with SA Health operated car parks.

9. Hours lost due to delayed transfer of care are measured from the ambulance's arrival at the hospital to the point when the patient's care is no longer the responsibility of SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) (beyond the first 30 minutes).

To that point, once a patient is transferred from the care of SAAS to that of the respective health network, transfer of care has occurred.'

ADELAIDE 500

389 The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (28 August 2024). Can the Premier advise:

1. The number of complementary tickets issues for the 2023 ADL500?
2. The total cost of the 'South Australia Suite' for the 2023 ADL500?

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

This year's event attracted a crowd of 259,400 across the four days. Hospitality and accommodation providers are also reporting a positive return from the 2024 VAILO Adelaide 500.

Early data has revealed the Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights saw a significant increase for Adelaide accommodation providers in revenue per available room (RevPAR), a key hospitality performance measure, indicating an increase in takings for the state's tourism and hospitality industry.

Overall, hotel occupancy rates were higher this year, averaging 93.3 per cent occupied across the three nights, compared to 84.4 per cent in 2023.

The 2023 event delivered a record \$61.6 million benefit to the South Australian economy. This was 18.8 per cent higher than 2022, and 59 per cent higher than the race in 2020.

With regard to complimentary ticketing, less than 5 per cent of all event tickets are provided on a complimentary basis. The vast majority of these tickets are provided for the schools day on the Thursday of the event.

LAND TAX

397 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (25 September 2024).

1. How many properties are there in South Australia that are subject to land tax? Please provide in table format, for financial years 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 for each question.
2. What is the total value of all South Australian properties that are subject to land tax?
3. How many properties in South Australia are owned by the following cohorts, broken down line by line: individuals in their personal capacity, tenants in common, joint tenants, fixed trusts, companies (not as trustee), and discretionary trusts?
4. What is the total land value for properties owned by the following cohorts, broken down line by line: individuals in their personal capacity, tenants in common, joint tenants, fixed trusts, companies (not as trustee), and discretionary trusts?
5. How much land tax is generated by properties in South Australia owned by the following cohorts, broken down line by line: individuals in their personal capacity, tenants in common, joint tenants, fixed trusts, companies (not as trustee), and discretionary trusts?
6. How many of those properties of each of the cohorts are subject to the principal place of residence exemption?
7. How many of those properties are subject to any other exemptions?

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

In 2023-24 there were 94,400 (rounded to the nearest hundred) properties liable for land tax with a tax liability greater than zero.

In 2023-24 the collective value of properties liable for land tax with a tax liability greater than zero was \$63.5 billion.

In 2023-24, 419,100 (rounded to the nearest hundred) properties received a principal place of residence (PPR) exemption.

Other information broken down to the level of detail requested is not available.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

413 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (29 October 2024). Can the Minister for Health and Wellbeing advise:

1. What is the dollar amount of SA Ambulance service fees and charges collected, broken down by incident response type for each of the below questions: Retrievals for compensable patients, emergency, non-emergency, and treat no transport?

Please provide in table format, for financial years 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 for each of the below questions.

2. What is the total number of SA Ambulance service fees and charges collected?

3. What is the dollar amount of overdue SA Ambulance service fees and charges?
4. What is the number of overdue SA Ambulance service fees and charges?

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

1. As outlined in the SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) annual report, in the financial year 2023-24, SAAS received income of \$129,425,000 for ambulance services rendered.

SAAS estimates that in a financial year, revenue fees received are on average broken into the following rounded percentages:

Emergency fees	91%
Non-emergency fees	5%
Treat no transport	2%
Compulsory third party insurance	2%

2. As outlined in the SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) annual reports, SAAS received the payment of the following amount in fees and charges:

2021-22	\$123,921,000
2022-23	\$177,264,000
2023-24	\$133,946,000

SAAS does not undertake reporting on the number of individual accounts for fees and charges.

3. As outlined in the SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) annual reports, SAAS has the following amounts of current debtors as at the 30 July of the respective year:

2021-22	\$54,113,000
2022-23	\$59,402,000
2023-24	\$53,320,000

SAAS does not undertake reporting on the amount owing on fees and charges alone, this is managed by SA Government Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit.

4. SA Ambulance Service does not undertake reporting on the number of fees and charges owed, this is managed by SA Government Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit.

MOBILE PHONE DETECTION CAMERAS

414 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (29 October 2024). Can the Treasurer advise:

1. A budget estimate of fines to be collected in 2024-25 from mobile phone detection cameras broken down by camera location.
2. What is the total dollar amount of total fines and expiations collected? Please provide in table format, for financial years 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 for each of the below questions.
3. What is the number of total fines and expiation collected?
4. What is the dollar amount of fines and expiations collected by the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit broken down by the following categories for each of the below questions: demerit traffic, non-demerit traffic, parking, other SAPOL, court fines, victims of crime (non-levy), salary overpayments, Electoral Commission, Department of Education, Department of Primary Industries and Regions, SA Ambulance, SA Housing Authority, other state debt, and any other categories?
5. What is the number of fines and expiations that have entered into an arrangement with the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit?
6. What is the number of fines and expiations overdue?
7. What is the dollar amount of fines and expiations overdue?
8. What is the dollar amount of overdue penalty fines?
9. What is the number of overdue penalty fines?
10. How many penalties (non-fines) have been enforced?

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

The Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) advises there are currently five priority locations across Adelaide where mobile phone detection cameras are installed. As provided in the 2023-24 state budget, budgeted expiations to be issued as a result of mobile phone detection cameras for 2024-25 is \$24.454 million.

The SA Police have only commenced the issuing of the penalty of \$556 plus a \$102 victims of crime Levy and three demerit points from offences detected by mobile phone detection cameras from 19 September 2024.

They continue to release expiation data for the five active locations publicly, with the latest information released within a media release dated 30 December 2024.

Due to the issuing only commencing from 19 September 2024, further detailed information regarding total expiations collected and the number managed through the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit is not yet available.

ELECTORATE SERVICES

416 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (27 November 2024). Can the Special Minister of State advise:

1. What staff movements are being referred to in the email from Lisa.Samarzia@sa.gov.au dated 11/11/2024, subject line Important Notice—Electorate Services?
2. Which positions were vacant and being recruited at the time of the email?
3. Which positions have been filled since?
4. Was the position of Manager Electorate Services vacant at the time of the email?
5. Who is currently the Manager Electorate Services, or the Acting Manager?
6. Are there other issues Electorate Services has faced regarding staff turnover that is of concern?

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

The staff movements referenced relate to Electorate Services staff taking staggered annual leave in the lead up to and over the Christmas period.

At the time of the email, the workforce consultant role was vacant and being recruited.

The Manager, Electorate Services role is shared by two staff members.

SUPER SA

417 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (27 November 2024). Can the Treasurer advise:

1. Broken down by quarter in a table format, the take up rate of Super SA funds from FY2022-23 to present? Including the portion of members who have elected an alternative fund following the introduction of choice of fund?
2. Broken down by quarter in a table format, the investment results of Super SA products from FY2022-23 to present?

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

Total membership numbers by product type:

Product	2022-23	2023-24
Triple S	177,907	180,128
Flexible Rollover Product	8,074	8,437
Income Stream	13,381	13,912
Superannuants	13,262	12,486
Pension	207	158
Lump Sum	1,920	1,649
SA Ambulance	567	525

To 30 November 2024, 7,775 members have made a fund selection.

Investment returns across products at 30 November 2024:

Triple S

	1 month	3 months	FYTD	1 year	3 years	5 years	10 years
Balanced	3.10%	3.90%	6.63%	14.65%	5.02%	6.56%	7.54%
High Growth	3.44%	4.76%	7.71%	16.44%	5.79%	7.28%	8.63%
Socially Responsible	3.82%	4.24%	7.86%	15.08%	4.66%	6.84%	7.09%
Moderate	2.44%	3.00%	5.51%	12.28%	4.14%	4.87%	6.09%

	1 month	3 months	FYTD	1 year	3 years	5 years	10 years
Stable	1.89%	2.36%	4.49%	9.62%	2.94%	3.49%	4.82%
Capital Defensive	1.44%	1.69%	3.61%	7.45%	2.08%	2.31%	3.60%
Cash	0.36%	1.14%	1.94%	4.62%	3.17%	2.01%	2.02%

Income Stream

	1 month	3 months	FYTD	1 year	3 years	5 years	10 years
Balanced	3.13%	3.93%	6.72%	14.91%	5.52%	6.83%	7.66%
High Growth	3.47%	4.76%	7.83%	16.69%	6.22%	7.57%	8.86%
Socially Responsible	3.83%	4.30%	7.98%	15.58%	5.06%	7.09%	7.44%
Moderate	2.47%	3.03%	5.52%	12.36%	4.48%	5.05%	6.13%
Stable	1.90%	2.29%	4.49%	9.71%	3.22%	3.50%	4.76%
Capital Defensive	1.47%	1.61%	3.63%	7.51%	2.27%	2.27%	3.46%
Cash	0.36%	1.14%	1.95%	4.65%	3.19%	2.02%	2.01%

TTR–Income Stream

	1 month	3 months	FYTD	1 year	3 years	5 years	10 years (1)
Balanced	2.69%	3.37%	5.74%	12.61%	6.37%	6.92%	N/A
High Growth	2.98%	4.08%	6.68%	14.08%	7.26%	7.74%	N/A
Socially Responsible	3.29%	3.68%	6.80%	13.15%	5.93%	7.16%	N/A
Moderate	2.12%	2.60%	4.72%	10.48%	5.04%	5.09%	N/A
Stable	1.63%	1.95%	3.83%	8.25%	3.60%	3.50%	N/A
Capital Defensive	1.26%	1.38%	3.09%	6.39%	2.44%	2.24%	N/A
Cash	0.31%	0.98%	1.68%	3.98%	2.72%	1.73%	N/A

(1) This option did not commence until 1/7/17.

Flexible Rollover Product

	1 month	3 months	FYTD	1 year	3 years	5 years	10 years
Balanced	2.80%	3.26%	5.70%	13.38%	4.93%	6.20%	6.77%
High Growth	3.11%	4.02%	6.71%	15.00%	5.58%	6.90%	7.90%
Socially Responsible	3.41%	3.58%	6.80%	13.94%	4.54%	6.45%	6.60%
Moderate	2.19%	2.44%	4.60%	11.06%	3.98%	4.56%	5.40%
Stable	1.67%	1.77%	3.67%	8.68%	2.85%	3.13%	4.15%
Capital Defensive	1.28%	1.17%	2.89%	6.74%	2.00%	2.01%	2.98%
Cash	0.31%	0.98%	1.66%	3.96%	2.69%	1.69%	1.69%

Super SA Select

	1 month	3 months	FYTD	1 year	3 years	5 years	10 years
Balanced	2.68%	3.25%	5.69%	13.12%	4.85%	6.16%	6.77%
Cash	0.31%	0.98%	1.66%	3.95%	2.70%	1.72%	1.72%

Lump Sum Scheme

	1 month	3 months	FYTD	1 year	3 years	5 years	10 years
Balanced	3.11%	3.92%	6.66%	14.80%	5.06%	6.60%	7.53%
High Growth	3.45%	4.78%	7.74%	16.59%	5.83%	7.32%	8.63%
Socially Responsible	3.82%	4.26%	7.89%	15.23%	4.70%	6.88%	7.09%
Moderate	2.45%	3.02%	5.55%	12.44%	4.18%	4.90%	6.08%
Stable	1.90%	2.38%	4.53%	9.77%	2.98%	3.51%	4.81%
Capital Defensive	1.46%	1.72%	3.65%	7.61%	2.12%	2.33%	3.59%
Cash	0.36%	1.14%	1.94%	4.62%	3.15%	1.99%	1.99%

SA Ambulance

	1 month	3 months	FYTD	1 year	3 years	5 years	10 years
Balanced	2.78%	3.51%	5.98%	13.11%	4.83%	6.20%	6.79%

TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT

418 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (27 November 2024). Can the Treasurer advise in a table format, a breakdown of staff turnover by month for years FY2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24, broken down by each Department of Treasury and Finance entities and by reason for leaving: intra-department transfer, retirement, redundancy, resignation, and dismissal?

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

The Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) captures staff turnover data for retirement, redundancy, resignation, and dismissal. It does not capture data on intra-department transfers but does capture staff transferring across the public sector. Staff turnover is outlined per entity below:

Treasury and Finance

2021-22

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed	1											1	2
Redundancy											1		1
Resignation	4	7	7	7	10	6	8	6	11	6	4	9	85
Retirement	1	1	2	1	2	2		1	2			1	13
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)	4	5	7	9	4	10	11	5	12	11	9	8	95
Total	10	13	16	17	16	18	19	12	25	17	14	19	196

2022-23

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy	1												1
Resignation	17	5	8	4	10	11	4	10	8	12	8	6	103
Retirement	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	1		1			15
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)	264	8	5	9	10	7	12	26	12	4	7	9	373
Total	284	14	15	14	22	21	18	37	20	17	15	15	492

2023-24

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed	1		1						1				3
Redundancy													0
Resignation	9	7	10	7	11	12	11	8	5	13	17	16	126
Retirement	2	2	2		1		1	1	1	2	1	1	14
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)	5	6	2	9	6	5	9	6	13	11	5	8	85
Total	17	15	15	16	18	17	21	15	20	26	23	25	228

South Australian Government Financing Authority

2021-22

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation			1	1						2	1	1	6
Retirement				1									1
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)	1	1			1								3
Total	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	10

2022-23

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation	3	2		2			1	1					9
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)						1							1
Total	3	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	10

2023-24

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation													0
Retirement			2		1	1		1	1			1	7
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)	1		1	2		2							6
Total	1	0	3	2	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	13

Super SA

2021-22

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed	1												1
Redundancy													0
Resignation	1		2	2	1	1	1	1		2	2	1	14
Retirement							1						1
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)		1		1			2	1	1	2			8
Total	2	1	2	3	1	1	4	2	1	4	2	1	24

2022-23

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed			1										1
Redundancy													0
Resignation	2	1	5	1	5	1	3	1	3	2	1	2	27
Retirement									1				1
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)	2	2		1		1	3	1		2			12
Total	4	3	6	2	5	2	6	2	4	4	1	2	41

2023-24

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed	1												1
Redundancy													0
Resignation	2	1	2	2		2	5	1	2	3	2	2	24
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)	2			2	1		1		2	1	1		10
Total	5	1	2	4	1	2	6	1	4	4	3	2	35

Compulsory Third Party Regulator

2021-22

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation						1	2				1		4
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)				1		1				1			3
Total	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	7

2022-23

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation			2		1					1			4
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)					1		1						2
Total	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	6

2023-24

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation			2			1	1		1	1			6
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)													0
Total	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	6

Office of the Industry Advocate

2021-22

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation													0
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)													0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2022-23

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation				1		1			1				3
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)					2								2
Total	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5

2023-24

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation													0
Retirement						1							1
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)		1						1					2
Total	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3

Lifetime Support Authority

2021-22

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation	2	2	1	2		2	1	2	1	2	2		17
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)		1		1	1		1		1		1		6
Total	2	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	0	23

2022-23

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed													0
Redundancy													0
Resignation	1	2	4		1	1	2		1			1	13
Retirement												1	1
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)			1			1				1			3
Total	1	2	5	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	17

2023-24

Reason for separation	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total
Dismissed									1				1
Redundancy													0
Resignation	2									1	2	3	8
Retirement													0
Transfer to other Dept (inc MOG)		1											1
Total	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	10

LAND TAX

419 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (27 November 2024). Can the Treasurer advise:

- How many land tax bills are currently overdue?
- What is the total value of overdue land tax bills, broken down in a table format by cohorts: individuals in their personal capacity, tenants in common, joint tenants, fixed trusts, companies (not as trustee), and discretionary trusts?
- What is the total value of late fees for overdue land tax bills, broken down in a table format by cohorts: individuals in their personal capacity, tenants in common, joint tenants, fixed trusts, companies (not as trustee), and discretionary trusts?
- When were property valuations from the Valuer-General provided to RevenueSA for FY2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25.
- What is the average wait time for the issuing of land tax bills from date of received Valuer-General property valuations. Please provide for FY2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25 year to date.

6. How many land tax bill recipients have requested extensions to their instalment due dates for FY2024-25 year to date, or sought other forms of financial relief/assistance, broken down in a table format by cohorts: individuals in their personal capacity, tenants in common, joint tenants, fixed trusts, companies (not as trustee), and discretionary trusts?

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

1. The land tax changes under the previous Liberal government have caused significant increases in land tax bills for many property owners, and significant challenges in land tax billing for RevenueSA. As at 15 January 2025, 2,430 land tax customers had overdue accounts.

2. RevenueSA does not have a reporting mechanism to break down overdue accounts into the cohorts requested.

However, as at 15 January 2025, the value of land tax accounts considered overdue is \$18.8 million.

3. RevenueSA does not have a reporting mechanism to provide this information.

4. RevenueSA receives valuation updates throughout the year however, as they are effective for the following financial year, these are stored during the year and loaded into RevenueSA's taxation system during RevenueSA's start of year process which generally occurs from 29 June until 2 July.

5. As detailed above, property valuations are generally loaded between 29 June and 2 July. Land tax billing dates for the requested financial years were:

Financial Year	Date land tax billing commenced
2022-23	21 October 2022
2023-24	3 November 2023
2024-25	1 November 2023

6. RevenueSA is unable to break this down into the individual cohorts requested. However, as at 15 January 2025, 146 customers have requested payment assistance for FY2024/25 via RevenueSA's online form. Customers are also able to request payment assistance from RevenueSA via other service channels however, these interactions are not reportable.

GENDER DYSPHORIA

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (19 March 2024).

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

The New South Wales government has engaged the Sax Institute, an independent health policy group, to review the national and international scientific literature, research and evidence on gender care. Queensland Health has recently released its external clinical service evaluation of the Queensland Children's Gender Service, which has found this service to be safe and evidence-based. The outcome of these reviews will be considered by SA Health.

The Gender Diversity Service at the Women's and Children's Hospital is currently providing treatment to 117 young people under the age of 18.

The Endocrinology Department, Women's and Children's Hospital advises the use of gonadotropin releasing hormone agonists (otherwise colloquially known as puberty blockers) for the management of precocious puberty in children has occurred since the early to mid-1980s at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

GENDER DYSPHORIA

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (19 March 2024).

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

The New South Wales government has engaged the Sax Institute, an independent health policy group, to review the national and international scientific literature, research and evidence on gender care. Queensland Health has recently released its external clinical service evaluation of the Queensland Children's Gender Service, which has found this service to be safe and evidence-based. The outcome of these reviews will be considered by SA Health.

The Gender Diversity Service at the Women's and Children's Hospital is currently providing treatment to 117 young people under the age of 18.

The Endocrinology Department, Women's and Children's Hospital advises the use of gonadotropin releasing hormone agonists (otherwise colloquially known as puberty blockers) for the management of precocious puberty in children has occurred since the early to mid-1980s at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

TAXI INDUSTRY

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (20 March 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport advises:

1. The Malinauskas government committed to undertaking a review of all point-to-point passenger transport services in South Australia.

On 30 August 2024, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (the department) released the Passenger Transport Act Review report. Recommendation 4 outlines a buyback of taxi licences from metropolitan taxi licence holders residing in South Australia. The buyback would be of metropolitan taxi licences that were obtained privately or at auction before the introduction of rideshare that are still held by the licence holder.

If legislation is passed by the South Australian parliament the department will release guidelines that set out how taxi licence owners can apply for a payment under the Taxi Industry Reform Package, as well as detailed eligibility requirements. The department will write to all taxi licence owners to provide a copy of the guidelines and outline the process.

Following stakeholder consultation, the next step to progress implementation of the review recommendations is to introduce a bill into South Australian parliament to amend the Passenger Transport Act 1994.

2. If you are referring to the Maurice Blackburn class action against Uber in the Supreme Court of Victoria, as the South Australian government would not be a party to any future civil action taken by the taxi industry against Uber, it has not sought legal advice.

3. I am advised that the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (the department) is not aware of any 'secret negotiations' with Uber undertaken in late 2014.

4. I am advised that the department conducted a search for documents within the scope of a freedom of information request and no documents were identified as being within the scope of the request. A review by the South Australian Ombudsman found that it did not appear that the department had failed to undertake reasonable searches for documents in response to the Taxi Council's application.

5. An independent report of the State Ombudsman found that the department had acted appropriately in relation to the freedom of information request.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (9 April 2024).

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

1. I have been notified of the resignation of Mr David Christian from his role of Chief Operating Officer Australia in accordance with the announcement made to the New Zealand Exchange and the Australian Stock Exchange on 8 April 2024.

2. I have previously advised that on 1 February 2024, SkyCity Entertainment Group Limited (NZ), the parent company of SkyCity Adelaide, announced that SkyCity Adelaide and AUSTRAC jointly informed the Federal Court that the parties have come to an agreement in relation to the contraventions that SkyCity Adelaide will admit in the proceedings and the amount of a civil penalty they will jointly propose to the Court, subject to finalisation of a statement of agreed facts and admissions.

It is understood from the market announcement that the resolution of the matter will involve SkyCity Adelaide admitting serious breaches of anti-money laundering laws and the imposition by the court of a material civil penalty.

A timetable has been put in place by the court to allow AUSTRAC and SkyCity to seek to finalise this process. If agreement is reached, it is however a matter for the Federal Court to determine the appropriate penalty in the proceedings.

Once the AUSTRAC proceedings have been resolved and the statement of agreed facts and admissions are available, the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner will then consider when the investigation by the Hon. Brian Marin KC into the suitability of SkyCity Adelaide Pty Ltd to hold the South Australia's casino licence and SkyCity Entertainment Group Limited (NZ) to be a close associate, should resume.

The Treasurer has advised:

3. On 21 March 2024, SkyCity Adelaide Pty Ltd ('SkyCity') applied to the High Court of Australia (the HCA) for special leave to appeal part of the judgement of the Court of Appeal, namely the answer given by the Court of Appeal on the converted credits issue. That is, the finding that credits on gaming machines arising from the conversion of loyalty points, when played by customers, are to be included in gaming revenue for the purpose of calculating casino duty. In light of this, the recovery of funds back to the state government has been placed on hold

until the HCA has ruled on SkyCity's application for special leave to appeal and, if special leave is granted by HCA, the appeal itself.

4. In light of the response provided to question 3, I am unable to advise what amount will be required to be paid back to the state government by SkyCity in relation to taxation of its loyalty program.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (10 April 2024).

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

The government has allocated \$3.2 billion to building our new hospital on the SAPOL barracks site, near the Royal Adelaide Hospital, to ensure we provide space for both hospitals to expand in the future. The new hospital will provide many key clinical benefits and will be 25 per cent bigger and have 56 more overnight beds than the current Women's and Children's Hospital. The facility will have a future capacity to provide a further 20 beds.

As a key training facility for women's and children's services and specialities the Women's and Children's Hospital has a strong research history and has recently released a research strategy. It focuses on improving health outcomes by building research capacity, enhancing research culture, strengthening collaborations to deliver evidence-based care, and ensuring translation of research into clinical outcomes. Provision of onsite research facilities assists with the realisation and continuation of this vision through embedding research into health service, practice and policy the Women's and Children's Hospital will continue to improve the health of pregnant women and children.

JUNK FOOD ADVERTISING

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (15 May 2024).

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

The Restriction of Unhealthy Food Advertising on South Australian Government Assets Working Group (the working group) was established in December 2023 and includes representation from Preventive Health SA, Department for Infrastructure and Transport and Department for Health and Wellbeing.

The government of South Australia recently undertook a targeted consultation process to understand the challenges and opportunities related to the proposed policy approach. The consultation process occurred via the online YourSAY engagement platform.

Feedback received from the consultation process will be considered to inform the final policy proposal to be considered by government.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (19 June 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Housing and Urban Development has advised:

The housing crisis is not specific to South Australia, it is a crisis currently being experienced internationally and across each Australian jurisdiction.

The Malinauskas Labor government is working on a considered strategy that seeks to pull every lever available to tackle the crisis head on.

One of the levers used to date has been the release of land, to address the simple market mechanics of supply and demand.

It should be noted, that throughout the Marshall Liberal government's time in office, less than 190 hectares of land was released for development as opposed to approximately 450 hectares released since March 2022 with an additional 4,000 hectares initiated.

On 25 June 2024, the Malinauskas Labor government released its Housing Roadmap—'More Homes for South Australians Housing Roadmap' a considered policy outlining the government's plan to tackle the housing crisis, place downward pressure on the price of housing and invest in the critical infrastructure to deliver additional housing stock to South Australia.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (19 June 2024). The Minister for Housing and Urban Development has advised:

The housing crisis is not specific to South Australia, it is a crisis currently being experienced internationally and across each Australian jurisdiction.

The Malinauskas Labor government is working on a considered strategy that seeks to pull every lever available to tackle the crisis head on.

One of the levers used to date has been the release of land, to address the simple market mechanics of supply and demand.

It should be noted, that throughout the Marshall Liberal government's time in office, less than 190 hectares of land was released for development as opposed to approximately 450 hectares released since March 2022 with an additional 4,000 hectares initiated.

On 25 June 2024, the Malinauskas Labor government released its Housing Roadmap—'More Homes for South Australians Housing Roadmap' a considered policy outlining the government's plan to tackle the housing crisis, place downward pressure on the price of housing and invest in the critical infrastructure to deliver additional housing stock to South Australia.

POLICE COMPLAINTS AND DISCIPLINE ACT

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (27 August 2024).

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

SAPOL can confirm the investigation has been reopened as there was cause for review, however no further information can be provided at this time.

MEN'S HEALTH

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (29 August 2024).

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

Considering the interests, health and wellbeing of all South Australians, including males is the responsibility of all government authorities.

Within the male cohort there are additional intersections that impact the experiences, health and wellbeing outcomes and needs of South Australian men, including living with disability, age over the life course, Indigenous identity, gender identity and sex, cultural identity, employment status and occupation type, mental and physical health status, region of usual residence and sociodemographic details.

For this reason, it is expected that during the development of policies related to population health, consideration will be given to identifying population groups who may be most affected by the issue to be addressed and this includes examining the evidence of need via publications such as the National Men's Strategy.

The development of laws, policies and plans relating to suicide prevention in South Australia provides a good example of this approach.

The South Australian Suicide Prevention Act (2021) provides for the identification of priority population groups which it describes as groups of people disproportionately affected by suicide or attempted suicide. A key object of the act is the implementation of suitable initiatives to prevent suicide within such groups.

The act requires that all state authorities give effect to the State Suicide Prevention Plan and further that prescribed state authorities must consult with persons who identify as being within a priority population group in developing suicide prevention action plans in working to prevent suicide in the community and their own workforce.

Under the act, the State Suicide Prevention Plan must include provisions specifically addressing the prevention of suicide among priority population groups.

The State Suicide Prevention Plan 2023-26 identifies males as a priority population and acknowledges that this group is most represented in the statistics regarding suicide. As a result, males are a group given priority consideration when developing policies, strategies and actions under the State Suicide Prevention Plan and for prescribed state authorities currently developing their respective suicide prevention action plans.

This policy of supporting men as a priority population can be observed as flowing on to provide real benefits to men in the community; every year the South Australian Suicide Prevention Community Grants provide local community groups with funds to take action against suicide. Priority is given to applications that identify activities to prevent male suicide across all age, identity and sociodemographic domains in the allocation of suicide prevention grants.

DAVENPORT COMMUNITY

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (29 August 2024).

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

The trust has not placed the Davenport Community Council (council) into administration. As the council is established under the Associations Incorporation Act 1985 (SA), administration can only be sought by Consumer and Business Services, which administers that act.

The council leases land at Davenport from the trust. In July 2020, the trust received a petition from Davenport community residents asserting a range of governance issues and seeking a general meeting of Davenport community members. After public consultation, the trust appointed a manager for the lands leased to the council, as it is entitled to do under s.45 of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013 (SA).

After that decision, the manager assumed the council's rights and responsibilities under the Davenport lease; however, the council continued to exist and its rights and obligations outside of the lease were unaffected by the manager's appointment.

I am not aware, nor is my department, of any findings of a criminal nature against anyone involved in the Davenport community, arising from the appointment of a manager by the trust. I am not aware of any investigation conducted by a law firm instructed by the trust, nor is my department. I am not aware of any current police investigation into the disappearance of heavy vehicles and equipment, nor is my department.

In response to longstanding requests from the Davenport community for an alcohol dry zone in its public areas, I have progressed amendments to regulations under the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013 and a proclamation under the Public Intoxication Act 1984, which together will introduce a dry zone to Davenport community lands. The dry zone will commence on 15 November 2024.

The dry zone is an innovative, health-based response that will give police powers to remove alcohol from unauthorised drinkers, to refer problem drinkers to screening services for health and wellbeing support, and to take persons at risk of harm to a safer place.

It is anticipated that over time these measures will reduce the likelihood of people intoxicated by alcohol committing offences in the Davenport community. In addition, ongoing alcohol restrictions have applied in nearby Port Augusta (4kms away) since November 2022 and were reviewed and confirmed in December 2023.

The restrictions prohibit bottle shops opening before 11am, with customers limited to purchase the following quantities of liquor per person per day:

- Up to two 750ml of bottles of spirits or
- One 1 litre bottle of spirits or
- One two-litre cask of wine, with casks over two litres prohibited from sale or
- One 750ml bottle of fortified wine or port.

All licensees who sell takeaway liquor in Port Augusta, where the liquor restrictions apply, are required to use ID Scan. ID Scan alerts a licensee if a person has reached their daily purchase limits for that region, or if they reside in a community where alcohol is prohibited and therefore are not permitted to purchase takeaway alcohol. ID Scan helps licensees to comply with conditions around the sale of takeaway alcohol aimed at minimising the risk of alcohol-related harm and preventing the supply of liquor to dry communities.

South Australia Police report that antisocial behaviour has reduced which is demonstrated by a downturn in public drunkenness, property damage, domestic violence and assaults, since the restrictions were introduced in November 2022.

In relation to damage to Davenport common facilities, I wish to advise that when this came to my department's notice, my departmental officers appropriately contacted the trust, being the responsible entity to respond as the landowners of Davenport lands.

I understand that the trust reported the matter to South Australia Police who attended. Repairs to the damaged assets are the responsibility of the trust.

FORENSIC EVIDENCE

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (10 September 2024).

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

In South Australia, there is currently no backlog of kits awaiting examination as, due to the seriousness of the offence types, these are prioritised for analysis. There is a one month wait time for initial evidence recovery screening results of sexual assault kits. Should a matter progress, the current wait time for full analysis and DNA results for sexual assault matters not involving minors is approximately 12 months. The current wait time for sexual assault matters involving minors is approximately eight months.

No concerns have been raised with Forensic Science SA (FSSA) by South Australia Police or the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) regarding the current wait times.

FSSA continually looks for business improvements to ensure an efficient and effective DNA service is provided that adds value to the SA judicial system. FSSA has strong working relationships with SAPOL, the DPP and the State Coroner's Office and regularly seeks feedback as to whether their needs are being met with the service being provided.

FSSA has reviewed all 123 recommendations from the Queensland Commission of Inquiry and has implemented a number of changes where relevant.

The 2024-25 Mid-Year Budget Review also includes an additional \$3.8 million over four years in additional resourcing to support the work of FSSA.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (11 September 2024).

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

Public funds for medical care and medical research are spent on people with a specific medical condition or who fit strict research criteria.

MEDICAL TRAINING SURVEY

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (12 September 2024).

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

The SA MET Health Advisory Council (advisory council) has implemented several initiatives based on the findings of the inaugural Medical Training Survey (MTS).

These include:

- Additional Reporting Pathways: new channels for reporting harassment and discrimination have been established to address concerns raised in the survey.
- Preventing Bullying, Harassment, and Discrimination Guide: this guide has been developed and is now in use across local health networks (LHNs). It supports trainees, supervisors, and managers in addressing workplace culture issues and promoting best practice across a range of fields.

The advisory council's accreditation process plays a crucial role in these improvements. The SA MET unit conducts accreditation visits to LHNs every four years, during which TMOs can raise concerns. These visits help identify issues systematically, ensuring compliance with quality standards and enhancing the overall training environment.

The advisory council is responsible for reviewing and considering the current recommendations from the MTS. These recommendations have been integrated into the SA Medical Education and Training Strategic Plan 2021-26, which outlines strategic initiatives to address the challenges of medical education and training.

SA HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (12 September 2024).

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

The responsibility for selecting a provider for proton therapy in South Australia was that of SAHMRI and the Australian Bragg Centre for Proton Therapy and Research. SAHMRI is an independent entity and as such the government did not have oversight or obligations in regard to establishing contractual arrangements with ProTom as provider.

The Department of Treasury and Finance oversee the state government's financial and contractual arrangements with SAHMRI for this project.

HOUSING CRISIS

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (15 October 2024).

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

South Australia has the lowest recidivism rate in the nation, with housing a key factor in reducing reoffending and supporting prisoners' reintegration into the community.

The state government has increased investment to ensure more people have access to secure and affordable housing after their release from prison.

In instances where private accommodation is not available, access to public housing can be sourced, as well as housing through other external providers.

The Department for Correctional Services (DCS) works with partner agencies, such as SA Housing Trust, to ensure housing is appropriate.

At the 2024-25 state budget, the state government committed \$3.4 million to repurpose the former juvenile detention centre at Cavan, to deliver an initial 36 post-release beds to provide accommodation to prisoners who do not have access to stable housing for release.

There are also a number of 'alternative to custody' initiatives delivered through DCS partnerships including:

- Bail Accommodation Support Program/the Arches, that provides short-term accommodation as an alternative to being remanded in custody for people on bail;
- Catherine House, which has placements for women either on bail or post-release who require supported housing;
- and Lemongrass Place, a residential facility in Port Augusta for Aboriginal men from remote areas to transition from custody to Country.

FOSSIL FUEL INVESTMENT

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (15 October 2024).

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

1. ANZ was selected as the whole-of-government banking provider following a competitive tender process and has been appointed for an initial contract term of five years with an option to further extend that contract period for a total term of up to 10 years. Any matters relating to the contract between ANZ and the state government are addressed through existing contract management processes. The state government is developing sustainable procurement requirements and guidance, including guidance for government agencies to support greater emissions reduction and adaptation outcomes.

2. Public authorities implement individual internal procurement frameworks which align the SA government procurement framework with the context of each agency's functions. Procurement SA provides guidance to public authorities about how to manage their internal procurement processes including supply chain and whole-of-life outcomes. This guidance includes information about:

- green procurement
- economic and social procurement
- making informed decisions about the whole-of-life value of procurements
- engaging with specialist advisors to target high priority outcomes from procurements
- developing procurement specifications that target high priority outcomes.

VICTIMS OF CRIME

In reply to **the Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO** (16 October 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): I am advised that Mr Egberts and Ms Wells were not expressly told that they were not able to make a request to intervene.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COURTS

In reply to **the Hon. D.G.E. HOOD** (16 October 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Family Violence Court is a specialist court in the South Australian Magistrates Court which has been operating over the last 20 years. The court hears criminal matters connected with domestic and family violence and abuse as well as the issuing of intervention orders. Family Violence Courts operate at the Adelaide, Port Adelaide, Elizabeth, Christies Beach, Murray Bridge, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta and Whyalla Magistrates Courts. The court has dedicated family violence magistrates and prosecutors who oversee the list.

Police Issued Interim Intervention Orders (PIIO's) have prioritised court hearings over non-DV matters whereby after the issuing of an interim intervention order by the police officer or court, the respondent will be required to appear in court within eight days. Where there is no PIIO in place, new applications for an intervention order are listed for preliminary hearing before a magistrate as soon as practicable.

WORK-FROM-HOME ARRANGEMENTS

In reply to **the Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO** (17 October 2024).

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

The Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment does not have data on the number of formal work-from-home agreements between an agency and employee that allows for more time working from home than in the workplace.

The South Australian public sector offers a range of flexible working options to its employees under enterprise agreements or awards. The availability of hybrid working arrangements is a matter determined by individual agencies based on their operational needs.

Remote work is not possible for most public sector employees as they work from dedicated sites to deliver essential services to the community.

The Commissioner for Public Sector Employment issued a whole-of-government email in May 2022 requesting all employees who have not resumed their pre-COVID working arrangements to do so as a priority.

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS

In reply to **the Hon. D.G.E. HOOD** (29 October 2024).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): As previously announced, the public child sex offender register has been funded as part of the Digital Police Station initiative in the 2024-25 state budget.

The design and implementation of the Digital Police Station is currently being undertaken by the South Australia Police (SAPOL). I understand that there are a number of different tranches to the project owing to the complexity.

The commencement of the legislation and the availability of the public register will therefore be dependent on the timelines for the project as advised by the SAPOL project team, and the Attorney-General's Department will continue to liaise closely with SAPOL in relation to these project timelines.

MEMBERS, CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (31 October 2024).

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

There are clear instructions and appropriate policies in place for ministers and public servants in relation to the declaration, and disclosure of gifts.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (12 November 2024).

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

Four claims for injuries sustained whilst working from home in the 2023-24 financial year have been accepted to date.

Commissioner's Determination 8—Working Flexibly requires public sector agencies to ensure all working from home agreements with employees have a review date and that the agreement identifies and addresses work health and safety issues.

WHALERS WAY ORBITAL LAUNCH COMPLEX

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (12 November 2024).

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

1. The Whalers Way Orbital Launch Complex project was approved by the Minister for Planning having carefully considered the relevant environmental, economic and social factors.

2. The amount of water used for each launch will depend on the size of the rocket, with the largest rockets using up to 50,000 litres (noting that most of this water would be recaptured).

Water demand would be met by a variety of ways, including trucking water to the site, use of available bore water on site and the collection of rainfall run-off.

3. The SA Water network does not extend to the site, so the mains water supply sourced from the Uley Basin, or the River Murray would not directly service the facility.

CRIMINAL DETAINEES

In reply to **the Hon. L.A. HENDERSON** (13 November 2024).

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

1. There are a total of 11 released detainees in South Australia in both correctional and community settings.

2. South Australia Police (SAPOL) manage released detainees in accordance with state legislation. Where a breach of the Migration Act 1958 (Cth) (the act) is disclosed, SAPOL's Public Protection Branch (PPB) will refer such matters to the Australian Federal Police (AFP). AFP is the responsible agency for prosecuting breaches of the act. SAPOL (PPB) is the single point of contact for commonwealth agencies (Australian Border Force/AFP) and maintains ongoing liaison with the agencies as it pertains to released detainees residing in South Australia.

3. The commonwealth parliament passed the Migration Amendment Bill 2024 (Cth) on 28 November 2024 which provides, among other measures, for enhanced monitoring of released detainees.

MAST 2024 CONFERENCE

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (27 November 2024).

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

1. Adelaide secured the hosting rights for the international maritime, air and space technologies defence event through a Business Events Adelaide (BEA) support package. The BEA support package is commercial in confidence. Funding is offered to business events that meet strict criteria and reconciliation is completed after the business event and is performance-based.

2. Hosting MAST in our region for the first time represented an opportunity to bring together policy makers, senior defence officials, industry leaders and the R&D community to discuss global defence policy, operations, and future technologies in the nation's defence state.

a. South Australian defence organisations participated on the defence state stand in addition to the Defence Teaming Centre and Industry Capability Network (SA) to promote South Australia's capabilities to a global audience, facilitate meetings and support media announcements during the event.

b. The South Australian government through Invest SA and Defence SA hosted three visiting delegations from the United States and United Kingdom. Programs for these international visitors included networking events, targeted B2B sessions, meeting with key defence and space sector stakeholders and facility tours.

c. The South Australian government formed several new business connections over the course of the event and had the opportunity to host defence sector visitors on walking tours of key precincts such as Lot Fourteen and the Defence and Space Landing Pad prior to their departure from the state.