

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 29 April 2025

**The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

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

### *Bills*

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (TOBACCO AND E-CIGARETTE PRODUCTS—CLOSURE ORDERS AND OFFENCES) BILL**

### *Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

### *Condolence*

#### **LEGGETT, MR S.R.**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:18):** By leave, I move:

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

I rise today on behalf of the government to commemorate the life of Mr Stewart Leggett, the former member for Hanson, and to offer our sincere condolences to his family upon his recent passing. Born in Bordertown in 1944, Stewart's early years were marked by resilience. After a car accident forced him to leave school early, he completed his education through night classes while working in retail. His determination laid the foundation for a life dedicated to service and leadership.

His career in education began at Pulteney Grammar School, where he served as director of drama. Later, he became deputy headmaster and pastor of Temple Christian College, and eventually head of the Aldinga campus of the Southern Vales Christian College. Stewart's passion for nurturing young minds was evident in every role that he undertook.

Stewart's commitment to public service then extended to politics. As the Liberal member for Hanson from 1993 to 1997, he served on committees addressing social development, family and community services, and tourism. His advocacy was guided by a deep sense of moral responsibility and a desire to uphold his values. Beyond his political achievements, Stewart will be remembered for his warmth, humility and genuine care for others.

Even after Stewart's retirement he remained active in the community. Stewart served as a Justice of the Peace, contributed to the Legal Practitioners Conduct Board, worked with SAPOL on delivering drivers' safety programs in schools and hosted a radio show on 90.1 Happy FM, Victor Harbor. His unwavering commitment to service continued to inspire those around him. On behalf of the government, I extend our deepest condolences to his wife, Jackie, daughter, Sarah, and grandchildren, Ellen and Sam.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** Today, I rise on behalf of the opposition to honour and pay tribute to the life and extraordinary legacy of Stewart Leggett, former Liberal member for Hanson, who served in this state's House of Assembly from 1993 to 1997. Stewart was a man who gave of himself with humility, with faith, with courage and compassion throughout both his career and life, to his students, his community and to the people of South Australia.

Stewart Leggett was born in Bordertown on 18 December 1944, during a time of great global turmoil. Yet from his earliest days he exhibited a spirit of optimism and determination that would

characterise his life's journey. Despite suffering a serious accident that ended his formal schooling during year 10, Stewart's commitment to education never faltered. Through night school he completed his senior studies and embarked on a distinguished teaching career. He taught at Pulteney Grammar and Temple College, rising to the role of vice principal, and later served as principal of the Southern Vales Christian College at Aldinga.

In each role, Stewart brought passion, humour and an unrelenting dedication to the betterment of young lives under his stewardship. His commitment to service extended well beyond the classroom. In 1993, Stewart was elected as the member for Hanson. His election was a source of immense pride for his family and community, and in parliament Stewart was known for his integrity, his compassion and his strength of conviction.

During his time in the House of Assembly he served on the Social Development Committee, dedicating himself to critical issues such as family support, community welfare and the reform of the prison system. Stewart spoke with particular conviction about the need to address drug use and sexual violence within prisons, and not out of political convenience but out of a deep moral responsibility. This was Stewart Leggett, a man guided by principle rather than popularity.

Stewart was also known for the friendships he fostered across political divides. He believed politics should be a contest of ideas, not enmity. He treated his opponents with respect and humanity, building enduring relationships, including with colleagues Joe Scalzi and Mick Atkinson. These friendships endured long after his time in political office. Stewart's Christian faith remained his guiding light throughout his life. Even when he presented a minority report on sensitive matters, he did so without compromising his principles, striving always to contribute to a society grounded in dignity, fairness and compassion.

Following his parliamentary service, Stewart, as was ever his mission, continued to serve his community. He worked as a senior adviser to the Premier and Deputy Premier of South Australia, returned to education as a principal and sat on the Legal Practitioners Conduct Board, advocating for accountability and ethical leadership in public life.

Beyond his professional contributions, Stewart was a man of many talents. In his youth he was an accomplished footballer and tennis player, captaining and coaching the North Adelaide Centrals to a premiership in 1967. He was also a gifted communicator and performer, acting in productions such *Oliver!* and *Noah's Flood* and appearing in South Australian Film Corporation productions. Later, he became a much-loved voice on Victor Harbor's 90.1 FM, sharing stories and conversations with sporting legends and community heroes alike.

Yet above all, Stewart's greatest pride and joy was his family. He was a devoted husband, father and grandfather. His love for his children and his family, and indeed his grandchildren, was palpable, and he spoke often and fondly, particularly, of his grandchildren, Ellen and Sam. Even in his final years, as illness took its toll, Stewart lived with grace, humour and spirit.

Stewart Leggett's life was a rich tapestry of service, of faith, of family and of community. He was a teacher, a preacher, a politician, a performer, a sportsman, a husband, a father, a grandfather and, above all, a man of deep heart and unwavering spirit.

On behalf of the Liberal Party and the opposition in the Legislative Council, I extend our deepest sympathies to Stewart's beloved wife, Jackie, his daughter, Sarah, his grandchildren, Ellen and Sam, and his close friends. His contribution to South Australia as an educator, as a member of parliament and as a community leader will endure. Stuart touched countless lives, and his legacy will live on. May he rest in peace. Vale Stewart Leggett.

**The PRESIDENT:** I ask honourable members to stand in their places and carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*Sitting suspended from 14:26 to 14:34.*

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

*Parliamentary Committees***SELECT COMMITTEE ON 2022-23 RIVER MURRAY FLOOD EVENT**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34):** I lay upon the table the report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:35):** I lay upon the table the report of the committee on its inquiry into the Potential for a Human Rights Act for South Australia.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Aboriginal Lands Trust—Report, 2023-24

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

Regulations under Acts—

Summary Offences Act 1953—Knives and Other Weapons

Rules of Court—

District Court Act 1991—

Joint Criminal—No 6

Joint Criminal—No 7

Uniform Special Statutory—No 5

Uniform Special Statutory—No 6

Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993—

Joint Criminal—No 6

Joint Criminal—No 7

Uniform Special Statutory—No 5

Uniform Special Statutory—No 6

Magistrates Court Act 1991—

Joint Criminal—No 6

Joint Criminal—No 7

Uniform Special Statutory—No 5

Uniform Special Statutory—No 6

Supreme Court Act 1935—

Joint Criminal—No 6

Joint Criminal—No 7

Uniform Special Statutory—No 5

Uniform Special Statutory—No 6

Youth Court Act 1993—

Joint Criminal—No 6

Joint Criminal—No 7

Uniform Special Statutory—No 5

Uniform Special Statutory—No 6

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

By Laws under Acts—

City of Tea Tree Gully—No. 7—Cats

Regulations under Acts—

Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Section 82A Demerit Points

Road Traffic Act 1961—

Miscellaneous—Breakdown Services Vehicles

Road Rules—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions—School Days

South Australian Government Response to the recommendations by the Natural

Resources Committee's Inquiry into the Environmental,

Social and Governance in Primary Production

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

South Australian Forestry Corporation Charter

#### *Question Time*

#### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in this place, regarding broken election promises.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** The Australian Medical Association's 2025 Ambulance Ramping Report Card revealed that the total number of hours ramped outside South Australian hospitals has almost tripled under Labor, rising from 15,329 hours ramped in 2019-20 under the former Liberal government to 45,399 under the now Malinauskas Labor government. My question to the Leader of the Government is: will the Malinauskas Labor government fix ramping and, if so, when?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:42):** I appreciate that the honourable member still has difficulty understanding what ministerial responsibility is for in this place—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** —but I do note that times for different codes in terms of taking people to hospital have come significantly down.

**The PRESIDENT:** Attorney, I couldn't hear the answer to—

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** I have given an answer, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition and the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition, come to order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition, your second question.

#### **METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42):** Let's hope he answers this one, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** Just ask your question.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on wage theft.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** At least 50 firefighters in South Australia are owed unpaid travel allowances from 1 August last year, and a recent decision of the SA Employment Tribunal means that the MFS has 28 days to pay up, including interest on the late payments. My questions to the Attorney-General in his role as Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Service are:

1. When did the minister first become aware of this issue?
2. Why didn't the minister step in earlier to address what has been described as one of the worst cases in South Australian public sector history, instead letting it go all the way through to the already clogged courts and costing taxpayers legal fees, which could have been avoided?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:43):** I thank the honourable member for her question. In relation to an allowance—I think it was a travel allowance for firefighters, which is one of many allowances that firefighters but also other members of the public sector are entitled to—my advice is that there was an inadvertent administrative error that saw allowances that had previously been paid not being paid.

As I am advised, once the MFS became aware of it, they put in motion steps to rectify it. I am advised it was in the order of some thousands—maybe between 6,000 and 12,000—of individual instances that had already been paid by the MFS after the MFS became aware of the instance. I am advised that it is under 1,000—in some hundreds—individual instances of travel allowance that are still to be paid and that the MFS is committed to doing so.

#### **METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:44):** Supplementary: when did the Minister for Industrial Relations first become aware of the issue?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:44):** I don't have an exact time. Certainly in recent months I became aware and was advised that the MFS had taken steps to rectify this problem and it was in the process of repaying almost all of those that had been outstanding due to that administrative error.

#### **METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:45):** Supplementary: how much is still owed and how many employees are still owed these paid amounts?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:45):** I thank the honourable member for her question. I will take it away and double-check. The minister responsible for the MFS, I am sure, has exact updates, but there were some hundreds. As of a few weeks ago, when I think I was last informed, it was some tens of thousands of dollars in total for a few hundred people, but if that is wrong from a few months ago and there is a better update I am happy to go away and bring back the member an answer. I suspect that, if she asks a further supplementary of the Hon. Emily Bourke, she may have an exact figure.

#### **METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:46):** Supplementary: was this error made due to understaffing and unfilled public sector places' workforce deficiencies in that way?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:46):** With further and better information, I am advised that all of the outstanding payments have been processed and are expected to be paid in the next pay cycle. In relation to the error, I am happy to go and double-check, but my understanding is that there was an employee who was responsible for the processing of these who had moved into another position and it was the fact that, essentially, the corporate knowledge and ability to do that may not have been transferred as it should have been. If that is not the case, I am happy to bring back a response.

**METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:47):** I seek leave to provide a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services regarding the delayed payments for the MFS firefighters.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** On 17 April this year, the South Australian Employment Tribunal ordered the MFS to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of unpaid travel allowances it owes MFS firefighters dating back nearly nine months. It was revealed that, despite thousands of outstanding claims, the government only dedicates an average of 12 hours per week of labour to paying allowances and that binding instructions prevent more staff from being hired to assist the process. The MFS has been given 28 days to repay with interest.

The United Firefighters Union criticised the Malinauskas Labor government for understaffing critical government departments and failing to pass wage theft laws even after raising the issue directly with the minister. My questions to the Minister for Emergency Services are:

1. How much does the MFS owe South Australian firefighters and how much interest has it been ordered to pay?
2. When will the government fulfil its election commitment to pass wage theft laws?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:48):** I thank the member for her question. As has been highlighted, this was not a case of wage theft because wage theft is typically understood as the intention of underpayment of a worker and their entitlements, for example, if they were doing this deliberately.

Steps were taken the second this was discovered, as I am advised, and processes were put in place to ensure this could be rectified. I know the MFS has been working tirelessly with the union to ensure that communication could be made to members at each step of the way. As we heard just before from the Attorney-General, all payments are now with Shared Services, so there are zero payments now outstanding as far as I am advised. As has been highlighted through the SAET orders, it is a 7 per cent interest rate per annum.

**METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:49):** Supplementary: is the minister heartened to hear that the Liberal opposition now believes in wage theft and wants to see action on wage theft?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:49):** It's a surprising finding.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. N.J. Centofanti:** Supplementary question, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** I am not sure the previous question was a supplementary, but anyhow, we will try this one. The honourable Leader of the Opposition, you have a supplementary question.

**METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:50):** Will the government commit to permanently employing more staff to manage out-of-pocket expenses to prevent similar issues in the future?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Attorney-General.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** I'm trying to help.

**The PRESIDENT:** Attorney. Thanks. I will give you a shout when I need a hand. No supplementary. We will go now to the Hon. Mr Ngo.

#### **YADU HEALTH ABORIGINAL CORPORATION**

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister tell the council about his recent attendance at the official sod turning event for the new Yadu Health clinic?

**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 his question. I know the honourable member has a keen interest and in fact has visited many remote Aboriginal communities throughout South Australia in his time as a member of this chamber.

It was a distinct privilege recently to attend the official sod turning ceremony for the new Yadu Health clinic, the Aboriginal health clinic in Ceduna, a milestone that marks a significant step forward for health care on the Far West Coast. For decades, Yadu Health has been a lifeline providing essential services to the Aboriginal community, even as it operated out of a building that was plagued by water damage, black mould, asbestos and serious safety hazards, including electrocution risks. The clinic was widely acknowledged as a ticking time bomb and an accident waiting to happen, and its demolition in January of 2024 was long overdue, although the journey to this point has taken some time.

In 2022, after listening to communities' concerns, both the then South Australian Labor state opposition and the then Labor federal opposition announced a commitment to delivering new funding needed to rebuild a purpose built Aboriginal health clinic. It was a commitment of around \$16 million between state and federal Labor oppositions that has now seen the planning and the development and now the sod turning for this new clinic.

I distinctly remember at the time this was announced, before the last state election, the then minister who had responsibility, although not the title, for Aboriginal affairs, the former member for Dunstan, described the commitment of two and a half million dollars from the state government towards this as extremely concerning for South Australian taxpayers. Having visited Yadu Health clinic a number of times, the conditions for the people who work there but more importantly the Aboriginal people who went there for help were exceptionally concerning.

There were reports of people plugging mobile phones in after rains and being electrocuted. There was asbestos throughout the building; as I said earlier, black mould; and water damage. To expect some of the most disadvantaged marginalised South Australians, the Aboriginal community on the Far West Coast, to put up with that standard of health care I think should be even more concerning to most people.

The building that housed Yadu Health, apart from being completely unfit for purpose, was also the old Department for Community Welfare building in Ceduna, the place where in decades gone by Aboriginal mothers took their children, often to never see them again. So for a whole range of reasons it was not an appropriate building to provide health care to anyone.

With the sod turning we will see a new purpose built Yadu Health clinic. It is a great example of a collaboration between state and federal Labor benefiting a local community. It was a privilege and an honour at the sod turning to be in the presence of some remarkable trailblazers for Aboriginal health on the West Coast.

Previously known as the Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service, it included Aunty Colleen Prideaux, who was the first Aboriginal CEO for the Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service and also the first Aboriginal CEO employed at any Aboriginal community health organisation in the state; Uncle Peter Miller, who from the shearing shed to the boardroom was the first chairperson of the Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service; and Aunties Gwen and Mavis Miller, both Aboriginal health workers who joined the health service in the 1970s along with Aunty Colleen and Uncle Peter.

I would like to thank all of those and everyone else who over the decades have done so much for the service of better Aboriginal health care for the Aboriginal people of the West Coast. Aboriginal people deserve infrastructure that is not only safe but functional and culturally appropriate and that is what this commitment represents.

### NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENTS

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:54):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of non-disclosure agreements in sexual harassment and discrimination cases to the Attorney-General, who is, of course, also the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** In many matters regarding workplace sexual harassment and discrimination there is a settlement that involves a non-disclosure agreement preventing workers from speaking about their experience. Experts in the field have suggested that such NDAs are harmful and counterproductive as they silence the victims and do not fix the core issue. Seventy-five per cent of legal professionals have never reached a sexual harassment settlement without strict NDAs and 59 per cent of people who are sexually harassed at work said their harasser had targeted others. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the government commit to restricting the use of blanket NDAs for sexual harassment and discrimination settlements?
2. Will the minister provide a report on the prevalence of their use in our public sector to this council?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:56):** I thank the honourable member for her question. It is an important issue. I have received various representations and have had meetings with advocates for a regime to restrict the use of non-disclosure agreements. It is something we are happy to have a look at. I don't think there's a jurisdiction yet that has legislated or regulated their use. I think Victoria has committed to do so, but I am not aware of another jurisdiction in Australia doing that. As I have told advocates, it is something we are happy to investigate and look at in South Australia.

This is not an easy area of public policy. We want to do things that encourage settlement of resolutions, particularly in a way that the victim survivor wishes it to happen. If that involves early contrition and early admission of acts, that is something we want to encourage. We don't want to do something that has an adverse impact on victim survivors who want a particular outcome, but we certainly don't want something that could lead to a perpetrator not being known to their workplace or a perpetrator not being known to a future workplace and then committing the same acts again. It is something we have committed to have a look at in South Australia.

In relation to the question about figures in the public sector, I am not sure it will be readily available across all elements of the public sector, but I am happy to ask if it is.

### NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENTS

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:57):** Supplementary: is the minister aware that victim survivors are often harmed by these blanket NDAs rather than more nuanced approaches?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:57):** I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. That is certainly something that people who have been advocates for reform have informed us of.

### DISTRICT POLICING MODEL

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:58):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Police, about reviewing the current policing model.

Leave granted.



**The Hon. J.S. LEE:** On 24 April 2025, *The Advertiser* reported that police commissioner Grant Stevens has made plans for an independent review of the District Policing Model. In a short video posted on the SA Police intranet, the police commissioner stated that it is time to do things differently and 'as I have said publicly, without an injection of resources to keep up with our ever-increasing demand,' the District Policing Model will not deliver what it was designed to do and 'we must think about its future'. Mr Stevens said that SAPOL are currently searching for a suitably qualified individual with the appropriate background and experience required to undertake the review. My questions to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Police, are:

1. What is the government's response to the police commissioner's plan to review the current policing model?
2. What specific concerns have been raised already to the government about the current policing model that the government has not addressed so far?
3. Why is the commissioner leading this independent inquiry and not the minister's office?
4. How will the minister ensure that the review process is transparent and that its findings are communicated to the public?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:59):** I thank the honourable member for her questions. I will pass them on to the minister responsible in another place and bring back a reply.

#### **METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services on the topic of MFS payroll payments and in reference to questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition in this place. Can the minister advise if there are any other current issues relating to incorrect payments of both payroll and allowances currently in play within the MFS?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:00):** As has been stated, there are zero payments that I am advised are outstanding from travel allowance. I have not been advised of any others, as far as I am aware.

#### **DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

**The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister speak to the chamber about the state government's \$73 million drought support package announced earlier this month?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00):** I thank the honourable member for her question. As I mention regularly in this place, agriculture is a vital part of our state's economy and the importance of farmers to regional communities and to our state as a whole cannot be underestimated. Primary producers in South Australia are currently facing extreme challenges with one of the worst production seasons in many years, as drought conditions combine with other compounding issues such as frost, biosecurity outbreaks and market declines or disruptions.

When the Premier and I announced the state government's \$18 million drought support package in November last year, we committed to monitoring conditions and to tailoring future support as necessary. Unfortunately, of course, drought conditions have not abated. Since last year, the government has worked closely with primary producers, industry and the communities affected by drought to ensure drought support measures are carefully and thoughtfully designed to target those most in need.

Since last year, the government has hosted seven regional round tables across the state to engage directly with farmers in their own regions. The Drought Advisory Group, comprising representatives from key industry bodies, has met 10 times. We have hosted a drought finance forum

with major banks and a drought forum for regional councils, and the government held an emergency management cabinet committee meeting about drought. The Premier hosted a drought round table with industry and farmers, and the Premier and I have met with farmers on-farm at multiple locations.

Our engagement with stakeholders, industry, farmers and regional community representatives culminated in the additional \$55 million announced in drought support on 8 April at the property of farmer John Lush. Our additional support brings state government drought funding to over \$73 million. The package is wideranging and comprehensive and comprises the following measures:

- \$18 million for on-farm drought infrastructure grants for rebates that assist with projects to manage drought conditions as well as strengthen drought preparedness;
- \$6 million to assist charities with freight costs to transport donated fodder to assist farmers with feeding livestock;
- immediate financial relief by providing rebates for emergency services levy and commercial vehicle registration fees for primary producers receiving the commonwealth's Farm Household Allowance;
- \$3.5 million for an immediate and comprehensive strategy to boost mental health and resilience in drought-affected areas;
- \$1 million additional for rural financial counselling support;
- \$3.5 million in additional support for rural small businesses;
- \$3.1 million to assist with pest management;
- \$4.5 million to support producers with the implementation of electronic identification (eID) for sheep and farmed goats;
- \$1.4 million to co-invest with councils in the upgrade of regional standpipes;
- \$1.1 million to support the provision of standpipes for critical water needs in the Adelaide Hills and Fleurieu;
- \$500,000 to make bulk water available from Bundaleer and Beetaloo reserves;
- \$2 million to assist sport and recreation clubs in drought-affected areas through the Active Club Program;
- \$400,000 to develop and encourage new regional events in drought-affected areas through the Regional Event Fund;
- \$250,000 to provide financial support for country students affected by drought to attend such things as camps and excursions; and
- \$500,000 for grants of up to \$5,000 each for the Connecting Communities Events Program for groups to host events that foster social connections and provide support.

The commonwealth government and the state government also partner in the Future Drought Fund, to which we have committed a further \$17.4 million in funding over four years.

The Future Drought Fund is an incredibly important initiative, providing funding for drought preparedness and resilience programs, including the development of regional drought resilience programs in partnership with RDAs and the Farm Business Resilience Program. The commonwealth government of course also provides support through the Farm Household Allowance, the Farm Management Deposit Scheme, low interest loans through the Regional Investment Corporation, income tax averaging and other primary producer concessions.

This government values our farmers, who feed our state, our country and the world. I am glad to show the government's support of our primary producers during these challenging times through this comprehensive support package.

**DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:05):** Supplementary: what transparency measures are in place to track the rollout and effectiveness of the \$55 million package, and will the minister commit to regular public reporting on how much money is actually flowing to farmers and when?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:05):** Our focus is getting the money flowing to farmers as soon as possible. We have vastly increased the number of staff who are processing the on-farm infrastructure grants, and the other mechanisms that will be helping farmers will be rolled out as swiftly as is possible.

**DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:06):** Supplementary: will the minister ensure that transparency measures are in place to track the rollout and effectiveness of the \$55 million package?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:06):** What we won't be doing is adding more red tape, which is what the member seems to be suggesting. What we want to do is focus on getting that assistance out to farmers, making sure that the assistance is rolled out as swiftly as is possible, and obviously the usual reporting measures will occur.

**IMMIGRATION POLICY**

**The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:07):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy, regarding the state's skilled migration program.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.L. GAME:** Data shows that South Australia has the highest rate of underutilised skilled migrants in the nation. The government recently announced a new \$1.5 million program to unlock the full potential of these skilled migrants who come to our state. The program was informed by a government-commissioned report by Deloitte titled 'Maximising the Value of the South Australian Migrant Community'. Electricians are among those skilled migrants coming to South Australia through our state-sponsored, taxpayer-funded migration program.

South Australia-based migration experts have informed my office that bridging courses, which upskill these migrant electricians to meet South Australian standards, are currently not available, meaning they cannot work in their chosen field. In this chamber, on 19 March this year, I asked the government what tracking or data it has that shows the outcomes and benefits of this state-sponsored migration program, including ensuring that skilled migrants are actually doing the jobs they are trained for.

Under current South Australian and federal laws, there is nothing requiring skilled migrants to work in their trained profession when they come to our state under the state nomination program, or to remain living or working in South Australia. My questions to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy, are:

1. Why is the government sponsoring migrants to come here as electricians if they can't actually work here as electricians due to the state's failure to provide courses to upskill them to meet South Australian requirements?
2. How many electricians has the government sponsored each year for the past five years through the state-sponsored skilled migration program, and when was the last time the state actually provided courses to upskill migrant electricians to meet South Australian requirements?
3. Does the government acknowledge that it has helped create the problem of underutilisation of skilled migrants by encouraging them to work in unskilled jobs to qualify for state sponsorship, and by failing to provide adequate training for others to meet local standards and subsequently work in their chosen field?

4. Given that government policy helped create the problem Deloitte was commissioned to explore, can the government tell taxpayers how much they paid for Deloitte's report?

5. If the government is serious about tackling the state's skills shortages and housing crisis, and in view of its ambition to build more homes, does it agree that having skilled tradespeople working in the roles they are trained for would deliver better value for taxpayer money and be a more desirable outcome?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:09):** I thank the honourable member for her question about the importance of migration, and I will be happy to pass that on to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

#### **METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:09):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services on the topic of wage theft. Can the minister explain why the MFS failed to pay travel allowances on time, and what measures are being implemented to ensure that such issues do not re-occur where resources are wasted, financially and time, including in the court system?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Attorney-General!

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:10):** I thank the honourable member for her question and interest in wage theft. As has been highlighted, this is not wage left—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** No; her interest all of a sudden in wage theft, if you want to listen to the answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Attorney!

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I've got a cold, I'm sorry, Nicola. This is not a case of wage theft, as has been highlighted. This was not a deliberate underpayment. This was a process that was followed; unfortunately, as we have heard, it was an administrative error and was rectified as quickly as possible. As I have already highlighted, there are zero travel payments outstanding. They have been provided to Shared Services to process within the next payment cycle.

Throughout this process there have been constant conversations with the union. There have been conversations with the MFS, and everyone has ensured that this process be rectified as quickly as possible. It is also important to note that at no point did the MFS oppose the orders that were provided by SAET, and I advise they are in line with the offers the MFS made to resolve the proceedings before even entering the SAET proceedings.

#### **METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:12):** Supplementary: what is the government doing to ensure the administrative error does not occur again?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:12):** We have worked closely with the MFS to ensure that they have appropriate people in place to now manage and look through how this is undertaken. As we have heard before, it was an administrative error from a program that was being used. We now have additional resources in place to be able to provide that support.

**METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:12):** A further supplementary: how many additional appropriate people are now in place?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:12):** The appropriate amount.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! No; sit down.

**REGIONAL DROUGHT RELIEF ROUND**

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:13):** My question is to the Minister for Sports, Recreation and Racing—and colds. Will the minister inform the council about support the Malinauskas government is providing to sport and recreation clubs in drought-affected areas?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:13):** The appropriate amount! I thank the honourable member for his question and interest about active club programs. The Regional Drought Relief Round is designed to support regional communities doing it tough due to ongoing drought conditions.

On 8 April 2025, the Malinauskas government announced a \$55 million support package to assist drought-affected farmers and communities across South Australia. As part of this broader commitment, \$2 million has been allocated to sport and recreation hubs and clubs through an additional round of the Active Club Program.

In the lead-up to this announcement I visited the Adelaide Plains and Mount Gambier, and heard first-hand of the need for urgent support to maintain vital community sporting facilities. The regional drought relief fund is a one-off funding boost for 2024-25, aimed at delivering urgent support where it is needed most. This round is specifically targeting sport and active recreation clubs across regional South Australia, which are feeling the strain of prolonged dry conditions.

The impact of this drought is widespread, from the Adelaide Hills and Adelaide Plains to the Mid North and Flinders Ranges, across the Riverland, Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula and through to the South-East and Kangaroo Island. In these regional communities, sport is more than just a weekend game; it is the social glue that holds towns together. It gives people purpose, families a moment of respite and brings entire main streets to life. We also recognise the critical role sports play in supporting mental health and wellbeing.

Through this program, eligible clubs can apply for grants up to \$5,000, depending on the size of the club. The funding can support practical, drought-resilient upgrades, including rainwater tanks, irrigation improvements, energy efficiency measures and utility cost relief. In a first, it can also be used to purchase white goods like fridges and ovens, helping clubs to continue to host post-match meals and community events. This round can also fund uniforms, protective equipment and technology that helps clubs stay safe, inclusive and functional.

I strongly encourage clubs to spend their grants locally, whether it's at the local irrigation supplier, electrical store or hardware shop, so that the benefits of this funding extend beyond the club and help support local businesses in keeping the money circulating within the community.

Applications are now open, and they close at midday on Wednesday 28 May 2025. Full details, including the list of eligible councils, are available on the website. I strongly encourage every club in these areas to apply. This is an investment in our communities. When a local club thrives, so do our local main streets. We know that when farmers are spending less money in their main streets, local businesses often have less capacity to sponsor their local sporting clubs. That is why we are stepping in as a government to help keep the heart of our local communities' sporting clubs beating. I thank all the clubs that have provided advice and have already applied.

### SPORTS VOUCHER SCHEME

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:16):** Supplementary: does the minister acknowledge that the Sports Voucher scheme beyond year 9 will greater assist students and families in regional areas in participating in sporting activities? Are there any plans to further expand eligibility for that program from the fund or elsewhere?

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, you can answer the question; it was a legitimately well-intentioned question, but it really wasn't a supplementary question.

**The Hon. C. Bonaros:** It's a fund, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** There was the word 'fund' in both answers, but—minister, you are on your feet.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:17):** Because the honourable member likes fun. This is, as she has pointed out, a very popular program. The Sports Voucher program is one that has grown over the years and one that we have just doubled recently to being two \$100 vouchers that can be made available per year. We are always willing to look at how we can further expand this program if it is wanted so much in the community.

### SPORTS VOUCHER SCHEME

**The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:18):** Supplementary: what is the processing time of these sporting grants, and when can applicants expect a reply?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:18):** Processing is within 30 days.

### ACCOMMODATION FOR WOMEN

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:18):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services—the minister herself and/or the Minister for Housing Infrastructure—a question regarding accommodation for women who have left prison or are granted bail.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Data released late last year by the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that South Australia has the highest percentage of unsentenced female prisoners of any jurisdiction, with more than 60 per cent of its female population awaiting trial on remand. Since then, the Department for Correctional Services has released its Women's Framework and Action Plan 2025-30, subheaded as Community Pathways: Women's Strategies for Reducing Reoffending, wherein the state government lists 'Reduce the incarceration of women, particularly on remand' under its stated goals.

The Law Society calls attention to this issue within the organisation's latest *Bulletin* release, pointing to the state's chronic shortage of bail accommodation for women, particularly Indigenous women. Whilst the publication credits the state government with its support of Seeds of Affinity, a not-for-profit community organisation run by and for women with lived prison experience, it notes the need for additional funding to ensure Seeds' newly acquired 15-room premises is able to fulfil its purpose of housing women in crisis.

Until such funding is provided, the meagre four beds available at Catherine House, as welcome and necessary and appreciated as they are, are the only such accommodation for women released on bail. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister provide an update on what, if any, initiatives the state government is taking to address a shortfall affecting female recidivism rates in this jurisdiction?

2. Is the government committed to additional funding for Seeds of Affinity or any other organisation committed to providing transitional housing as a means of providing relief to female prisoners remanded in custody due to a lack of accommodation options?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:20):** I thank the member for her question. Work Ready, Release Ready is a program that the government has invested in heavily. It is a program that starts, as I understand it, when people are transitioning out of prison. It is not a matter of once you leave prison, then you get access to this program. My understanding is that this steps in months, if not almost a year, prior to someone exiting the prison system, to make sure that they can start that work in getting someone ready to be in the community

That can be a process of helping with CVs, getting them an understanding of what the interview process might look like and also to be thinking about what job opportunities are available to them. Work Ready, Release Ready is a fantastic program that the government has invested in heavily, and that is why we do see in South Australia the lowest reoffending rate, something that is a quite significant outcome.

That has come about because of the investments that came through the 10by20 strategy that was undertaken by the now Premier, but also now we have increased that to the 20by26 strategy in reducing reoffending in South Australia. You have mentioned Catherine House as a possibility for supported accommodation. OARS is also a great organisation that provides support for people exiting our prison system and the supports that are available to them in the community. I look forward to having further conversations with other organisations like Seeds.

#### ACCOMMODATION FOR WOMEN

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:22):** Supplementary: does the minister acknowledge that women who are on remand and awaiting trial probably are not eligible for programs such as Work Ready, which would only apply to those who have already been incarcerated, sentenced, as opposed to being held on remand, because there are no places for them to go to?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:22):** I am happy to provide further information. I also believe OARS can provide support at this point, but I am happy to clarify that if incorrect.

#### YOUTH CRIME

**The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:22):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding the government's failure to control serious youth crime.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B.R. HOOD:** Despite the government's announcement of their so-called youth offender plan, youth crime is spiralling out of control. In just nine months, 1,745 charges have been laid for breaches of bail, on track to more than double last year's figures, yet repeat youth offenders are still walking free with nothing more than warnings or community orders.

The government has focused on reviews and plans while violent repeat offenders continue to terrorise the community without consequence. My question to the Attorney-General is: when will the government stop protecting repeat youth offenders and start protecting the community by immediately introducing tougher bail laws?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:23):** We have announced a comprehensive review into bail laws in South Australia, and not just us doing it but having the South Australian Law Reform Institute (SALRI) look at it. In relation to youth offending rates, it would be worth pointing out the official figures.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that youth offending rates since the Liberals were in government have approximately halved in South Australia—have approximately halved in South Australia. ABS data released on 6 March this year show the youth offending rate in South Australia is the lowest of any state in the whole country—the lowest of any single state in the whole country—and, as I said, half of that when the Liberals were in government previously.

According to the official Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, the only place in the nation that has a lower youth offending rate is the ACT. We have seen over the last decade a continuing decrease in the youth offender rate; however, we do know that there are a small number of young people responsible for a disproportionate number of matters before our Youth Court. I think the figure that SAPOL has released was that there were approximately 20 young people responsible for about 11 per cent of all charges before the Youth Court, and that's exactly what we are aiming to do something about. We have released a youth offender plan to look at a number of different areas.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** The opposition interjects 'another review', which is exactly what they have been calling for. Let's look at what the opposition has actually done: they have called for a review into bail laws. We are doing a review into bail laws, and now they say 'another review'. 'You are doing exactly what we asked for.' What did they do when they were in government? Not much. Not much when the youth offender rate, according to the official figures, was double what it is now. I know that the opposition, and particularly the shadow minister in another place, the member for Dunstan, likes to get up and talk about these sort of things and show—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** —the member for Bragg—his abject inexperience as a portfolio holder. Given that the youth offending rate, according to the official figures, was double under the Liberals, it is surprising that the shadow minister continues to come out. Do you know who we don't see coming out in relation to this? That is the person who has portfolio responsibility and has a legislative responsibility for these bits of legislation. That is the shadow attorney-general, the member for Heysen.

The member for Heysen has been around a bit longer and probably doesn't want to come out given the own goal it kicks in terms of the youth offending rate under the previous government. But not the young and inexperienced member who has designs on leadership within the Liberal Party. He is happy to come out all the time. So you have to ask yourself, why don't we see the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Heysen, who has portfolio responsibility and the acts that govern these matters, come out on these things? It's probably because he knows a little bit better.

#### YOUTH CRIME

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:26):** Supplementary: does the minister acknowledge that incarceration and locking kids in a cell in the absence of rehabilitation and intervention simply does not work?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:27):** I thank the honourable member for her question. It is a very, very good point. The members opposite, and the inexperienced member who comes out on this a lot, would probably not mention anything about intervention programs or rehabilitation, but they are critically important. If we can stop young people becoming involved in the criminal justice system, then it's much more likely that a young person won't turn to a life of crime as an adult.

As part of our youth offender plan, we have committed \$3 million for intervention programs specifically aimed at those young people, those serious, recidivist offenders who find themselves in contact with the criminal justice system far too much. We want to do things so that those young offenders today don't become young offenders as adults, and that is a measure that is designed squarely at community safety in South Australia.

#### ENGINEERED STONE

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:28):** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Will the minister provide an update about the national ban on engineered stone?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:28):** I would be most happy to. I thank the honourable member for his question. It is yet another demonstration of the progress that you see when you have state and federal Labor governments. Over the past year, we have seen



significant action around the country to safeguard the health and wellbeing of workers from the dangers of engineered stone.

When we received expert scientific advice about the increasing prevalence of silicosis in the workforce, and from the expert report that there is, and I quote, 'no safe threshold' of silica content in stone benchtops, South Australia was one of the first jurisdictions to call for a ban on these products. We could not sit idly by and repeat the mistakes of the past by allowing this new asbestos of the 21<sup>st</sup> century to run rampant in workplaces.

We made it clear at the time that we wanted to see a nationally consistent approach, but if that didn't occur we were willing to go it alone and consider a ban at a state level. Fortunately, and with the leadership and the ability of having a state and federal Labor government, it didn't come to that. That is because in Canberra we had a federal Labor government that was just as concerned about this problem as we were and just as committed to keeping workers safe. First with workplace relations minister Tony Burke and later with the current minister, Senator Murray Watt, we have worked hand in hand to take action against this threat.

As of 1 July last year, South Australia has implemented a ban on the manufacture, supply, processing and installation of engineered stone panels, benchtops and slabs. This ban is not merely a regulatory change. This is this state government and the federal government's collective resolve to prioritise human life over convenience. The decision was based on expert advice recommended by Safe Work Australia, acknowledging the unacceptable risk posed by engineered stone to workers' health. It reflects a broader commitment to occupational health and safety. By eliminating the source of exposure, we are taking a proactive stance to prevent disease rather than react to its consequences. This approach not only protects workers but also sets a precedent for other industries to follow.

I would like to especially acknowledge the collaborative efforts of government agencies, industry stakeholders and advocacy groups that have worked tirelessly to bring about this change. Their dedication underscores the power of collective action to drive meaningful change, particularly members of the union movement who have been campaigning for this for a very long time.

I am pleased that the Albanese federal Labor government has followed up on that work by introducing a national ban on the importation of engineered stone benchtops, panels and slabs, effective from 1 January this year. This ensures that not only can these products not be used but they cannot even be brought into Australia by unscrupulous operators who might be minded to try to skirt around our health and safety laws.

The ban on engineered stone has been a landmark decision to place the health and safety of workers at the forefront. It is a clear message that Labor governments are dedicated to workers' health and safer workplaces. We should take pride in this achievement and continue to advocate for measures that protect and enhance the lives of workers in our community.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR JOBS**

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:31):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on the topic of public sector jobs.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** The federal opposition leader, the Hon. Peter Dutton, has proposed to cut 41,000 jobs from the Australian Public Service as part of the Coalition's election plan. Analysis by Greens Senator Barbara Pocock has revealed that the Coalition's plan equates to approximately 3,700 Australian public sector workers here in South Australia. That is the equivalent of three times the number of workers currently employed by the Whyalla Steelworks and equates to approximately one in four Australian public sector workers here in our state.

My question to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, therefore, is: is the minister concerned about the potential for significant job losses for South Australians under a Dutton government and has the state government done any modelling on support packages that may be required to support workers at risk?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:32):** I thank the honourable member for his question and it is a good question, because if we had 40,000 federal public servants cut it would have dire consequences right around the country. Some economists have even talked about the possibility of that alone plunging Australia into recession.

But more than that, it is a perfect illustration of something we know is simply in the DNA of the Liberal Party at state and federal levels. We are seeing this pledge now from the federal Liberal Party to cut 41,000 public sector jobs and let's not forget how ingrained this is in the Liberal Party's DNA. Who can forget the former Leader of the Opposition, Isobel Redmond, in the lead-up to the 2014 state election promising to slash 20,000 state public sector jobs—promising to cut a quarter of the state public sector? This is an intrinsic value of the Liberals in South Australia and across the nation and we are seeing it play out in the federal parliament.

If there is anything we are learning at the moment it is that these Trump-style policies, the DOGE-style cuts, do not resonate with Australians. I know that many members opposite love Trump-style politics: the culture wars and slashing the public sector.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** Point of order, Mr President: standing orders specifically rule out opinion.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Excuse me. Order! I am trying to listen to the Hon. Dennis Hood.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** The minister implicated members of the opposition's preference for the President of the United States' policies, which he can't possibly know.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Point of order on the point of order.

**The PRESIDENT:** I need to rule on the point of order first.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Well, the opinion is specifically to the asking of questions, not to the answering of questions. And a further point of order: the previous Hon. Ben Hood question was laden with opinion about the crime and youth offender rates.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! What I will say is it would be better if you just stuck to the substance. I think drifting off—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.M. Scriven:** But the opposition has no substance.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I am actually speaking, minister. Can you just get on with your answer? I need a couple more questions today; otherwise, we will be short of our quota.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** In relation to the honourable member's question about the slashing—of massive public service cuts—the honourable member talked about Whyalla and the way the South Australian government stepped in there and the support that will be needed. The question was directly in relation to what support might be needed if there are these huge job losses right around Australia.

I think it is a good example that the honourable member has used. It wasn't the private sector that stepped in to support the Whyalla Steelworks. It was the government of South Australia with the federal government taking the lead on doing that and ably and essentially supported by public sector agencies, workers who provided all sorts of advice—legal advice, financial advice—about how we can have the steelworks survive.

We do know that if there was a different sort of government in South Australia we would see the Trump-like policies that they are so fond of, meaning you wouldn't have seen that sort of support. You would have seen those cuts, and you will see the cuts no doubt if we see a Liberal—

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** Based on what?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Based on everything every Liberal Party ever does. That is the main sort of thing. Based on their—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Alright.

### YOUTH CRIME

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:36):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding youth crime and repeat offending in South Australia.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** Recently obtained court documents reveal that a single 14-year-old South Australian accumulated 131 charges in a single financial year, including multiple assaults, home invasions, drug offences and, I think extraordinarily, 34 breaches of bail or bond conditions. The police commissioner has expressed and acknowledged frustration with a small cohort that I think the Attorney mentioned in a previous answer today of repeat youth offenders.

The government has announced, to be fair, its Young Offender Plan, including proposed changes to bail laws and increased penalties, which are likely to receive support from our side, I suspect. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Does the Attorney share the police commissioner's frustration at this extraordinary situation?
2. Is the Attorney satisfied that our justice system, in these cases anyway, is operating in line with community expectations?

**An honourable member:** Good question.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:37):** I thank the honourable member for his question, and it is in fact a good question. I acknowledge that the honourable member regularly asks questions about community safety in South Australia. It stands in stark contrast to other questions we have heard today and how they are asked. This is a sensible question about youth offending—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*The Hon. H.M. Girolamo interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Excuse me. Order! Answer the question.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Chuck her out.

**The PRESIDENT:** Answer the question.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** The honourable member asked about one particular, I think, young person who had in the order of 130 matters. Let me just say this very clearly: that is unacceptable. That is unacceptable, and that is precisely why we have done what the honourable member outlined and are taking action.

We have spent a lot of time talking particularly to SAPOL about measures that they may need to take further and better action, so more serious consequences, notwithstanding that I think certainly the biggest contributor to breaches of bail are things like not recharging electronic monitoring bracelets, not being home or not being at the place you should be at the time, so the more

administrative breaches that don't put other people in harm's way. Notwithstanding that, though, that is unacceptable, and that is why we have put these measures in place.

As the honourable member alluded to, the statistic, I think, that SAPOL used was 11 per cent of all matters before the Youth Court in one particular year were the result of 20 young people. That is unacceptable and that is why we are putting measures in place specifically to target that cohort who find themselves far, far too many times in the criminal justice system.

What we are looking at are more serious consequences for those frequent flyers, the recidivist, serious offenders. We are looking at ways to give authorities more powers, particularly in relation to youth street gangs. But, importantly, as I outlined in relation to a supplementary question from the Hon. Connie Bonaros, we are looking at ways to stop those young people coming into contact with the criminal justice system, looking at intervention programs so that the young offenders of today don't become the adult offenders into the future.

We have allocated \$3 million, new money for new programs. We held a round table bringing together many people with expertise in these sorts of areas to put forward views. We will be considering them and particularly in conjunction with the Department of Human Services looking at ways to put in place those programs to divert young people, to help turn their lives around so that they don't continue to offend as a young person and, as I said, become those adult offenders into the future.

As I said before in relation to a question, the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that the offender rate in South Australia is coming down. As I said, it has approximately halved since the Liberals were last in government. According to the official ABS statistics, we have the lowest rate of offending of any state. It's only the ACT that is below us. But, there is more to be done. Any rate of offending is too much offending. That is why we are committed to introducing new laws and introducing new programs specifically targeted at that cohort of youth offenders who are recidivists and committing too many crimes.

### *Bills*

## **STATE DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION AND FACILITATION BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 April 2025.)

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:42):** I rise to place some comments on the record in relation to this piece of legislation. I note it was the subject of quite an extensive debate in the House of Assembly as prosecuted by our shadow treasurer, the member for Flinders, Mr Samuel Telfer.

The origins of this bill predate this parliament and indeed this government with it being a recommendation, I understand, of the South Australian Productivity Commission under the Marshall Liberal government, so conceptually very much what the intent of this legislation is sits very comfortably with members of the Liberal Party in that this legislation is clearly intended to facilitate approvals.

I thank the officers from the government who provided us with a briefing, who I think used the language of 'a process improvement.' Being the nerd that I am, I love a good bit of process improvement. I would love it if this piece of legislation does indeed have that outcome. I think it has been drafted a little bit differently from what we would have done if we were in government, but, nevertheless, it is a significant piece of legislation to establish a Coordinator-General's Office and modify mechanisms for the facilitation of strategically important development projects in South Australia.

For those students of history, it has echoes of major project status that meant, I think it is fair to say, that projects that were deemed to be major projects would not necessarily bypass approvals but they would be given a special pathway that acknowledged the significance of them and often projects that are a larger nature may require a larger number of approvals. It is probably a bit simplistic to say it is a 'one-stop shop' or use that sort of language, but it should improve the delivery,

particularly in a timeliness sense, so that there is some certainty for them into the future and the timeframes are reduced.

I note that it targets housing—which is to be commended—critical minerals, clean energy and defence industries, particularly those connected to AUKUS. It proposes to do so by creating state development areas (SDAs) and giving the Coordinator-General's Office powers to coordinate, expedite and support major projects within those areas.

Obviously, the Liberal Party supports the improved coordination and project delivery, particularly for projects that will shape our economy and our communities for decades to come. We have seen from time to time in this parliament indenture bills which have had a similar effect when they have been required. Faster, more proactive infrastructure planning and streamlined regulation are critical to maintaining our competitiveness and liveability.

As I said, there was extensive debate and some close scrutiny of this legislation in the House of Assembly. I think it is noteworthy that the regulatory process is not abolished but should take place earlier in the process so it does not actually remove any particular regulations. It remains to be seen as to how the coordinator will operate in practice and whether it is really going to make a huge amount of difference or not. I did ask questions about this in the briefing, but, again, these are matters which are unclear.

If we are particularly talking about the housing space, which is something that is much more familiar to me, HIPDU was created probably two years ago. The director, Ms Elinor Walker, has stepped down from her role. I am not sure what the ongoing future role of HIPDU is in the housing environment. Also, we have the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has a bit more of that role of coordination. These processes sit alongside each other, I assume, rather than one taking precedence over another.

The bill also confers significant powers on the Coordinator-General's Office, but there is still a high level of ministerial discretion over operations generally. Ministers may direct the CGO and recommend removal of certain members. Such powers can potentially open the door to politicisation of what should be an independent and expert body overseeing projects of state significance.

The bill's governance structure for the CGO could certainly be improved. There is no current requirement for regional representation among its membership, despite the fact that many future developments of state significance occur outside of metropolitan Adelaide. Nor are there sufficient safeguards, in our view, against dominance by single organisations or particular vested interests.

There are also questions about how land acquisition, appeal rights and environmental protections will operate alongside the new powers and how the rights of local communities will be respected within the SDAs. To address these concerns, we have proposed a series of amendments, which we will address during the committee stage. Broadly, they seek to, firstly, ensure greater transparency and accountability for the CGO; secondly, strengthen the CGO's independence from ministerial direction; thirdly, require reporting on opportunities for genuine red tape reduction; fourthly, improve governance standards and promote broader representation, including from regional South Australia; and, fifthly, enhance parliamentary oversight of major project declarations.

In closing, the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Bill represents an important opportunity to modernise how we manage major projects. If implemented with the right safeguards, it can potentially deliver real benefits for our economy, our environment and our communities. However, we would like to see more of an independent, fair and focused on public benefit system.

We look forward to debating the committee stage and addressing any amendments that may come up. I apologise that our amendments have been filed somewhat late, but I do note that during the debate in the House of Assembly certainly the intent of those was anticipated. With those comments, I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:50):** I rise today to speak in support of the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Bill 2025. I believe that, in order for South Australia to be competitive and to have the ability to attract investment for key developments, this bill intends to improve efficacy and efficiency, provide certainty and reduce risk for development by creating a centralised

Coordinator-General's Office and improved system-wide coordination of key developments in South Australia for social, economic and environmental purposes.

The bill aims to improve coordination across South Australia's planning and regulatory system and will provide for:

- the ability to proactively apply existing planning and regulatory processes;
- pathways to take a place-based approach where development can be facilitated in a timely manner in areas which have been proactively identified as environmentally and economically suitable;
- streamlined provision of enabling infrastructure to get more large housing developments built more quickly (I think that is welcome);
- increased capacity and efficiency; and
- greater influence over development and environmental outcomes through conditions and other mechanisms.

The key new measures introduced in this bill are the establishment of a Coordinator-General's Office (CGO) and its ability to create state development areas. State development areas, called SDAs, have been described as pre-assessed go zones. In other countries, I have observed that many of those zones are called special economic zones (I believe that is very similar), which allow for regulatory assessment to be undertaken at an earlier stage of the planning and development process. This is intended to establish a proactive and place-based approach to identify suitable areas for development and provide clarity for community and for development proponents, and will allow for faster approvals once applications are made.

It is important to note that the government has stressed that there will be no reductions to existing regulatory requirements or standards that apply under existing legislation. The government argues that the CGO will instead help coordinate these existing processes and standardise and streamline timeframes for statutory processes where possible. There is no doubt that this coordinator approach is something that industries and developers have been crying out for, and we have seen the success of similar coordinator-general functions in other jurisdictions interstate and overseas.

For example, in June 2024, New South Wales established a coordinator-general function to coordinate the delivery of key priorities in renewables in housing and the Western Sydney growth area, and similarly Queensland continues to refine its longstanding coordinator-general model, achieving successes in critical minerals, green manufacturing and infrastructure corridors. Governments in both the Northern Territory and Western Australia are also, as I understand, planning very similar reforms.

I think these sort of reforms can unlock many economic corridors and developments in South Australia. I am supportive of what South Australia is doing, because we need to keep up with best practices so that South Australia does not fall behind or miss out on opportunities to grow our industries, build more houses, growing jobs and boosting our productivity and interest for our economic development. I sincerely hope that this new CGO will indeed improve efficiency, enabling some streamlined processes, and not have another additional layer of bureaucracy laid on top of it for private investors to navigate.

I am encouraged to see the state development areas introduced in this bill, and this will create the ability for the CGO to proactively access suitable areas for critical development and give proponents confidence that applications will be given timely and targeted consideration. Pre-assessment of SDAs will help to identify, avoid or manage barriers to a proposed development, and ensure that the sites are fit for purpose, can be zoned appropriately, and can accommodate key infrastructure and developments without undue local impacts. This ability to proactively pre-assess a range of statutory requirements will be a gamechanger for many developments, helping to de-risk projects of critical importance to our state.

I would also like to point out that the bill would allow for the minister to authorise the CGO to undertake essential infrastructure works for designated projects or projects in an SDA. I believe that will facilitate public and private enabling infrastructure to help bring large housing developments and

new communities to life more quickly, which is really a legitimate partnership between public and private sectors.

I note that the Hon. Robert Simms will be moving amendments, and I will consider those amendments during the committee stage. I also understand that the Liberal opposition, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, also filed some late amendments. Some of them are quite sensible, so I will consider those amendments as well. Overall, I am encouraged to see progress towards a more streamlined, proactive and positive approach to development in South Australia. With those remarks, I commend the bill.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:56):** I rise to speak on the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Bill 2025 on behalf of the Greens. I listened with interest to the speeches of my colleagues the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Jing Lee, and I suspect I am going to be the odd one out here in indicating that the Greens are not supportive of this bill.

I am very concerned that this bill represents a significant change in the way in which we do things in South Australia, and it requires very careful scrutiny. Obviously, we are going to undertake a committee process shortly but I am very, very concerned that we run the risk of handing the Malinauskas government a blank cheque and an opportunity to override existing laws and protections here in our state.

That is concerning for our democracy, and it is coming at a time when I think a lot of South Australians are very concerned about the way in which governments of both persuasions—Labor and Liberal—are disregarding their views when it comes to their embrace of the United States and their very dangerous foreign policy.

I hear the Hon. Michelle Lensink groaning. This is a view that I think most people in the South Australian community share; this is a significant issue in Australia at the moment. The Trump presidency poses a real risk to Australia, and I think people right across the state are concerned about the nature of our relationship with the Trump administration. This is an issue that has been playing out over in Canada just today.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** With respect, the bill specifically references AUKUS, and that is one of the key elements that the Greens are concerned about. AUKUS involves a collaboration between the United States and our country, and I think it is legitimate to talk about the risks of that relationship when it comes to our security.

The bill establishes the Coordinator-General's Office, and I understand that where there is a project of state significance the bill allows the newly established Coordinator-General's Office to perform a series of functions or assessment processes that currently sit within other acts of parliament. This is a broad set of powers that are being proposed.

We understand that the government has undertaken consultation in the development of the bill, both open and targeted. However, while some concerns have been raised in the consultation stage and have been addressed, there are others that have not been sufficiently tackled by the government. One of these significant issues that has been raised with the Greens is the concentration of power to four unelected officials who will make up the Coordinator-General's Office.

The primary principle established in the bill, that the Coordinator-General's Office must consider the economic, environmental and social aspects of the project, is meritorious. We of course support that being included. However, there is not sufficient guidance being provided to the Coordinator-General's Office in terms of how that assessment is made. One of the fundamental concerns that we have, which I flagged in my introductory remarks, is the relationship between this bill and AUKUS.

The intention, as stated by the government very clearly, is to undertake projects of state significance, including increasing the supply of housing that is desperately needed for the state. Of course we support that, but I do not accept the government's premise that one of the major barriers to housing development in South Australia is a lack of fast-track approvals. Surely the major issue, when it comes to housing development in our state, is the lack of capacity to actually get the work

done and the lack of investment from the South Australian government and the federal government in terms of public housing. That is the major barrier, not necessarily land release and certainly not necessarily red tape.

It is clear that the Coordinator-General's Office will be tasked with various AUKUS projects. Indeed, the bill makes it clear that one of the members of this office must have expertise when it comes to AUKUS. The Greens have been very clear that we do not support this dud deal. It is a dud deal for our nation and it is a dud deal for the people of South Australia. It trashes our reputation as a clean, green state and it makes our country less safe by putting us in the eye of the storm by tying our foreign policy interests and our defence interests to the delusional nutcase, Donald Trump. We do not believe that this is an equal partnership, we do not believe that we will ever see any benefit that will flow from this dud deal, and we have serious concerns about the toxic nuclear waste storage and transport that is associated with this deal.

I should say that this bill will also allow the government to, in effect, sweep in and find sites for nuclear waste and to potentially impose those on communities against their wishes. I recognise that the Malinauskas government and the Tarzia opposition are locked into supporting AUKUS. They are a unity ticket on this reform. But that is not the view of the community. For instance, the Port Adelaide Community Opposing AUKUS group have been advocating a long time into this project, and the residents of that area are directly impacted by the project in a number of ways.

There has been a lack of consultation and transparency from both state and federal governments when it comes to the implications of the AUKUS deal for that community. They have concerns about their health and their local environment. They have concerns about the potential impacts of any accidents that may happen in relation to nuclear waste.

It is interesting: when people talk about nuclear waste it is very easy to talk about it in the abstract, but no-one wants it in their backyard. There is a reason why the opposition leader, Peter Dutton, has not visited one potential nuclear waste site during the federal election. He knows that people do not want nuclear waste in their backyard and for good reasons—because the health and the environmental risks are well documented and well known.

Here in South Australia, we pride ourselves on being a clean, green state, yet we have signed up to a deal that allows nuclear waste to be stored amongst our suburbs. The concerns of the community are valid, and we do not want to see the state government ignoring their views. We know that we cannot rely on a Trump administration to treat us equitably in any deal moving forward. Trump did not even know what AUKUS was when he was asked about it.

The atrocious public policy decisions being made by the Trump administration in the US should be making us question the state and federal government's dedication to AUKUS and our defence strategy in general. We know that South Australia is not set to start building submarines until 2030 or 2040, and in the meantime it is clear that there are going to be significant shifts in global politics that will impact on this deal.

The Greens will be moving amendments to the bill to ensure that this new Coordinator-General's Office's powers cannot be used for the doomed AUKUS project. Furthermore, we want to give assurances to the people of South Australia, and in particular the impacted community around Osborne, that these powers will not be used to establish nuclear waste sites, and so our amendments make that expressly clear.

This is a test for the Labor and Liberal parties. They will say that this is not about nuclear waste. If that is the case, they will support the Greens' amendments to make this very clear to the people of South Australia. I suspect, however, that what we will see is the unity ticket of Labor and the Liberals voting together to give this new office the power to fast-track finding these nuclear waste sites.

The Greens are also concerned that this bill is bad news for the environment. The Conservation Council made a submission to an earlier draft of the bill and it states:

The environment sector does not support the delegation of decision-making functions without clear safeguards to ensure the existing integrity of environmental approval processes are upheld rather than subverted.



This bill enables the Coordinator-General's Office to call in the functions of, or to undertake approvals under, a series of important acts: the Native Vegetation Act, the Environment Protection Act, the Coast Protection Act, the Heritage Places Act and the pastoral lands act. Parliament took great care in crafting these pieces of legislation. We should also exercise our due diligence when a government comes along with a plan to hand those powers over to another office without the same level of ministerial oversight, without the same level of knowledge or expertise that exists within those departments when administering those acts.

Our amendments seek to remove those acts from the remit of this bill, as we believe these are important standalone legislative instruments that should have their unique status preserved. In particular, we recognise that these acts are fundamental to environmental protection. That is why we have identified them for discrete treatment.

We are also concerned about the potential implications for work health and safety. As a result, we will be seeking to remove the ability to call in the functions of the Work Health and Safety Act. We see no reason why the Coordinator-General needs to bring these functions into their remit. The Work Health and Safety Act is a vital piece of legislation for keeping workers safe. Why do we need to transfer the powers of that act over to unelected officials?

I understand, of course, that the government will claim that these concerns will be addressed by the fact that parliament can disallow some parts of the bill. We will be asking questions in the committee stage about exactly which provisions of the legislation will be disallowable, as we have received some contradictory advice about how this will work in practice.

We also have concerns about the composition of the Coordinator-General's Office. As I mentioned before, the Greens do not want to see these powers being used for AUKUS, and therefore we will seek to change the composition of the council to ensure that there is diversity of expertise. Our amendments will remove a requirement that there is expertise in AUKUS and instead ensure that a member of the First Nations Voice is included, a person with expertise in climate change and a person with expertise in planning.

If indeed this bill is to enable development, let's make sure that there is somebody at the table with planning expertise. If the government is serious in its commitments to addressing climate and engaging with First Nations people as part of our planning, then it should also make a commitment to ensuring that these decision-makers in the Coordinator-General's Office have expertise in that regard. It is vital that these voices are included in these decisions, and this would go some way to addressing the concerns of members of the community who feel that they are being shut out of this process.

I am concerned that this bill is a power grab from the Malinauskas government, so that they can establish yet another office to fast-track key developments. This office will be able to take on the roles of important agencies to do the bidding of the government of the day, to prioritise the projects that they see fit, and it further reduces the level of public scrutiny and oversight over the provisions of the toxic AUKUS deal. This is the Malinauskas government bulldozing their way through our state, and the Greens are not supportive of this approach.

I do urge the opposition to think very carefully about their position on this bill. I understand that they are moving a number of amendments. As the Hon. Michelle Lensink acknowledged, we have only just seen those, but we will consider those and form a position on them during the committee stage. At first blush, many of the amendments that the opposition are proposing are sensible and do introduce some level of transparency, but they do not go anywhere near far enough in terms of addressing the myriad concerns that the Greens have with this legislation.

Might I also express some frustration at the way in which the Malinauskas government has approached this issue. This is something that should receive a high level of public scrutiny and a high level of public engagement. I accept the government has conducted a consultation piece; however, dealing with this in the parliament this week, which is on the eve of the federal election when all eyes are focused on national politics, does seem a little bit too clever from my perspective. It is being a bit too clever by half.

The government could have waited until another week, so that this could get the level of public and media scrutiny that it deserves. It is a significant change. It is one that the Greens believe the public should be engaged with, and it is one that this parliament should really give due scrutiny or due consideration of. We are moving a series of amendments. I urge members to support those, but ultimately our view is that this bill sets our state down a dangerous path.

**The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:12):** I rise to speak on the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Bill. Unfortunately, my office was only briefed on this bill yesterday. Given its complexity and significance, it has been challenging to fulfil due diligence within such a short timeframe.

It is clear that the government is keen to progress this bill as quickly as possible, and while I appreciate the urgency to respond to the housing crisis and meet the challenges of our state's transitioning economy, I remain concerned that fundamentally this bill views the extension of government power and influence as the solution to improving the cost of doing business in this state. Surely a reduction in the excessive regulatory framework hampering business growth, development and investment in this state would be more effective in addressing the urgent need to improve business efficiency rather than creating yet another government office.

We have reached an unfortunate state of affairs when the government solution to resolving the regulatory complexity of doing business in this state is to create another government office. Bigger government is rarely an effective solution to problems of economic efficiency. Nevertheless, it is understandable that industry supports this move as it will alleviate the burden of navigating the current layers of bureaucracy associated with gaining land-use assessment and approvals from multiple different public agencies, which is causing ongoing and unnecessary delays.

However, the creation of one centralised public office to coordinate this red tape fails to address the fundamental underlying cause of the problem, which is the excessive regulations and increasing government interference. As one business owner recently stated in response to a survey conducted by the South Australian Business Chamber, Australian business is drowning. Reduce tax. Reduce red and green tape.

The Association of Mining and Exploration Companies has also highlighted the significant number of commonwealth and state government environmental legislative reforms currently underway in Australia, which will impact the regulatory approvals and ongoing monitoring and compliance of explorers and miners who already undertake significant rigorous approvals and compliance.

According to the association, the state government's intention to accelerate approvals with this bill is a welcome and worthwhile measure; however, the association also notes that most mining projects trigger commonwealth requirements for environmental assessments under the Mining Act and that this dual process of assessment will actually undermine the intentions of the South Australian government.

In directly addressing this bill, the association also stated that the bill enables the South Australian government to make a decision in favour of one industry project over another and requested that the government should provide clear and up-front information regarding provisions that consider compensation for future losses for tenement holders with existing rights.

The association raises a legitimate concern about the extension and broadening of government power into one central office and, given that this office will have a significant role in the coordination of major land approvals in this state, I believe it is an element of this bill that requires further examination.

I do note that the Hon. Robert Simms has proposed amendments to clause 6 regarding the appointment of the four officers to the new Coordinator-General's Office. It is clear that this amendment is intended to address the broad powers given to this new office and the fact that the four officers will be appointed by the minister.

The honourable member has stipulated that the minister must ensure that at least one member of the new office must be from the State First Nations Voice and at least one other member must have expertise in climate change. While I appreciate the honourable member's concerns, I would suggest that such interest groups are already adequately represented and protected within

the current legislative framework at both the state and federal level and that any appointment to this new office should be drawn from relevant industry, given that the whole intention of this new office is to streamline the approval process and alleviate the burden and unnecessary delay on land approvals for all investors.

To attract more investment to our state, we need to reduce the cost of doing business and the complexity of our compliance measures. While this bill offers operators and investors some much needed administrative support, it does not address the systemic problems of doing business in this state and it also provides the government with further and broader opportunities to increase its power and influence rather than removing the regulatory barriers to allow business and investors to improve our level of productivity and stimulate the growth of our economy.

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:16):** I rise to speak in support of the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Bill, a bill which seeks to streamline the approvals process for declared large or complex developments through a one-stop shop by creating a new four-member board called the Coordinator-General's Office, which I will refer to now as the CGO.

The bill also allows for the creation of state development areas. These are pre-assessed go zones which the CGO, in partnership with regulators, have confirmed as regulatorily and environmentally suitable for development. The CGO will have the capacity to rezone land, build infrastructure and facilitate streamlined approvals within these state development areas. This will be done by using the work that the CGO and regulators have done up-front, such as baseline studies, master planning or pre-assessments. State development areas also allow the CGO to steer development to suitable locations by incentivising development within them. This helps facilitate the right developments into the right locations.

With this bill we can ensure our state's planning and regulatory framework is fit for purpose to keep up with the growing demands of our state. Our government has made a concerted effort to make sure that young South Australians can have a great future here and harness all the opportunities available in our state. This includes being able, of course, to buy a home. Hence, this bill aims to streamline planning and regulatory processes to allow more homes to be built closer to key public transport routes and indeed other key services.

In an ever-competitive market for major projects, this bill seeks to ensure South Australia remains competitive to attract investment in major projects. The bill provides new functions and powers to the CGO. These powers of coordination enable existing processes and requirements to be applied in a consolidated and streamlined manner where necessary, instead of creating a major projects pathway that sidesteps existing requirements. Examples include:

- setting, varying or aligning timeframes for processes, such as an assessment process;
- calling in a process so that the CGO may perform, for example, a planning approval for an arterial road where a CGO has done the baseline studies and master planning;
- attaching a condition to decisions where appropriate (for example, a requirement to transition from traditional clean energy to measurable two-year milestones); and
- creating and operating state development areas.

I note that this bill is in no way unique. Similar legislation has been in place in other jurisdictions, including Queensland and New South Wales. They have proven to be effective in encouraging development and the creation of jobs in those states. I understand that WA and the NT are also developing or establishing similar processes.

In conclusion, I want to note that this bill has been endorsed by a wide range of industries, from housing, renewable energy and manufacturing groups. This has come about because of the extensive public consultation and stakeholder engagement that occurred late last year. The bill seeks to be ambitious but responsible. It includes a range of checks and balances, protections and exclusions, including for protected areas under state law and Aboriginal heritage, which is deliberately left out of scope. I commend the bill to the council.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:20):** I rise very briefly to speak on this bill, noting of course its main objective in terms of improving coordination across our existing planning and regulatory

processes and pathways to a place-based approach to de-risking critical developments through what the government has coined as state development areas, environmentally and economically suitable go zones proactively assessed by regulators, streamlined provision of enabling infrastructure for large housing developments, increased capacity and efficiency, and greater influence over the development and environmental outcomes through conditions and other mechanisms, amongst other things.

I do note that the bill has gone through an extensive consultation process. I note also that in the briefing I had on this bill when I asked about that consultation process I think it is fair to sum up the advice given to me as a middle-of-the-road type approach where everybody got a bit of something—not everything they wanted—in terms of the final outcome. Certainly, there was give and take on both sides with industry stakeholders in terms of reaching that middle ground, if you like, and being able to introduce this bill.

It has been I think quite rightly and aptly described to me as ensuring that we have these plug and go, plug and play—whatever you want to call them—areas where people know what the lay of the land is, in short. I have always been very supportive in principle of the notion of one-stop shops, and it is on that basis that I have considered this bill. We know that it can cost a ridiculous amount of money and a lot of time to get approvals through existing processes.

I think the example given to me at the briefing was one of the worst examples, of something like \$20 million and a two-year process for an approval. It beggars belief that you could go to those sorts of extents before you have actually reached any outcome and have incurred those sorts of fees and costs and that sort of timeframe. It beggars belief that any company or organisation would stick around and not leave this jurisdiction and go to another if they are spending that sort of money trying to get an approval in South Australia over such a protracted period of time.

I guess that was the best example given to me because these are issues that I often discuss with stakeholders in my office in relation to the fact that there are so many different pathways that you have to go along, and it is a bit of a—it is not just a bit; it is a bureaucratic nightmare and one that we need to overcome. So I accept that this bill is designed to address those issues.

I will say, though, that one of the things I raised during my briefing, and I am hoping the minister responsible will take this on board and be able to respond to it, is it is all well and good for, I guess, the big operators to know where to go and look once we have these designated places in place and places of state significance in place and I note that there is no monetary threshold in the bill and there is a different way of determining eligibility—and I am glad there is not a threshold—but not all operators are going to be of the same size and magnitude.

I did speak to the advisers about the option of an undertaking by the government that this will be prominently placed on their website so that those operators who are not as big and potentially do not have the capacity of other operators who will know where to go and look, will have, in addition to the one-stop shop, one place where they can go and look at decisions that have been made in relation to go zones, because that at the moment has certainly been an issue.

It has certainly been an issue for stakeholders who come to see me about certain projects and find themselves running between three or four different departments and councils and whatnot and all the regulatory processes that come with that, without even having identified a suitable parcel of land for a particular project. I think that is a very important inclusion and one that ought to be very prominently placed on the website, as I said.

I do note a couple of points the Hon. Rob Simms made. Perhaps I will ask this question particularly in relation to work health and safety, but I do note also that there are powers that will come within the realm of this legislation that are already existing in other areas. It is not just the substantive act where those powers may exist, they may exist under different pieces of legislation as well, and I would be keen to hear whether work health and safety falls within that category of powers. The land acquisition one is the one that I can think of off the top of my head where there are various agencies that hold powers in relation to that under different pieces of legislation. That is no different from including them in this piece of legislation.

I did say I would not speak for very long on this other than to say that in principle the concept of one-stop shops and these plug and go areas I think is a good one in terms of efficiencies. I understand there is a lot of detail here. There will be a lot of detail yet to come in the regulations, which we will have to have a very close look at. As we know, the devil is always in the detail. I intend to do just that.

Again, I would ask the minister to confirm that that is one of the things the government is intending to do to ensure that, regardless of size and scope of those who will be effectively taking advantage of this piece of legislation, there will be somewhere easy for them to go and identify areas that are relevant to the sorts of undertakings they wish to pursue and that those processes are intended, indeed, to cut the red tape, make it more efficient and less bureaucratic in terms of being able to seek quicker outcomes and certainly in a much cheaper way.

Lastly, one of the other questions I did ask is: given that so much work has already gone into this and there has been such an extensive consultation period, I am keen to get a better idea of if the worst case scenario is two or three years what is the best case scenario under this sort of model in terms of savings on time and money? I point again to that insane example that I gave where you have a company spending \$20 million in two years just for an approval of a project. That is not the sort of thing that stimulates any sort of economic development activity or, indeed, I would say, making South Australia favourable for projects if you can get it done cheaper and quicker elsewhere.

With those words, I look forward to the committee stage debate. I look forward to the minister's response to my question and I will consider the amendments that are on file as we get to them.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (16:29):** I would like to thank the honourable members who have made a contribution on—

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Pangallo has just stood up. Sit down, the Hon. Mr Pangallo. I have called the minister to conclude, but if you want to make a contribution, when we get to clause 1 you can make your contribution. Minister, I am sorry to interrupt.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I would like to thank members for making a contribution: the Hon. Ms Lensink, the Hon. Ms Lee, the Hon. Mr Simms, the Hon. Ms Game, the Hon. Mr Hanson and the Hon. Connie Bonaros. It is an important bill that aims to streamline the systems that we currently have and requires balancing of social, economic and environmental considerations on a state and a local level. I am sure this is something that we would all seek to find the right balance for.

In terms of the amendments that have been filed by the opposition today, the Hon. Ms Lensink acknowledged that they were filed pretty much as we were discussing today and we acknowledge the apology that was put forward, but, because of the late filing, we will not be able to support them. However, it may be that some of them do have merit and, if they pass in this place, the government is happy to consider them between the houses.

I think one or two members mentioned timeframes for progress of this bill. My advice is that briefings were offered 11 weeks ago. If briefings were only received in the last days, that was not due to anything remiss of the government. I thank the honourable members for their contributions, and I commend the bill to the chamber.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes .....16  
Noes.....3  
Majority .....13

#### AYES

Bonaros, C.  
El Dannawi, M.  
Hanson, J.E.  
Hunter, I.K.

Bourke, E.S.  
Game, S.L.  
Hood, B.R.  
Lee, J.S.

Centofanti, N.J.  
Girolamo, H.M.  
Hood, D.G.E.  
Lensink, J.M.A.

Maher, K.J.  
Wortley, R.P.

Ngo, T.T.

Scriven, C.M. (teller)

#### NOES

Franks, T.A.

Pangallo, F.

Simms, R.A. (teller)

Second reading thus carried; bill read a second time.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### VISITORS

**The PRESIDENT:** Just before we go into the committee stage, I do not normally acknowledge former members of the House of Assembly, but given that we have Ivan Venning, a baron of the Barossa, a man of note, I acknowledge the honourable Mr Venning.

#### *Bills*

#### STATE DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION AND FACILITATION BILL

#### *Committee Stage*

Clause 1.

**The CHAIR:** I indicated before the second reading that the Hon. Mr Pangallo would like to make a contribution, so we will do that now.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** I rise to say that I support the Hon. Rob Simms and the Greens in opposing this bill. While I support measures to streamline development approvals, I believe that this bill certainly goes way beyond that and gives enormous powers to a coordinator to override existing legislation if it is deemed to be in the state's best economic interest. I note that it was stated that there were concerns from within the government that, if this legislation was not put through, it could discourage other investors from coming into South Australia and putting money into various projects in South Australia, which I do not believe.

This is a state that provides stamp duty exemptions for commercial purchases in the state, and large projects are going on at the moment all around the state, from towers being built right behind us at Parliament House, through to the Riverlea housing project and other housing projects that are now on the Premier's mud map or road housing map, or whatever he calls it, in the hope of building thousands of homes, which they will never be able to achieve.

As I said, this bill gives enormous powers to this coordinator, who is not an elected representative, and he or she—whoever gets the job—can override existing legislation if it is in the state's best interests. I raised this matter with the Premier's own advisers, and I thank them for coming into my office yesterday. I did not get a briefing until yesterday, even though one was listed as being available back in February, but I did not think this was going to be shunted through at such pace as it is today.

I note that there is a list of exempted places where this legislation will not apply. My concern is that this legislation could well be a Trojan horse, that once you put this legislation through there will be nothing stopping a government that has control of both houses of parliament being able to move through the legislation, amend that legislation, and see development even on the Parklands again—even though the Premier says they will not. I was assured this will not happen, that there would not be any development on parklands, which was good to hear, but of course we know that this government is about to carve out a huge slice of parklands in North Adelaide for its LIV golf course. Of course, that will not be applicable to this piece of legislation.

I have also raised concerns about the impacts these housing developments might have on existing businesses. I have been approached by businesses from Murray Bridge who believe that future housing developments there may endanger their own businesses that have been there for a long period of time. One in particular, of course, is the Costa Mushrooms business. I raised this with the advisers who came to my office yesterday.

It is probably a bit too late now, but this is likely to occur with the government's announcement of a 1,700 home subdivision at Sellicks Beach. Now, that's a disgraceful situation that continues there that has not been addressed at all by this government. It has been totally ignored by the environment minister, the planning minister, the premier. This is where residents in Sellicks Beach have, for the last five months or more—in fact, it happens for nearly half of the year—been subjected to constant, 24/7 showers of dust from the large Adelaide Brighton Cement quarry, which is going to be operating—and it operates day and night—when the 1,700 allotments are going to be developed at Sellicks Beach.

These residents are being subjected to a constant shower of dust—and we are not just talking about any ordinary dust, it also contains dangerous levels of silica. This is the same stuff that the Attorney-General was bragging about during question time, and rightfully so, about how they banned stone cutting. However, I have seen the levels of silica dust that have been recorded at homes in Sellicks Beach and it is alarming. In fact, you have residents who are now reporting health problems as a result of inhaling the dust that constantly falls each day.

I have urged members of parliament, I have urged the ministers, to go and have a look for themselves to see what is going on at Sellicks Beach right now, where the residents are being subjected to this; it is almost like a storm of dust when the wind blows. Every day they have to sweep out their homes. It gets inside their homes, it is everywhere, and they are inhaling it—and it includes dangerous silica dust.

Of course, here we have a government that, once this legislation goes through, will be able to quickly fast-track that 1,700 home development at Sellicks. It will get developed, and unsuspecting buyers will have to put up with the same problems that current Sellicks residents are having to put up with. One resident has told me that they are so fed up they are going to sell up and leave. One has already decided to sell his home, and others are also contemplating moving out of the place—and I am not talking about a handful of people. This dust covers almost the entire suburb.

This legislation is certainly going to protect the developers that will work on that new subdivision, and I have to say that it is actually just across the road from this quarry, which has a length of about four kilometres, its depth is huge, and has a life of 150 years. Here is a government that says it is concerned about inhaling silica dust but is showing absolutely no concern for these residents at Sellicks right now who are having to put up with this. Nobody is listening to them, nobody. The environment minister, Susan Close—no, not interested. The planning minister, Nick Champion—not interested. They just do not have any interest in what has been created and the problem that exists in that suburb right now, and it will only get worse.

As I said, my concern is that this is Trojan Horse legislation, quite clearly. While I certainly want to see developments in this state being fast-tracked more than they have been in the past, I think there needs to be some sort of measure in there to put the brakes on what is going on here. With that, I will be supporting the Hon. Robert Simms and his amendments.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** I thought it might assist in the committee stage—I have some questions about specific provisions but I also have some general questions, so I might start with the general questions at clause 1 and move through some of those. Might I say that I agree with the Hon. Frank Pangallo's statement around the risk of this being a Trojan Horse. It has been referred to by some community advocacy groups as 'one bill to rule them all'. The mega bill that overrides so many other pieces of legislation I think does send a shiver down the spine of many South Australians who care about our democracy.

The bill requires consultation in certain circumstances but places no clear requirement on the Coordinator-General's Office to take the results of the consultation on board when they come to make decisions. What is the government's expectation in terms of how consultation will impact on decision-making of the office under this legislation?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** My advice is that it would have the usual expectations: it is an implied expectation that when consultation is undertaken it will be taken on board. Obviously, that does not mean that everyone's viewpoint is necessarily able to be accommodated, but what it does mean is that all viewpoints are listened to and changes are made where appropriate.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** We have received conflicting advice from various sources about what instruments are disallowable under the bill. Can the minister clarify exactly which provisions of the bill will be disallowable?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I would refer the honourable member to part 3, division 1, clause 19—Interpretation:

(1) In this Part—

...disallowable notice means a notice under any of the following provisions:

- (a) section 25(1);
- (b) section 36(3);
- (c) section 37(1),

that modifies or excludes the application of a designated Act (or a provision of a designated Act), and includes a notice [that there is such a notice]

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** I am sorry, but that does not actually assist me in understanding the provision. What I am trying to understand is: how much oversight or opportunity will the parliament have in terms of being able to disallow? Is it the case that existing disallowable provisions within existing legislation will automatically be disallowable if they fall under the remit of the new state development coordination office, or are some elements going to be treated differently? I am not asking the minister to simply read from the act. I am trying to get clarification on how this is going to work in practice.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that there are no changes to any disallowable instruments in any other acts, and therefore the disallowable characteristic that we are referring to only refers to those three provisions that I outlined in the answer to the previous question.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** What precisely do those three provisions relate to? Are they relating to any particular projects or legislation?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised it will refer only to any notice where the CGO makes use of the functions. The three areas that it refers to specifically are the calling provision, the pre-assessment and pre-approval provision, and the essential infrastructure provision, but only where it would modify or issue an exemption.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Again, I apologise—I understand this is not the minister's bill; I understand that you are dealing with it in this house—but I think this is an important point, so I am keen to clarify here, because it does go to the heart of the level of transparency. Can the minister be specific around, again, how that is going to work in practice? The parliament will not have the power to disallow provisions that relate to—can the minister repeat those for me?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I will convey the information that has been provided to me. If it is still not answering the question, perhaps the honourable member will frame it in a different manner. The three provisions that were referred to would be subject to the usual disallowance process. In the same way that the parliament might disallow a regulation, it would be exactly the same process for a disallowance in this particular case.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** I will have to give up on this line of inquiry. I am not getting any closer to actually understanding where the parliament's powers for disallowance may be curtailed. If the government's view is that they are not going to be impacted in any way, it would be useful for them to clarify that, but I will move on. When the CGO takes on secondments from another agency, will that agency be given additional funding to backfill that position, so that they can continue business as usual?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that the budget appropriation does have the capacity for such a backfilling situation, but it is important to note that the reason there is a significant budget appropriation is so that there will be sufficient resourcing for the CGO and also for the regulatory system. According to my advice, that apparently came through very strongly in the feedback and consultation that it needed to be appropriately resourced, essentially, in order to be effective and to have the positive impact that we are hoping it will have.



**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Can the government give a commitment that this will not have any adverse impact on the work of existing departments or agencies?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The intention is to have a positive impact, and therefore I think it is fair to say 'yes'.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** What interaction will the Coordinator-General's Office have with the Premier's Delivery Unit?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** We would not expect it to have any.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Isn't the purpose of this new office to deliver key projects of strategic importance to the state, or are they not considered of value in terms of the Premier's Delivery Unit?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** There is no requirement for the CGO to interact with the Premier's Delivery Unit. My advice is there would be nothing precluding that occurring, but it does not seem particularly—certainly there is no requirement for it.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** In Queensland, the Coordinator-General's Office was used to expand the Adani coal mine, despite the fact that there was significant community opposition to the project. Is there potential for this legislation to be used to approve similar projects in South Australia that might have adverse environmental outcomes?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that this bill maintains existing requirements around such matters. It does not make something able to be approved that is currently not able to be approved in circumstances that have been outlined by the honourable member.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** What level of funding does the government consider will be required to establish and maintain the Coordinator-General's Office?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that the expectation is it will cost around about \$4 million per year. That obviously includes both the establishment and the operationalisation going forward.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Can the minister clarify whether that is new money or whether that will be taken away from existing agencies?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised it is a budget appropriation. It is new money.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** In his second reading speech, the minister said that the bill was to ensure independent decision-making; however, the bill enables the minister to give directions to the new CGO. Does this mean the new office is not independent of the government of the day?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The bill establishes the CGO as a statutory authority with independence. Because it is established so that the Public Sector Act 2009 and the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995 apply to the CGO, the CGO is legally required to act in a non-political way and detached from any other interests. Clause 9(2)(c) of this bill also prohibits the responsible minister from directing the CGO to either approve or reject an application. I am advised that the provisions are modelled on very similar provisions that protect the independence of the State Planning Commission.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Members of the CGO will be entitled to remuneration. Can the minister clarify who will set this remuneration? Will it be set by the Remuneration Tribunal of South Australia, for instance?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that the CGO would be a government board and therefore remuneration would be set in line with the framework for government boards and committees.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Can the minister clarify what that framework is? How is that determined?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** My advice is that it is under one of the Premier and Cabinet Circulars. It is certainly available publicly online.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Could the minister advise what it is? How are members of the public meant to know? I am trying to ask these questions so that we can get to the bottom of how this bill is going to work in practice and I am finding some of the responses to be quite circular.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The framework for boards and committees is set out. It has specific bands. I am not sure if that is the correct term that is used, but it is essentially bands or tiers based on the remit of the board or committee in terms of its scope. It is something that has been in place for many years so I am not quite sure why there would be new questions around it now.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Which minister will the act be committed to?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that at this stage that has not been determined. An act can be committed to any minister, as all acts can, and that will be worked out in due course.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Is it standard for the parliament to be asked to give such significant powers to a minister when we do not even know which minister will have responsibility for the act? Is that standard practice? I have not seen that in the time I have been here.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** An act can be committed to any minister. The honourable member might recall that, when we have a new government elected, for the first few days often all acts are committed between perhaps the Premier and one or two others, so it is not unusual according to my advice.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Can I just go back a step in relation to the constitution of the CGO. I note that the provisions of the bill say there will be a board and that there will be one member who is appointed as the principal member. Is it anticipated that the role of the CGO, which is that one member, will effectively be an executive government appointment?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that that is possible, but it is not required. I am referred to and I would refer honourable members to the Planning Commission, which is currently a mixture of both external members and public servants. So a similar model could be used in this case.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** Further to that question from the Hon. Connie Bonaros regarding the composition of the panel, will they be selected? We do not know which minister is going to be responsible for this piece of legislation. How will these panel members be selected? Will they have to apply, or will they be captain's picks?

Further to that I note that there is an allocation for a specialist for AUKUS and that it needs to be somebody with a knowledge of the AUKUS project. Considering that it is still in its infancy, who would that person likely be? Will it be a politician, defence personnel? Where would that person come from?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised, in terms of the first question around panel selection, it would be usual to appoint persons based on their skills. It could be either an open recruitment or an appointment by a minister in the same way as occurs with many other boards. In terms of the second question, there would need to be a recruitment process where someone could demonstrate a sufficient knowledge of AUKUS.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Just again in terms of the role of the CGO and the reference to the Planning Commission, is it anticipated that in this instance the role of the CGO, given the gravity and scope of the scheme, will be a full-time role, as opposed to some of the examples that are given that are not occupied by full-time members?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that the bill does not specify whether it will be a full-time or part-time position. It would be based on workload. Currently the expectation is that there will be quite a high workload, which would suggest it is likely to be full-time, but it is not specified in the bill.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Just further to the composition of the board, can the minister clarify why precisely AUKUS has been singled out and why there is not a requirement for members of this board or committee to have, say, planning expertise or climate change expertise or expertise in the housing sector?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that the, if you like, general members of the board will be appointed based on their ability to fulfil the functions and that is likely to be a broad range of skill sets. It could include planning, it could include various other things. Obviously, as with the make-up of any well operating board, they will be seeking to have the appropriate mix of skills.

In terms of why AUKUS is specified, as was noted by a previous speaker it is quite a rare skill set. Given that there could be significant implications in terms of the AUKUS supply chain, it was considered appropriate to specify and ensure that where there is something that will affect the AUKUS supply chain or involve the AUKUS supply chain, there are specific skills related to AUKUS.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** What are the steps open to individuals or groups who may be opposed to a decision made by the coordinator?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that this bill does not remove any existing review or appeal rights that exist in any other bill and therefore it does not create that type of change.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** I am just having a look at exclusions here. What about native title? Is there the ability here to even override native title rights?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Essentially, I think the honourable member is asking whether this will take power away from native title holders or in regard to those matters and I am advised that, no, the bill deliberately focuses on internal government processes. There was a decision that was taken quite deliberately earlier on in the process to leave Aboriginal heritage, Aboriginal land rights legislation and the ALT, as well as native title matters, out of scope of this bill. That is because affecting those protections, rights and processes simply will not be appropriate either for Aboriginal communities nor for proponents.

Improved coordination and certainty in this context can only be achieved through earlier improved engagement and collaboration and doing so will continue to be an important priority for state authorities and for the Coordinator-General's Office, especially where those things are relevant.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** Will the office of the coordinator have the authority or the power to override, say, commonwealth developments that may be slated for South Australia?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that any development that is under a commonwealth act or on designated commonwealth land can only be changed through commonwealth authorities and, therefore, this would not enable that to occur.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** To clarify the issue I raised earlier about the Parklands, I notice that the Governor may, on the recommendation of the minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, establish a specified area of land as a state development area. Does that leave the door open for Parklands or other protected areas to be included?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that section 19, the interpretation section, refers to protected areas. Specifically, it includes:

- (a) the Adelaide Park Lands as defined (from time to time) by the Adelaide Park Lands Plan under the Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005;

So it is specifically excluded, and then there are a number of other areas under that same explanation.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** What happens, say, with the development of the LIV Golf project at North Adelaide? There will be separate legislation required there for the government to acquire that section there. Does that mean that this legislation will then apply to that slice of parkland that will be acquired by the government to complete its LIV Golf project?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that, no, this bill would not apply to that. As the honourable member suggests and I think has been made clear previously, that is separate legislation.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Can I go back a step again just to clarify? On the example of native title or heritage significance or environmental significance, is not the concept really that whatever is required to be done in relation to native title, heritage significance or anything else would have been done prior to the relevant land parcel being identified as ready to go? If there is native

title significance, for instance, that would have been done already, and we would have established whether it is an appropriate area of land. If it has cultural heritage significance or environmental significance, similarly, that body of work will have been done in advance, before we say, 'This area is ready for certain industries to go into.'

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that essentially, yes, that is the goal. To have a state development area, the intention is that the work that is required is done as early as possible and therefore that gives greater clarity for proponents. It is worth, however, also reiterating that that work is done through existing processes, so it does not remove native title rights. It does not remove Aboriginal heritage, for example. It is done through existing processes, but exactly as the honourable member suggests, by having that work done up-front and as soon as possible that will streamline the processes and give proponents a swifter opportunity going forward.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** I thank the minister for that response. I go to one final point that I raised during my second reading contribution, and that is that not all players in these fields are of the same scope and scale. Is it the government's intention, and will they give an undertaking, that they will give some prominence—I am not suggesting that there be a register as such—on the website so that people can easily identify the areas that have gone through the processes we have discussed and are available for certain activities in certain industries in certain areas?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Yes. I am happy to expand, if necessary, but I think essentially that covers it. The answer is yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

New clause 4A.

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

Amendment No 1 [Simms-1]—

Page 7, after line 3—After clause 4 insert:

4A—Application of Act

This Act does not apply to or in relation to—

- (a) a project to establish a site to store nuclear waste; or
- (b) a project relating to AUKUS.

The purpose of this amendment is to remove AUKUS from the remit of this bill and also to ensure the Coordinator-General's Office cannot use these powers to establish nuclear waste sites in South Australia. The government has told us that this bill is primarily for development, and they have talked about the potential to collaborate in terms of delivering housing. If that is the case, then it should be a no-brainer for the government to exclude AUKUS from this bill. It has been their argument throughout this process that this is an office that will simply use powers that are already available.

If the government wishes to narrow the field, this is an opportunity for them to do so. I point out, in speaking in favour of the amendment, that South Australians have a long history of standing against nuclear waste dumps in our state. The Barngarla people fought and won a 20-year fight against a nuclear waste dump, with the court deciding in 2023 that the facility could not be built. In 2004, a South Australian campaign opposing the Howard government's plan to create a nuclear waste dump in Woomera resulted in the plan being shelved. The Greens are concerned that these new powers could be used to establish nuclear waste sites. My amendment makes it expressly clear that there is no potential for the new office to be used in this way.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act is a separate South Australian act that prohibits already any state authorities from any involvement with nuclear waste activities or projects. That act continues to apply and, according to my advice, is unaffected by this bill. The prohibition that this amendment purports to achieve already applies through other legislation, and therefore this amendment would have no practical effect in that regard. Secondly, excluding AUKUS-related projects is not reconcilable with the intent of this bill, which is to

be able to support AUKUS and, where relevant, task the CGO with supporting AUKUS-related developments. The government will not be supporting this amendment.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** The Liberal Party will not be supporting this amendment either.

The committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes .....2  
Noes.....17  
Majority .....15

#### AYES

Franks, T.A.

Simms, R.A. (teller)

#### NOES

Bonaros, C.

El Dannawi, M.

Hanson, J.E.

Hunter, I.K.

Maher, K.J.

Scriven, C.M. (teller)

Bourke, E.S.

Game, S.L.

Hood, B.R.

Lee, J.S.

Ngo, T.T.

Wortley, R.P.

Centofanti, N.J.

Girolamo, H.M.

Hood, D.G.E.

Lensink, J.M.A.

Pangallo, F.

New clause thus negated.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

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

Amendment No 2 [Simms–1]—

Page 7, lines 26 to 31 [clause 6(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

- (3) In nominating members for appointment, the Minister must ensure that—
  - (a) at least 1 member is a member of the State First Nations Voice (within the meaning of the *First Nations Voice Act 2023*); and
  - (b) at least 1 member has expertise in climate change; and
  - (c) at least 1 member has expertise in planning.

The effect of this amendment is to expressly remove the requirement for a member to have expertise with AUKUS and instead to insert some other areas of expertise.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The government will not be supporting the Hon. Mr Simms' amendment, particularly in regard to removing the AUKUS member. As I mentioned a little earlier, that would also be inconsistent with the government's stated policy objectives of supporting AUKUS and tasking the CGO with supporting AUKUS-related developments.

In regard to the Hon. Ms Lensink's amendment, if that is moved I will flag that whilst the government cannot support it, given the lateness of its filing, as I indicated in my summing-up we are willing to consider it between the houses.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** I note that we have not moved the amendment of the Hon. Ms Lensink yet.

**The CHAIR:** We will move them one at a time.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Yes, and I will speak to that when we get to it, as an amendment that I would be inclined to support. I note that, in relation to this particular amendment, I will not be supporting it. We are kind of picking and choosing between who we put on as relevant—and perhaps if they were separated it would be a different issue as well.

In relation to the inclusion of the State First Nations Voice, I would just highlight that the State First Nations Voice, whilst I am not opposed in principle to that concept, would of course still have the ability to make comment in relation to this bill and report to this parliament on any issues or concerns that they have in relation to the bill. It may be that one of those individuals who is appointed as one of the four on this is from the First Nations Voice or, indeed, from another Aboriginal Indigenous representative and not necessarily from the Voice itself. I would just make the observation that there is not anything precluding the Voice from sharing their views on this bill, but there also is not anything in the bill itself, as it is now, preventing anybody with expertise in that area from being appointed under the current guidelines.

I do not share the same views of the Hon. Rob Simms in relation to AUKUS, but I wonder whether we would then have to look at further changes to include everybody who we think might necessarily be on the board. I do note that the Hon. Michelle Lensink has a related amendment, for which I am willing to indicate now that I will support it and consider it between the houses as we progress through this bill.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** It will come as no surprise to the Greens that we will not be supporting their amendment. I agree with everything that the preceding speaker, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, just said. We do hold some concerns in relation to ensuring a breadth of expertise, but I will speak to my amendment in a minute when we deal with that.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Could the minister clarify how this will be negotiated between the houses, given that we have received it from the other house and unless there is an amendment made there is no message to come back to us? How will that process work?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** As I was referring to, if, for argument's sake, the Hon. Ms Lensink's amendment passes here even without government support, we would then be willing to consider that between the houses.

**The Hon. T.A. Franks:** So everyone else has to vote for it.

**The CHAIR:** We will deal with that amendment when we come to it.

Amendment negatived.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Lensink-1]—

Page 7, after line 31—Insert:

- (3a) In addition, in nominating members for appointment, the Minister must ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that the membership of CGO reflects an appropriate diversity of experience and perspectives (whether business, industry, government or other experience or perspectives) and should have regard to the knowledge, experience and background of each person to be nominated for appointment.

As I indicated in my second reading speech—and I think this is reflected in the House of Assembly debate by my colleague Mr Sam Telfer, the member for Flinders—we do have some concerns that the government may have missed some opportunities in its drafting, particularly when it comes to governance issues.

There is an opportunity within this clause for the CGO to feature a full panel of members from one particular organisation, whether that is a business, a trade union, an industry organisation or any similar sort of entity. This proposed amendment is to ensure a diversity of skills and experience within the CGO, which seeks to ensure the diversity that the Treasurer spoke about in committee in the other place. It ensures against a minister looking to—if we could use this word and which I am sure does not occur in any political parties represented here—stack a CGO to achieve a predetermined outcome.

Given the only existing prerequisite for CGO membership is that one member fulfills an AUKUS-related position, the other three positions could theoretically be manipulated without such a safeguard, so I move this amendment standing in my name. Just to test the Legislative Council, I am prepared to call divide if we do not win it on the voices.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I think it is worth putting on the record that we would, of course, expect—in fact, I think I have referred to it earlier today—that the board would have an appropriate diversity of experiences and perspectives. Knowledge and experience are obviously absolutely essential to an appropriately functioning board. As I mentioned, whilst we cannot formally commit to supporting an amendment that was received after we have gone through our usual processes within government, we are certainly happy to consider it. On face value, it does not appear to be contrary to any of what would be the intention in any case.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Yes, notwithstanding our position on the bill overall, this does seem to be a sensible improvement on what had been originally proposed, so the Greens will support this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I move:

Amendment No 2 [Lensink-1]—

Page 10, after line 8—Insert:

- (1a) In connection with subsection (1)(b), if CGO conducts an investigation into the regulation of a project, CGO must submit a report on the investigation to the Minister, which must set out any improvements to the regulation of such projects identified by CGO (or, if relevant, include a statement that no improvements were identified).
- (1b) The Minister must, within 3 sitting days after receiving a report under this section, cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Currently, the bill only requires an annual report to be submitted by the CGO, and separately clause 10(1)(b) only requires identification of areas of improvement for state regulation. This may be withheld until the publication of the annual report.

The proposed amendment ensures that a report is to be tabled in parliament on every project undertaken by the CGO, even when there is no identified area for improvement. We seek to do this for two reasons: firstly, to ensure that all members are aware of the CGO's views on the project where otherwise no submission may result in ambiguity about the CGO's views; and secondly to provide timely feedback on a project without having to wait until an annual report publication, which, if a project is only finalised days after an annual report being completed, could take up to 12 months to be provided to the parliament without such a mandatory report.

The tight timeframe of three sitting days also ensures fast turnaround times for the parliament to consider what regulatory changes can be made for future projects undertaken within the state and to streamline any processes, which is the goal of the entire bill as outlined by the Treasurer in his second reading speech as read in the other place. I commend the amendment to the committee.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** I am sorry, it is very difficult for us to form a position on this amendment having literally only just seen it. I do not really have an understanding of the implications of what the opposition is proposing, so on that basis I think we would have to oppose it.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I move:

Amendment No 3 [Lensink-1]—

Page 10, after line 26 [clause 12(2)]—After paragraph (a) insert:

- (ab) must provide for a quorum of CGO to include at least the principal member; and

This, once again, is a question of what we view is an improvement to the governance structure. The Treasurer, in the committee stage in the other place, agreed that some matters of a particular project

might not require the input of the entire CGO, depending on the experience of each member. However, without requiring the coordinating member to be present as part of the quorum, each individual member theoretically holds the power to convene a meeting with a quorum of one after requesting the coordinating member call such a meeting.

By requiring the coordinating member to be present at any meeting and for any quorum to be a minimum of two of the four members, the hierarchy of the CGO is maintained and the coordinating member's position as such is never brought into doubt should there be conflict between other members of the CGO. This amendment effectively ensures that the CGO can continue, in the words of the Treasurer, 'to be a bit more nimble and quicker' in dealing with issues as they arise and still ensuring the coordinating member has jurisdiction unquestioned.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Again, given the lateness of the filing of the amendment, the government has not had the opportunity to go through our processes and therefore will not be supporting this amendment.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Providing for a quorum for this group sounds like a fairly sensible proposition. It does at least safeguard against, as the honourable member has pointed out, one member simply making a decision without others being present. On that basis, we will support that.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** I, too, will be supporting it, and I echo the words of the Hon. Robert Simms.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Again, on the face of it, this looks like a sensible amendment to me and I will be supporting it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 13 to 27 passed.

Clause 28.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Clause 28 requires the CGO to develop and maintain reports, material or information relating to environmental, social and economic considerations and impacts. Will these reports be made available to the public?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that should this bill pass, we are hoping to be able to promote the information around the state development areas. It would obviously be in the best interest for information to be made available. However, there will, of course, be some exceptions to that, if it is commercial-in-confidence and so on. There is some flexibility in there, but given the intent of the bill, the intent of what the outcome would be in terms of making the state development areas attractive for development, we would expect that that information in the majority of cases would be available.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Just on that, will broader meetings of the board be publicly available as well?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** My advice is that clause 12 refers to procedures being published on a website determined by the CGO and also that the CGO must have accurate minutes kept of its meetings and ensure that a record of its decisions is maintained.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Can I just ask a follow-on question from that: save and except for material that may be commercial-in-confidence, does the current drafting under paragraph (d) or (e), particularly as it relates to recommendations, allow for cabinet confidentiality to apply? So if something is presented to the minister, particularly under 28(d), could it be that the minister then takes that to cabinet and it has the privilege of cabinet, and therefore prevents disclosure of that material publicly?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that, where there is general information, that is not likely to be covered by cabinet-in-confidence. However, if there was a recommendation—for example, that cabinet should consider doing X, Y or Z—then that potentially would be covered through the cabinet-in-confidence processes. Essentially, it will depend on the circumstances of the nature of the recommendations that are being made.



**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** That may very well be the case, but does that prevent the CGO from publicly disclosing the recommendations they have made which the government may consider to be cabinet-in-confidence? If the CGO has not made that assessment and determined that it should be cabinet-in confidence, will they still have the ability to disclose that information?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that it will be the nature of the information that will determine whether something is cabinet-in-confidence or not. It is not the CGO who will make that determination; it will be on the facts of whether something is, for example, general advice or general information, in which case it is not likely to be subject to cabinet-in-confidence. In contrast, if something is a recommendation that, for example, cabinet should invest in building X, Y and Z, then that potentially could be a recommendation that would be subject to cabinet-in-confidence.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** Is the office of CGO subject to freedom of information requests?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Yes, they are subject to the FOI Act, as all other state authorities are.

Clause passed.

Clauses 29 to 32 passed.

Clause 33.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I move:

Amendment No 4 [Lensink-1]—

Page 23, after line 22—Insert:

- (5a) If CGO publishes a declaration under subsection (1), the Minister must, within 6 sitting days after publication of the declaration, cause a copy of the declaration to be laid before—
  - (a) if the Minister is a Member of Parliament—the House of Parliament of which the Minister is a Member; or
  - (b) in any other case—the House of Assembly.
- (5b) If either House of Parliament passes a resolution disallowing a declaration laid before it under subsection (5a), the declaration will cease to have effect.
- (5c) A resolution of a House of Parliament is not effective for the purposes of subsection (5b) unless the resolution is passed within 14 sitting days (which need not fall within the same session of Parliament) after the day on which the declaration was laid before the House under subsection (5a).
- (5d) Nothing in this section affects the validity of a declaration under subsection (1) disallowed under this section before the passing of the disallowance resolution.

Clause 33 of the bill refers to applications for prescribed approvals under the Mining Act of 1971. It might not be immediately apparent, but for those who have dealt with some of these issues over the years there can often be conflict between agricultural interests, particularly with mining. With this particular amendment we are intending to address some of the friction and help to manage that in certain scenarios and with particular applications.

The intent of the amendment is to ensure that the parliament maintains the right to assess the strategic importance of a project under this section and not merely the financial benefits of it. While a mining project could over time easily generate millions, potentially billions of dollars, the impact of such a project could be that the long-term viability of certain agricultural interests, for example, could be threatened, such as in the debate over GM crops and the ongoing prominence and viability of Kangaroo Island GM-free produce.

This amendment does not seek to have the parliament veto CGO as an administrator but looks to ensure that the separate issues of strategic planning and the administration of a project are separated. I suppose an analogy could be that the role of a court is not to determine the merits of a law but to determine whether individuals conform with it. That is the best explanation I can offer, which I hope assists members in their determination as to whether they support this amendment.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The government will not be supporting this amendment for several reasons. The first is that it has not been able to be given due consideration. Initial advice is that it may not actually achieve the stated aims of the honourable member; hence some more detailed analysis would be required. Secondly, the primary principle of the act refers to the economic, social and environmental outcomes both for the state and locally, so again and simply on face value it would appear that the stated aim of the opposition is covered by the existing primary principle which appears in this bill.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** It is my interpretation of what the honourable member is proposing is that this would actually ensure some increased level of transparency around these potential declarations. Given one of the concerns we have had with this reform is the potential for reduced transparency, giving the parliament a bit more oversight seems like a sensible proposal from the opposition. We will support it on that basis, but I recognise what the government has said around working between the houses. If there is some significant issue that we are not aware of, we can always revisit that.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** I am inclined to agree with that assessment. If there are issues there—unintended consequences—we can tease those out and iron them out between the houses. I therefore support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 34 to 37 passed.

Clause 38.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I move:

Amendment No 5 [Lensink-1]—

Page 28, after line 29—Insert:

- (9a) For the purposes of this section (including in legal proceedings)—
    - (a) a statement in a claim that an owner of land suffered loss or damage as a result of a person entering or temporarily occupying land under this section; and
    - (b) a statement in a claim specifying the amount of the loss or damage,
- will, in the absence of proof to the contrary, be accepted as proof of the matter so stated.

This is an amendment to clause 38, which refers to entry onto land, etc. I think it is fair to say that the reversal of the burden of proof in any legal setting is one which cannot be taken lightly. However, the ongoing conflict between ease of access to remote land or even regional agricultural land and the need for possible preliminary works to be undertaken in our view makes it necessary to place the onus on the CGO to ensure that the landowner is not disadvantaged.

It is well known to all in and out of this place that legal action can be cumbersome, expensive and detrimental to those who are accused of wrongdoing. In placing the burden of proof on the CGO to demonstrate land has not been damaged, the landowners, who often do not have the time or resources to dedicate to any legal action, will be protected. This amendment does not seek to prevent any access for the purpose of projects of significance but to demonstrate an act of good faith.

The entire bill seeks to streamline and fast-track projects of state significance and any burden of proof borne by landholders whose land is required for such a project could be taken to be an example of government seeking to ride roughshod over the private property rights should a particular CGO be so narrowly focused on the delivery of a project that the rights of the private citizen are cast aside. With those words, I commend the amendment to the house.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** At this stage the government will be opposing this amendment, first of all for the reasons already stated of being able to see the full implications—there has not been sufficient time for that—and given that it reverses the current position. As I understand it, what it would mean is that, if a government employee entered a property, the landowner could then claim there was \$50,000 of damages done and it would be up to the government to disprove that, which is

a vast change from usual and existing processes. It potentially raises significant issues and the government does not consider that there has been sufficient time to analyse the actual effects.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** I suspect this may be an amendment that will require a bit more time to consider, given the difference between what exists in the bill itself now and what is being proposed here. I do not fundamentally disagree with what the mover has said, but I think we do need more time to consider the two side by side. I guess my concern is that, if we reject the amendment now, we lose that opportunity to do so. So, in principle, to keep this issue alive in terms of having some further discussions about it, I intend to support the amendment with a view to, I hope, getting some better clarification from both parties in relation to how they will interact.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Yes, I concur with the Hon. Connie Bonaros. I think that makes sense. There is clearly a potential issue here, but I do also recognise the point made by the minister. We need to understand what this might mean in practical terms. So I am happy to support it, but on the proviso that there is potentially an opportunity to revisit this and iron out potential issues.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 39 to 52 passed.

Schedule 1.

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

Amendment No 3 [Simms-1]—

Page 34, line 7—Delete the item relating to the *Coast Protection Act 1972*

Amendment No 4 [Simms-1]—

Page 34, line 12—Delete the item relating to the *Environment Protection Act 1993*

Amendment No 5 [Simms-1]—

Page 34, line 17—Delete the item relating to the *Heritage Places Act 1993*

Amendment No 6 [Simms-1]—

Page 34, line 24—Delete the item relating to the *Native Vegetation Act 1991*

Amendment No 7 [Simms-1]—

Page 34, line 26—Delete the item relating to the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*

To make it clear for members, what these amendments do is they delete a number of items from the act. They delete the item relating to the Coast Protection Act, the Environment Protection Act, the Heritage Places Act, the Native Vegetation Act and the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act.

The Greens are taking this action because we believe that these acts should not be called into the functions of the Coordinator-General's Office. The environmental movement in particular has been very concerned about these acts being included in the remit of the office. The Conservation Council, the Native Vegetation Council and the South Australia Nature Alliance have all reached out to the Greens and called for the Native Vegetation Act to be excluded from the list of designated acts. Indeed, the Conservation Council's own submission to the government states:

This [law potentially] allows the coordinator General's Office to 'act in the same capacity as the relevant decisionmaker', replacing the Native Vegetation Council with three members of the CGO who have no requirement to possess knowledge relating to native vegetation, and thus helping to fundamentally overturn the cornerstone of what limited protections are currently available to South Australia's nature and native vegetation.

We are concerned that this will remove important safeguards in respect of environmental protection, heritage protection and our pastoral lands. On that basis we move that those acts be taken out of the bill.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The government opposes this amendment because essentially it is contrary to the entire policy intent. It would considerably reduce the utility of the bill. It would prevent the bill from providing a system-wide facilitation and limit it to planning matters only. What

we are trying to achieve with this bill is streamlining the opportunity to have the state development areas clearly available with people aware that all the work has occurred and so on.

According to my advice, it would prevent the use of the bill for environmental purposes. For example, according to my advice, these amendments would compromise the CGO's ability to assess and create state development areas as environmentally suitable development go zones, which, according to my advice, is a feature of the bill that environmental NGOs indicated that they are supportive of.

It would also mean that the CGO and regulators such as the EPA could no longer use this bill to put pre-assessments in place. That would also further compromise the ability for the CGO to facilitate offsets, development of biodiversity corridors and so on. So it is essentially entirely contrary to the intent of the bill and therefore the government will not be supporting it.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** I am sorry to disappoint the honourable member but that makes sense to me, particularly if you go back to the main core function in relation to making those environmental and economically suitable assessments and decisions. The reason I ask the honourable member to leave out the work health and safety one is because I do not understand why that one is there. It is not like the others, it is very distinct in nature from the others, and so I am hoping that when we get to that particular one the minister can actually explain why it is that we would need to leave work health and safety out of that list.

I flag now that perhaps that is something we may consider having to look at further between the houses as well because I do not understand, on the face of it, why that one needs to be included in the list in schedule 1.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** The Liberal Party will not be supporting this set of amendments.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Could I take the Hon. Ms Bonaros' comment as a question and therefore provide an answer in a moment?

**The CHAIR:** Yes, sure. I was going to deal with that when we got to that next one.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** That is fine then.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you.

The committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes .....	3
Noes.....	14
Majority .....	11

#### AYES

Franks, T.A.

Pangallo, F.

Simms, R.A. (teller)

#### NOES

Bonaros, C.

Bourke, E.S.

Centofanti, N.J.

Game, S.L.

Hanson, J.E.

Hood, B.R.

Hood, D.G.E.

Hunter, I.K.

Lee, J.S.

Lensink, J.M.A.

Maher, K.J.

Ngo, T.T.

Scriven, C.M. (teller)

Wortley, R.P.

Amendments thus negated.

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

Amendment No 8 [Simms—1]—

Page 35, line 2—Delete the item relating to the *Work Health and Safety Act 2012*

I think the Hon. Connie Bonaros actually clearly articulated why this amendment is so important. Whilst it is certainly the view of the Greens that all of these acts should be taken out, the Work Health and Safety Act is of a very different dimension from the other acts that fall within the remit of this new office. It is not clear to me why it has been included. The minister indicated that she was keen to elaborate on that, so I would certainly be interested in her response. But from our perspective, even if members were opposed to removing the other acts, I am hopeful that this might be one where members will see the merit in what the Greens are proposing and I may be able to increase the support that I received on the last vote. We will see.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I can provide further clarification as to why this is included. The Work Health and Safety Act is included only so that the CGO can help facilitate licensing under that act for major facilities. For example, a large manufacturing facility would need to be specifically licensed, and by this provision being included it means that the CGO can assist with that.

A specific carve-out in the bill has been included to clarify that the work health and safety regulator's activities—compliance, enforcement and prosecution powers—are entirely out of scope, which is of course appropriate. I trust that that will actually clarify. There is no reduction in protections for employees; it is simply so that the CGO would be able to assist with licensing for, for example, large manufacturing facilities.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** The second part of that make sense to me. The first part I am still struggling with a little in relation to the licensing. Is there any further clarity that the minister can provide?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that when there is a major facility, for example, that is a major hazard facility—that could be a facility that deals with chemicals or energy or high voltage; that kind of situation—specific licences are required for that facility to operate. By this provision being included, that would mean that the CGO was able to assist in those licences being obtained.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Were any industrial unions or SafeWork SA consulted with regard to this piece of legislation?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that there certainly has been consultation with SafeWork SA, particularly around the carve out. To reassure members, I can refer them to section 19 under 'excluded decision' and 'excluded function'. I am advised it is those particular parts that will ensure that the compliance, enforcement and prosecution powers are not included in this particular provision.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** In which month was SafeWork SA consulted with?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I am advised that we do not have that to hand. I am happy to try to source that, but I do not currently have it to hand.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** I have a final question. I was provided with a list of the organisations that this government asserts that they consulted with, and that list does not contain SafeWork SA or indeed any other industrial unions or workplace expertise. Could you please undertake to provide to this council an assurance that SafeWork SA and indeed those who are concerned with work health and safety legislation have been properly consulted, as you have just informed this council that they were?

**The CHAIR:** The Hon. Ms Bonaros, do you want to make a comment or a question?

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Chair, I am not going to tie myself up in knots on this because I understand it is going to be lost in any event. I do understand the rationale that the minister has provided. That now makes sense to me, but even on that basis, given some of the other amendments that we have decided to consider between the houses further, I think this is, in the grand scheme of things, not the most substantive one. Therefore, my position would be to support it between houses so that I can have a closer look at those issues that the minister has raised and, indeed, the mover has raised and consider it further. That said, I understand it is going to be lost anyway—not to pre-empt any outcome.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** I can provide some of the information that has been requested. First of all, I am advised that consultation with SafeWork around this particular provision occurred in

July last year. In terms of the list of organisations that was provided to the Hon. Ms Franks, the list, I am advised, was the list outside of government; all the government bodies or agencies that were involved were not included in that list, according to my advice.

Amendment negatived; schedule passed.

Schedule 2.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I move:

Amendment No 6 [Lensink-1]—

Page 35, lines 29 to 31 [Schedule 2, clause 1(1), definition of *relevant interest*]—

Delete 'interest (including pecuniary and personal interests) of a kind specified by the Minister as being relevant to the office of member of CGO' and substitute:

interest of a kind prescribed by the regulations

I do not think this one will take long; it is fairly obvious what it is intending. Where it specifies in this schedule that 'relevant interest' is one that is defined by the minister, our amendment seeks that the interest should be prescribed by regulation.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** Given we do not even know who the minister is, I am concerned about giving them powers to determine pecuniary and personal interests. I think the suggestion of the Hon. Michelle Lensink that this be of a kind prescribed by regulation, which ensures that there is some level of transparency, makes sense. Again, if there is some glaring issue that the government identifies, I am open to revisiting that between the houses.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Quite peculiarly, I will support this—not because I like things being included in regulation, because once they are in regulations they are lost forever and none of us get to see anything that happens in those things. That said, I take on board the points that have been raised and, again, I think this is one of those issues that we can consider between the houses. As such, I support it on the basis that we will give further consideration to it between the houses.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Again, on face value there does not appear to be a huge issue with the proposed amendment, but given that we have not been able to consider it appropriately and take it through the usual processes we are not in a position at this stage to support it.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Remaining schedule (3) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

### *Third Reading*

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (18:18):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The council divided on the third reading:

Ayes .....14  
Noes .....3  
Majority .....11

### AYES

Bonaros, C.  
Game, S.L.  
Hood, D.G.E.  
Lensink, J.M.A.  
Scriven, C.M. (teller)

Bourke, E.S.  
Hanson, J.E.  
Hunter, I.K.  
Maher, K.J.  
Wortley, R.P.

Centofanti, N.J.  
Hood, B.R.  
Lee, J.S.  
Ngo, T.T.

NOES

Franks, T.A.

Pangallo, F.

Simms, R.A. (teller)

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (TOBACCO AND E-CIGARETTE PRODUCTS—CLOSURE ORDERS  
AND OFFENCES) BILL**

*Final Stages*

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD  
PRODUCTION AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

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

At 18:22 the council adjourned until Wednesday 30 April 2025 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***RESERVOIR WATER LEVELS**

**429 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (6 March 2025). Can the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water advise—

1. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Barossa Reservoir?
2. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Happy Valley Reservoir?
3. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Hope Valley Reservoir?
4. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Kangaroo Creek Reservoir?
5. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Little Para Reservoir?
6. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Millbrook Reservoir?
7. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Mount Bold Reservoir?
8. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Myponga Reservoir?
9. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the South Para Reservoir?
10. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Warren Reservoir?
11. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Baroota Reservoir?
12. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Blue Lake Reservoir?
13. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Bundaleer Reservoir?
14. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Middle River Reservoir?
15. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Tod Reservoir?
16. The monthly water level (in both GL and per cent filled) over the last four years for the Wirrina Cove Reservoir?

**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 Infrastructure has advised:

1.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		4.09	4.06	4.15	4.12
Feb		3.95	4.01	4.05	4.12
Mar	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.03	
Apr	4.14	4.09	3.98	4.12	
May	4.08	4.05	4.02	4.07	
Jun	4.06	4.03	4.12	4.00	
Jul	4.14	4.10	4.07	4.03	
Aug	4.09	3.99	4.07	4.01	
Sep	3.90	4.14	4.11	4.02	
Oct	4.07	4.06	4.07	4.10	
Nov	4.07	4.07	4.06	3.98	
Dec	4.05	3.99	4.15	4.09	



Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		93.4%	92.7%	94.9%	94.2%
Feb		90.3%	91.7%	92.5%	94.2%
Mar	92.0%	94.4%	94.7%	92.2%	
Apr	94.7%	93.4%	91.0%	94.2%	
May	93.2%	92.5%	92.0%	93.0%	
Jun	92.7%	92.2%	94.2%	91.5%	
Jul	94.7%	93.7%	93.0%	92.2%	
Aug	93.4%	91.3%	93.0%	91.7%	
Sep	89.1%	94.7%	93.9%	92.0%	
Oct	93.0%	92.7%	93.0%	93.7%	
Nov	93.0%	93.0%	92.7%	91.0%	
Dec	92.5%	91.3%	94.9%	93.4%	

2.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		10.28	9.99	10.60	10.55
Feb		10.25	10.28	10.13	10.22
Mar	10.34	9.79	10.55	10.13	
Apr	10.40	10.55	10.13	9.99	
May	10.31	10.28	10.25	10.34	
Jun	10.25	11.58	10.28	10.28	
Jul	10.52	9.99	10.34	10.31	
Aug	10.13	10.05	10.19	10.16	
Sep	10.19	10.60	10.05	10.25	
Oct	10.34	11.27	10.16	11.42	
Nov	9.85	10.34	10.16	10.05	
Dec	9.82	10.22	10.22	10.72	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		81.6%	79.3%	84.2%	83.7%
Feb		81.4%	81.6%	80.4%	81.1%
Mar	82.1%	77.7%	83.7%	80.4%	
Apr	82.5%	83.7%	80.4%	79.3%	
May	81.8%	81.6%	81.4%	82.1%	
Jun	81.4%	91.9%	81.6%	81.6%	
Jul	83.5%	79.3%	82.1%	81.8%	
Aug	80.4%	79.8%	80.9%	80.7%	
Sep	80.9%	84.2%	79.8%	81.4%	
Oct	82.1%	89.5%	80.7%	90.7%	
Nov	78.2%	82.1%	80.7%	79.8%	
Dec	77.9%	81.1%	81.1%	85.1%	

3.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		2.71	2.70	2.52	2.54
Feb		2.51	2.35	2.55	2.88
Mar	2.71	2.75	2.55	2.51	
Apr	2.54	2.76	2.30	2.46	
May	2.67	2.83	2.48	2.46	
Jun	2.64	2.53	2.16	2.37	
Jul	2.43	2.33	2.34	2.37	
Aug	2.43	2.17	2.25	2.32	
Sep	2.79	2.25	2.41	2.35	
Oct	2.57	2.44	2.31	2.30	
Nov	2.60	2.39	2.48	2.31	

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Dec	2.72	2.49	2.51	2.47	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		92.3%	91.9%	86.0%	86.7%
Feb		85.7%	80.0%	87.0%	98.1%
Mar	92.3%	93.7%	87.0%	85.7%	
Apr	86.7%	94.1%	78.3%	84.0%	
May	90.9%	96.3%	84.6%	84.0%	
Jun	89.8%	86.4%	73.5%	80.6%	
Jul	83.0%	79.3%	79.6%	80.6%	
Aug	83.0%	73.8%	76.7%	79.0%	
Sep	95.2%	76.7%	82.3%	80.0%	
Oct	87.7%	83.3%	78.6%	78.3%	
Nov	88.4%	81.3%	84.6%	78.6%	
Dec	92.7%	85.0%	85.7%	84.3%	

4.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		6.53	14.29	9.61	4.63
Feb		5.62	12.47	7.22	2.39
Mar	5.08	4.18	10.34	4.80	
Apr	3.96	4.29	9.30	4.55	
May	2.79	3.96	8.53	4.70	
Jun	4.08	4.92	12.33	4.94	
Jul	9.60	5.17	14.88	4.57	
Aug	12.43	9.43	15.27	5.10	
Sep	11.50	16.65	14.48	6.01	
Oct	11.43	18.84	13.24	6.34	
Nov	9.83	18.78	11.66	6.48	
Dec	7.72	16.84	10.90	6.46	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		34.9%	76.5%	51.5%	24.8%
Feb		30.1%	66.8%	38.6%	12.8%
Mar	27.2%	22.4%	55.4%	25.7%	
Apr	21.2%	23.0%	49.8%	24.4%	
May	14.9%	21.2%	45.6%	25.2%	
Jun	21.8%	26.3%	66.0%	26.4%	
Jul	51.4%	27.7%	79.6%	24.4%	
Aug	66.5%	50.5%	81.7%	27.3%	
Sep	61.5%	89.1%	77.5%	32.2%	
Oct	61.2%	100.8%	70.8%	34.0%	
Nov	52.6%	100.5%	62.4%	34.7%	
Dec	41.3%	90.1%	58.4%	34.6%	

5.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		8.69	15.23	11.86	5.21
Feb		8.26	14.85	10.55	4.20
Mar	6.23	7.44	14.18	8.74	
Apr	5.54	6.56	13.83	8.60	
May	5.61	6.04	13.41	8.56	
Jun	6.12	6.76	14.34	8.56	
Jul	8.01	7.10	14.71	7.98	
Aug	9.70	9.78	14.85	7.75	
Sep	10.23	12.66	14.07	7.13	

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Oct	10.79	13.61	13.26	6.61	
Nov	10.81	16.71	12.56	6.28	
Dec	9.82	16.54	12.62	5.99	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		41.6%	72.9%	56.8%	24.9%
Feb		39.5%	71.1%	50.5%	20.1%
Mar	29.8%	35.6%	67.9%	41.9%	
Apr	26.5%	31.4%	66.2%	41.2%	
May	26.8%	28.9%	64.2%	41.0%	
Jun	29.3%	32.4%	68.7%	41.0%	
Jul	38.3%	34.0%	70.4%	38.2%	
Aug	46.4%	46.8%	71.1%	37.1%	
Sep	49.0%	60.6%	67.4%	34.1%	
Oct	51.6%	65.1%	63.5%	31.7%	
Nov	51.7%	80.0%	60.1%	30.1%	
Dec	47.0%	79.2%	60.4%	28.7%	

6.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		11.45	12.09	11.03	9.18
Feb		10.32	10.00	9.40	8.32
Mar	9.15	9.58	8.46	9.23	
Apr	8.13	8.44	8.20	7.79	
May	8.34	8.66	7.40	6.99	
Jun	7.72	9.28	9.53	7.19	
Jul	9.58	9.58	11.71	7.43	
Aug	11.77	11.54	12.96	7.63	
Sep	12.09	13.37	13.18	8.13	
Oct	13.18	12.33	13.12	8.88	
Nov	12.03	15.11	12.63	9.23	
Dec	11.54	13.33	11.83	9.50	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		72.9%	77.0%	70.2%	58.4%
Feb		65.7%	63.6%	59.8%	53.0%
Mar	58.2%	61.0%	53.9%	58.7%	
Apr	51.8%	53.7%	52.2%	49.5%	
May	53.1%	55.1%	47.1%	44.5%	
Jun	49.1%	59.0%	60.6%	45.7%	
Jul	61.0%	61.0%	74.5%	47.3%	
Aug	74.9%	73.4%	82.5%	48.5%	
Sep	77.0%	85.1%	83.9%	51.8%	
Oct	83.9%	78.5%	83.5%	56.5%	
Nov	76.6%	96.2%	80.4%	58.7%	
Dec	73.4%	84.9%	75.3%	60.5%	

7.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		21.03	31.27	27.97	13.96
Feb		17.54	23.52	22.35	15.15
Mar	15.39	13.79	18.34	18.00	
Apr	12.09	9.04	14.50	15.21	
May	9.36	8.54	11.19	10.68	
Jun	12.38	11.36	27.79	13.02	
Jul	29.82	13.73	33.60	15.58	

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Aug	35.88	30.19	35.78	20.08	
Sep	36.51	42.13	35.37	21.36	
Oct	36.98	42.25	34.55	21.07	
Nov	34.55	43.46	31.18	20.19	
Dec	26.92	39.34	32.81	15.82	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		45.3%	67.4%	60.3%	30.1%
Feb		37.8%	50.7%	48.2%	32.7%
Mar	33.2%	29.7%	39.5%	38.8%	
Apr	26.1%	19.5%	31.3%	32.8%	
May	20.2%	18.4%	24.1%	23.0%	
Jun	26.7%	24.5%	59.9%	28.1%	
Jul	64.3%	29.6%	72.4%	33.6%	
Aug	77.3%	65.1%	77.1%	43.3%	
Sep	78.7%	90.8%	76.2%	46.0%	
Oct	79.7%	91.0%	74.5%	45.4%	
Nov	74.5%	93.7%	67.2%	43.5%	
Dec	58.0%	84.8%	70.7%	34.1%	

8.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		25.12	23.54	23.32	16.44
Feb		24.34	22.68	19.41	15.41
Mar	23.49	23.58	22.09	18.59	
Apr	22.93	23.02	21.97	18.10	
May	22.59	22.89	22.30	17.67	
Jun	23.23	23.76	24.43	18.21	
Jul	26.45	24.16	24.29	18.70	
Aug	26.79	26.25	24.93	19.16	
Sep	26.55	25.07	25.02	19.34	
Oct	26.94	25.26	24.70	19.02	
Nov	26.89	25.16	24.07	18.42	
Dec	25.92	24.61	23.85	17.53	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		91.1%	85.4%	84.6%	59.6%
Feb		88.3%	82.3%	70.4%	55.9%
Mar	85.2%	85.5%	80.2%	67.4%	
Apr	83.2%	83.5%	79.7%	65.7%	
May	82.0%	83.0%	80.9%	64.1%	
Jun	84.3%	86.2%	88.6%	66.1%	
Jul	96.0%	87.6%	88.1%	67.8%	
Aug	97.2%	95.2%	90.4%	69.5%	
Sep	96.3%	90.9%	90.8%	70.2%	
Oct	97.7%	91.6%	89.6%	69.0%	
Nov	97.6%	91.3%	87.3%	66.8%	
Dec	94.0%	89.3%	86.5%	63.6%	

9.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		25.46	38.06	23.56	16.57
Feb		23.56	35.73	21.66	14.52
Mar	18.17	21.80	33.24	19.45	
Apr	16.99	20.36	32.75	17.61	
May	17.45	19.93	31.64	18.49	

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jun	19.33	20.54	32.00	20.27	
Jul	24.90	21.62	32.32	22.27	
Aug	29.04	28.76	31.82	22.22	
Sep	29.73	36.33	30.26	21.99	
Oct	29.96	38.90	28.59	21.66	
Nov	29.15	44.40	26.72	20.72	
Dec	27.21	40.85	25.41	18.87	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		56.8%	84.9%	52.5%	37.0%
Feb		52.5%	79.7%	48.3%	32.4%
Mar	40.5%	48.6%	74.1%	43.4%	
Apr	37.9%	45.4%	73.1%	39.3%	
May	38.9%	44.4%	70.6%	41.3%	
Jun	43.1%	45.8%	71.4%	45.2%	
Jul	55.5%	48.2%	72.1%	49.7%	
Aug	64.8%	64.1%	71.0%	49.6%	
Sep	66.3%	81.0%	67.5%	49.0%	
Oct	66.8%	86.8%	63.8%	48.3%	
Nov	65.0%	99.0%	59.6%	46.2%	
Dec	60.7%	91.1%	56.7%	42.1%	

10.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		4.05	2.41	4.28	2.24
Feb		3.66	0.94	3.39	1.97
Mar	3.15	4.00	0.83	3.63	
Apr	3.99	4.45	0.17	4.46	
May	4.79	4.77	0.07	3.64	
Jun	4.77	4.79	0.75	2.62	
Jul	4.81	4.79	0.59	1.56	
Aug	4.79	4.81	1.16	2.49	
Sep	4.71	4.77	2.67	3.02	
Oct	4.77	4.77	4.14	3.20	
Nov	4.77	4.75	4.54	3.26	
Dec	4.60	4.30	4.46	2.87	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		85.7%	51.0%	90.5%	47.4%
Feb		77.3%	19.9%	71.7%	41.6%
Mar	66.5%	84.6%	17.6%	76.6%	
Apr	84.2%	94.0%	3.6%	94.3%	
May	101.2%	100.8%	1.4%	77.0%	
Jun	100.8%	101.2%	15.8%	55.3%	
Jul	101.6%	101.2%	12.6%	32.9%	
Aug	101.2%	101.6%	24.4%	52.7%	
Sep	99.5%	100.8%	56.3%	63.8%	
Oct	100.8%	100.8%	87.5%	67.7%	
Nov	100.8%	100.4%	95.9%	68.9%	
Dec	97.1%	90.9%	94.3%	60.7%	

11.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		1.76	3.48	2.24	1.00
Feb		1.67	3.30	2.13	0.95
Mar	2.21	1.60	3.17	2.03	0.93

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Apr	2.12	1.58	3.15	1.98	
May	2.05	1.64	3.15	1.94	
Jun	2.01	1.64	1.83	1.90	
Jul	2.10	1.51	1.75	1.89	
Aug	2.24	1.92	1.70	1.27	
Sep	2.09	2.24	1.63	1.22	
Oct	2.00	2.59	1.54	1.18	
Nov	1.95	3.90	1.47	1.14	
Dec	1.85	3.69	2.35	1.07	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		30.6%	60.7%	39.1%	17.5%
Feb		29.2%	57.4%	37.2%	16.5%
Mar	38.6%	27.8%	55.2%	35.4%	16.2%
Apr	36.9%	27.5%	54.9%	34.6%	
May	35.8%	28.7%	54.9%	33.8%	
Jun	35.0%	28.6%	31.8%	33.1%	
Jul	36.6%	26.3%	30.5%	33.0%	
Aug	39.0%	33.5%	29.7%	22.2%	
Sep	36.4%	39.0%	28.4%	21.3%	
Oct	34.9%	45.2%	26.9%	20.6%	
Nov	34.0%	67.9%	25.5%	19.9%	
Dec	32.2%	64.3%	40.9%	18.6%	

12. Blue Lake is a natural lake created by groundwater. Volume and percent full are unavailable.

Date	WaterLevel_m
31/03/2021	11.16
29/09/2021	11.21
13/12/2021	11.15
25/03/2022	10.94
10/08/2022	10.97
14/09/2022	11.00
20/09/2022	11.03
18/11/2022	11.06
15/03/2023	10.89
06/09/2023	11.03
13/02/2024	10.86
21/03/2024	10.79
26/06/2024	10.78
24/09/2024	10.86
18/12/2024	10.76

- 13.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		0.49	2.86	2.09	1.35
Feb		0.45	2.74	1.97	1.26
Mar	0.65	0.43	2.69	1.88	
Apr	0.61	0.38	2.59	1.81	
May	N/A	0.38	2.56	1.77	
Jun	0.59	0.38	2.55	1.76	
Jul	0.63	0.33	2.53	1.75	
Aug	0.62	0.38	2.51	1.73	
Sep	0.61	0.98	2.46	1.68	
Oct	0.52	1.49	2.37	1.63	
Nov	0.59	3.14	2.29	1.56	
Dec	0.53	3.12	2.20	1.46	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		8.3%	48.9%	35.7%	23.1%
Feb		7.7%	46.8%	33.7%	21.5%
Mar	11.1%	7.3%	46.0%	32.1%	
Apr	10.5%	6.6%	44.2%	31.0%	
May	NA	6.6%	43.7%	30.2%	
Jun	10.1%	6.6%	43.5%	30.1%	
Jul	10.7%	5.7%	43.1%	29.9%	
Aug	10.7%	6.6%	42.9%	29.6%	
Sep	10.4%	16.7%	42.0%	28.7%	
Oct	8.9%	25.5%	40.5%	27.9%	
Nov	10.0%	53.6%	39.1%	26.6%	
Dec	9.1%	53.4%	37.6%	24.9%	

14,

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		0.48	0.50	0.40	0.44
Feb		0.42	0.43	0.32	0.37
Mar	0.40	0.36	0.37	0.25	
Apr	0.35	0.31	0.43	0.19	
May	0.33	0.31	0.51	0.15	
Jun	0.61	0.61	0.54	0.24	
Jul	0.61	0.62	0.54	0.61	
Aug	0.61	0.62	0.53	0.61	
Sep	0.61	0.61	0.58	0.61	
Oct	0.61	0.61	0.57	0.61	
Nov	0.60	0.61	0.51	0.57	
Dec	0.52	0.58	0.47	0.51	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		87.9%	91.4%	73.3%	80.6%
Feb		77.6%	79.0%	59.3%	67.4%
Mar	72.7%	65.7%	68.3%	45.5%	
Apr	63.8%	56.6%	78.9%	35.1%	
May	59.9%	56.8%	93.5%	26.9%	
Jun	111.2%	112.1%	99.5%	44.6%	
Jul	112.7%	114.2%	99.0%	112.1%	
Aug	112.6%	113.0%	98.1%	112.3%	
Sep	111.9%	112.3%	105.7%	111.9%	
Oct	112.2%	112.4%	105.0%	111.0%	
Nov	109.9%	111.9%	93.1%	103.9%	
Dec	96.2%	105.7%	85.5%	93.6%	

15.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		0.87	0.89	0.84	0.75
Feb		0.93	0.89	0.81	0.70
Mar	0.75	0.92	0.88	NA	
Apr	0.73	0.90	0.89	0.72	
May	0.71	0.92	0.77	0.71	
Jun	0.76	0.93	0.97	0.70	
Jul	0.96	0.93	0.96	0.95	
Aug	0.93	1.00	0.94	0.94	
Sep	0.92	0.93	0.94	0.93	
Oct	0.93	0.93	0.90	0.91	
Nov	0.92	0.93	0.86	0.87	
Dec	0.90	0.91		0.84	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		0.90	0.92	0.88	0.78
Feb		0.97	0.92	0.85	0.73
Mar	0.78	0.96	0.91	NA	
Apr	0.76	0.94	0.92	0.75	
May	0.74	0.96	0.80	0.74	
Jun	0.79	0.96	1.01	0.73	
Jul	1.00	0.97	1.00	0.99	
Aug	0.97	1.04	0.98	0.97	
Sep	0.96	0.97	0.97	0.97	
Oct	0.96	0.97	0.94	0.95	
Nov	0.96	0.96	0.90	0.90	
Dec	0.94	0.95		0.87	

16.

Monthly Water Volume (GL)	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		0.51	0.55	0.58	0.45
Feb		0.49	0.53	0.52	0.38
Mar	0.44	0.46	0.50	0.47	
Apr	0.41	0.42	0.44	0.45	
May	0.38	0.41	0.48	0.43	
Jun	0.37	0.46	0.52	0.44	
Jul	0.45	0.60	0.63	0.61	
Aug	0.61	0.63	0.62	0.62	
Sep	0.61	0.62	0.62	0.61	
Oct	0.62	0.63	0.60	0.58	
Nov	0.60	0.61	0.56	0.54	
Dec	0.58	0.61	0.60	0.48	

Percent Full	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jan		84.3%	91.1%	96.2%	74.3%
Feb		81.2%	88.0%	85.3%	62.4%
Mar	72.6%	76.4%	82.7%	76.8%	
Apr	67.0%	69.9%	71.8%	73.4%	
May	62.4%	66.7%	78.4%	70.2%	
Jun	60.2%	76.4%	85.3%	71.8%	
Jul	74.4%	98.1%	102.9%	101.0%	
Aug	101.1%	103.8%	101.9%	101.9%	
Sep	101.0%	102.3%	101.5%	101.1%	
Oct	101.9%	103.3%	98.9%	96.2%	
Nov	99.0%	100.0%	91.4%	88.9%	
Dec	95.9%	100.0%	99.0%	78.4%	

### HISTORICAL HOMOSEXUAL CONVICTIONS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (27 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 Spent Convictions Act 2009 (Spent Convictions Act) prescribes the process for spending a historical conviction relating to consensual sexual activity between persons of the same sex. A convicted person or a person specified in schedule 2, clause 1A of the Spent Convictions Act can make an application for a historical homosexual offence to be spent.

Schedule 2 clause 1A lists those persons who can apply in circumstances where the convicted person is deceased, being:

- (i) The person who was the convicted person's spouse or domestic partner at the time of death; or
- (ii) An adult who is a sibling or child of the convicted person; or
- (iii) The executor or administrator of the convicted person's estate; or



- (iv) Any other person a qualified magistrate considers to be an appropriate person to make an application in the circumstances of the particular case.

The application is made to a 'qualified magistrate', as defined by the Spent Convictions Act.

'Any other person' is intended to cover those persons outside of the deceased person's immediate family (given spouses, domestic partners, siblings and children are already explicitly identified). The provision is expressed broadly and it is ultimately a question for the qualified magistrate to determine who appropriately has standing to bring an application in the circumstances of a given case.

If a person is aggrieved that their application is refused by a qualified magistrate, they may wish to seek legal advice about their options to review that decision.

#### APY LANDS GENERAL MANAGER

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (4 February 2025).

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State):** The appointment of an APY general manager is a matter for the elected APY Executive Board. As the responsible minister, I only determine to approve or not approve the conditions of appointment for the general manager.

I have not yet approved the conditions as I sought for the board to further consider the proposed conditions of appointment.

#### ILLEGAL TOBACCO SALES

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (5 February 2025).

**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, and the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs have advised:

Our government has demonstrated its strong commitment to tackling illicit tobacco and e-cigarette sales in South Australia. In the last budget our government committed \$16 million over the next four years to tackle this growing trade in illicit tobacco and to take action against anyone thinking they can still sell illicit tobacco and e-cigarette products.

From 1 July 2024, Consumer and Business Services assumed responsibility of the licensing and the enforcement functions related to illegal sales of e-cigarettes and illicit tobacco. They are now responsible for assessing new licence applications, ensuring existing licensees are complying with the law and investigating and prosecuting offenders. This tougher compliance approach is necessary to tackle the criminal activities that are occurring and is more closely aligned with their current compliance work.

Last year our government also passed legislation that:

- banned the supply of vapes to any person under 18 years old—even by prescription;
- increased penalties—up to \$1.5 million;
- banned vending machine sales of tobacco products in public areas;
- introduced a new authority to ban novel products which are marketed as an alternative to vapes, and used this to ban nicotine pouches;
- created a smoke-free and vape-free buffer zone for enclosed public transport areas;
- allowed the issuing of a closure order on a premises so that authorised officers, and the courts, can immediately close down unlawful activity relating to illicit tobacco; and
- updated licencing and enforcement provisions to allow for greater capacity to enforce breaches of the law.

These new measures have been used by both Consumer and Business Services (CBS) and South Australia Police (SAPOL) to seize illicit products across the state.

As at 24 March 2025, approximately \$18 million worth of illicit products had been seized by our enforcement teams. This includes:

- more than 16 million cigarettes;
- more than 5.5 tonnes of tobacco;
- more than 500 kilograms of shisha; and
- more than 65,000 vapes.

Since new laws started on 13 December 2024 to 24 March 2025, the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs has issued 18 interim closure orders and successfully applied to the courts for one long-term closure order.

We acknowledge that the fight against the harms of tobacco continues. Which is why this year we have introduced the Statutes Amendment (Tobacco and E-Cigarettes—Closure Orders and Offences) Bill 2025, which seeks to amend both the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997 and the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995, to further enhance powers and penalties for these illicit operators. This bill was developed by Preventive Health SA in partnership with Consumer and Business Services, South Australia Police, and with input from the Small Business Commissioner. It comes in response to a request by the Commissioner of Police to help reduce criminal activity and the risks posed to the community by the illicit tobacco and e-cigarette trade.

The new amendments will:

- Provide additional powers for police to undertake additional searches in premises suspected of selling illicit products, to include searches for drugs, weapons and explosives.
- Create a provision for information relating to the closure of unlicensed premises to be made publicly available.
- Provide greater clarification for information sharing between our enforcement agencies, as well as their ability to disclose information relating to illicit activity to interested parties such as the owner of a premises or their agent.
- Create an offence for a person who, being the owner or having the control or management of a premises, causes or permits another to engage in prohibited conduct, such as the sale of illicit products, on that premises.
- Introduces the highest financial penalties in the country, for those in possession of, selling, or supplying, commercial quantities of illicit tobacco and e-cigarette products. At the highest level, anyone in possession, selling or supplying a 'large commercial' quantity will face a fine of up to \$2.1 million for a first offence and \$4.2 million for a second or subsequent offence. A body corporate will face an initial fine of up to \$4.5 million and then \$6.6 million for a second or subsequent offence. In comparison, the highest current penalty in the act is \$1.1 million, and up until late 2024 the highest penalty in the legislation was \$75,000.

'Tobacco sticks' or 'heat-not-burn' tobacco products are relatively new and advice from Consumer and Business Services is that its inspectors have not detected them during their inspections in SA to date. I encourage anyone who has detected this product to report these sellers to Consumer and Business Services.

They are similar to e-cigarettes (or 'vapes'), but usually have a tobacco 'stick' which is inserted into the device so that it can be heated. The heating process causes the tobacco stick to release emissions for the user to inhale.

The 'heat-not-burn' tobacco sticks are already tightly regulated. This is because they are regulated by the commonwealth therapeutic goods law which, as I am advised, effectively prohibits their sale.

Additionally, depending on the product type, a 'heat-not-burn' device may be classified as an 'e-cigarette product' under South Australia's tobacco and vaping legislation. Under this legislation, persons who sell or supply e-cigarette products unlawfully could face fines of up to \$1.1 million for offences under the act. The government will continue to closely monitor these products to ensure they are not being sold here. If it is required however, we will not hesitate to further regulate any new nicotine product that threatens the health of South Australians, particularly young people, in the same way that we have recently done for nicotine pouches.

The government has committed to conducting an assessment of the smoke-free generation model proposed by the Hon. Frank Pangallo MLC.

Preventive Health SA is leading this assessment, analysing the legal implications, enforcement frameworks, the health and equity effects, and the business and economic impacts associated with the smoke-free generation model. This advice will enable the government to make a fully informed decision.

New enforcement powers have also been used to issue interim closure orders on premises found supplying and selling illicit tobacco and e-cigarette products to prevent traders operating for 72 hours. These orders have resulted in shops closing for the period of the order. The Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs will continue to work closely with CBS to ensure a hardline approach to tackle the industry, utilising both interim and long-term closure orders along with other powers to enforce the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997.

The recently introduced government bill, the Statutes Amendment (Tobacco and E-Cigarettes—Closure Orders and Offences) Bill 2025, proposes amendments to both the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997 and the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995, to further enhance powers and penalties for these illicit operators.

#### **ILLEGAL TOBACCO SALES**

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (5 February 2025).

**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, and the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs have advised:

Our government has demonstrated its strong commitment to tackling illicit tobacco and e-cigarette sales in South Australia. In the last budget our government committed \$16 million over the next four years to tackle this growing trade in illicit tobacco and to take action against anyone thinking they can still sell illicit tobacco and e-cigarette products.

From 1 July 2024, Consumer and Business Services assumed responsibility of the licensing and the enforcement functions related to illegal sales of e-cigarettes and illicit tobacco. They are now responsible for assessing new licence applications, ensuring existing licensees are complying with the law and investigating and prosecuting offenders. This tougher compliance approach is necessary to tackle the criminal activities that are occurring and is more closely aligned with their current compliance work.

Last year our government also passed legislation that:

- banned the supply of vapes to any person under 18 years old—even by prescription;
- increased penalties—up to \$1.5 million;
- banned vending machine sales of tobacco products in public areas;
- introduced a new authority to ban novel products which are marketed as an alternative to vapes, and used this to ban nicotine pouches;
- created a smoke-free and vape-free buffer zone for enclosed public transport areas;
- allowed the issuing of a closure order on a premises so that authorised officers, and the courts, can immediately close down unlawful activity relating to illicit tobacco; and
- updated licencing and enforcement provisions to allow for greater capacity to enforce breaches of the law.

These new measures have been used by both Consumer and Business Services (CBS) and South Australia Police (SAPOL) to seize illicit products across the state.

As at 24 March 2025, approximately \$18 million worth of illicit products had been seized by our enforcement teams. This includes:

- more than 16 million cigarettes;
- more than 5.5 tonnes of tobacco;
- more than 500 kilograms of shisha; and
- more than 65,000 vapes.

Since new laws started on 13 December 2024 to 24 March 2025, the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs has issued 18 interim closure orders and successfully applied to the courts for one long-term closure order.

We acknowledge that the fight against the harms of tobacco continues. Which is why this year we have introduced the Statutes Amendment (Tobacco and E-Cigarettes—Closure Orders and Offences) Bill 2025, which seeks to amend both the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997 and the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995, to further enhance powers and penalties for these illicit operators. This bill was developed by Preventive Health SA in partnership with Consumer and Business Services, South Australia Police, and with input from the Small Business Commissioner. It comes in response to a request by the Commissioner of Police to help reduce criminal activity and the risks posed to the community by the illicit tobacco and e-cigarette trade.

The new amendments will:

- Provide additional powers for police to undertake additional searches in premises suspected of selling illicit products, to include searches for drugs, weapons and explosives.
- Create a provision for information relating to the closure of unlicensed premises to be made publicly available.
- Provide greater clarification for information sharing between our enforcement agencies, as well as their ability to disclose information relating to illicit activity to interested parties such as the owner of a premises or their agent.
- Create an offence for a person who, being the owner or having the control or management of a premises, causes or permits another to engage in prohibited conduct, such as the sale of illicit products, on that premises.

- Introduces the highest financial penalties in the country, for those in possession of, selling, or supplying, commercial quantities of illicit tobacco and e-cigarette products. At the highest level, anyone in possession, selling or supplying a 'large commercial' quantity will face a fine of up to \$2.1 million for a first offence and \$4.2 million for a second or subsequent offence. A body corporate will face an initial fine of up to \$4.5 million and then \$6.6 million for a second or subsequent offence. In comparison, the highest current penalty in the act is \$1.1 million, and up until late 2024 the highest penalty in the legislation was \$75,000.

'Tobacco sticks' or 'heat-not-burn' tobacco products are relatively new and advice from Consumer and Business Services is that its inspectors have not detected them during their inspections in SA to date. I encourage anyone who has detected this product to report these sellers to Consumer and Business Services.

They are similar to e-cigarettes (or 'vapes'), but usually have a tobacco 'stick' which is inserted into the device so that it can be heated. The heating process causes the tobacco stick to release emissions for the user to inhale.

The 'heat-not-burn' tobacco sticks are already tightly regulated. This is because they are regulated by the commonwealth therapeutic goods law which, as I am advised, effectively prohibits their sale.

Additionally, depending on the product type, a 'heat-not-burn' device may be classified as an 'e-cigarette product' under South Australia's tobacco and vaping legislation. Under this legislation, persons who sell or supply e-cigarette products unlawfully could face fines of up to \$1.1 million for offences under the act. The government will continue to closely monitor these products to ensure they are not being sold here. If it is required however, we will not hesitate to further regulate any new nicotine product that threatens the health of South Australians, particularly young people, in the same way that we have recently done for nicotine pouches.

The government has committed to conducting an assessment of the smoke-free generation model proposed by the Hon. Frank Pangallo MLC.

Preventive Health SA is leading this assessment, analysing the legal implications, enforcement frameworks, the health and equity effects, and the business and economic impacts associated with the smoke-free generation model. This advice will enable the government to make a fully informed decision.

New enforcement powers have also been used to issue interim closure orders on premises found supplying and selling illicit tobacco and e-cigarette products to prevent traders operating for 72 hours. These orders have resulted in shops closing for the period of the order. The Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs will continue to work closely with CBS to ensure a hardline approach to tackle the industry, utilising both interim and long-term closure orders along with other powers to enforce the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997.

The recently introduced government bill, the Statutes Amendment (Tobacco and E-Cigarettes—Closure Orders and Offences) Bill 2025, proposes amendments to both the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997 and the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995, to further enhance powers and penalties for these illicit operators.

#### COURT BACKLOGS

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (18 February 2025).

**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:

South Australian criminal courts have the second highest clearance rate in Australia, with an increased clearance rate from 69.9 per cent in 2022-23 to 102.5 per cent in 2023-24. This means our criminal courts are finalising more cases each year than are being lodged.

There are various factors that contribute to the number of pending cases in our courts, including the impacts of COVID-19, increased court lodgements, and the complexity of matters before the courts. For example, a number of the trials related to Operation Ironside remain pending awaiting the outcome of High Court matters.

The number of finalisations of criminal matters in the District Court has increased steadily year on year since 2020-21, and the clearance rate has significantly increased from 76.7 per cent in 2020-21 to 100.3 per cent in 2023-24.

This government has made significant investments in the justice system to ensure an efficient system, including:

- \$2.8 million in upgrades to assist the courts in managing large multi-defendant trials
- \$4.7 million over four years in extra resources for the Director of Public Prosecutions
- \$2.9 million over four years for an additional Youth Court magistrate and support staff.

#### CODE BLACK CALLS

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (19 February 2025).

**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. A rise in violence and aggression has been experienced across numerous sectors worldwide, SA Health continues to focus on the safety, security, and wellbeing of its workforce.

The 'Abuse shouldn't be part of the job' Respectful Behaviours Campaign will be extended, following the successful rollout last year. The advertisements highlight the unacceptable abuse levelled at our health workers and call for respect for our doctors, nurses, ambulance officers and other health workers. The TV ad campaign is backed by six health unions and draws from real-life experiences of our public hospital staff, featuring real workers and actors.

The campaign adds to the improved security measures that have already been put in place as we work to implement the ANMF's 10-point plan to end violence and aggression in our hospitals.

This includes the employment of 24/7 security guards across major regional hubs, as well as fit-for-purpose technology and design throughout the suite of new health infrastructure currently under construction and already delivered.

The SA Health Positive Behaviour Support Framework has been updated to align to the latest evidence-based practice, it will be finalised in coming months following recent consultation.

All local health networks have security service agreements in place with dedicated portfolios supporting the ongoing work to meet the framework's objectives. These include training staff in working with consumers who display behaviours of concern related to prevention, management, and response, and embarking on infrastructure projects that improve and expand safety and security measures.

2. Increasing awareness of the importance of reporting has seen an improvement in the reporting culture within SA Health and reporting of incidents by staff. Improved reporting helps us learn from incidents and make improvements.

The unique issues and challenges faced by regional hospitals and healthcare providers are acknowledged. Security upgrades are being undertaken across multiple regional health services, including CCTV, access control, duress systems, and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) measures, dedicated points of entry, security screens and door and hardware replacements, additional external lighting, security fencing, and bollard installations.

Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Whyalla, Mount Barker, Gawler, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, and Mount Gambier health services have all strategically implemented security guards on site.

The department continues to work closely with all the local health networks to support them all with their security posture. Furthermore, the department has developed the SA Health Agency Security Plan consistent with the South Australian Protective Security Framework requirements which elevates the agency's security maturity.

#### COMMUNITY SAFETY

In reply to the Hon. R.A. SIMMS (5 March 2025).

**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 Human Services has advised:

The Department of Human Services is budgeted to spend approximately \$35 million in 2024-25 towards youth justice programs and services which address the causes of crime.

#### ADELAIDE PARKLANDS FLYING FOX COLONY

In reply to the Hon. T.A. FRANKS (6 March 2025).

**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:

The Department for Environment and Water staff work closely with WOMADelaide event producers, Australian grey-headed flying fox experts and the SA grey-headed flying fox working group, which acts to develop an adaptive process for managing any potential animal or public health welfare issues, to enable the continued activation of Botanic Park, including for events such as WOMADelaide.

The continuous year-on-year growth of the grey-headed flying fox camp, from 10,000 animals in 2010 to over 50,000, would suggest that WOMADelaide is not causing disruption to the camp. Monitoring has shown that most of the animals stay within the camp during the festival event, with many behaviours observed being similar to when the event is not occurring.

The Department for Environment and Water has a range of measures in place to protect both the wellbeing of patrons and welfare of the grey-headed flying fox, including during the WOMADelaide festival. These measures include:

- Working with experts from Department for Environment and Water, Green Adelaide, University of Adelaide, City of Adelaide, SA Health, PIRSA, the commonwealth and Zoos SA.
- The application and regular review of the camp management plan and ongoing monitoring of the camp.

- Protocols for managing heat stress events, including fencing the camp area when needed and the deployment of a sprinkler system to lower the temperature within the camp.
- Safe work procedures are in place at all times for staff and contractors working near the camp, including animal handling and appropriate protective equipment.
- Provision of safety information on the WOMADelaide website and on site during the festival for all festival attendees and Botanic Garden visitors.
- Provision of space and facilities for Fauna Rescue SA, Bat Rescue SA and University of Adelaide to provide animal care when needed during the event. Sharing knowledge and information about flying foxes and promoting their conservation at Botanic Park via the WOMADelaide Bat Tent.
- Provision of longer term support for university research into flying fox conservation and camp management through facilitating access to the site, data provision, staff support and financial support.

On the basis of these observations and provisions, it is not intended that WOMADelaide be moved from its current location at the present time.

#### IMMIGRATION POLICY

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (19 March 2025).

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

1. The Australian Government's Continuous Survey of Australia's Migrants, shows that skilled migrants, including those nominated by states and territories, have higher rates of labour force participation, lower unemployment, and higher annual earnings when compared to the general population. The Review of the Migration System in 2023 found that state nominated skilled migrants make a lifetime per person economic contribution of \$2.8 million compared to \$1.6 million for the general population.

The South Australian government receives regular feedback from industry outlining the value of the state nominated General Skilled Migration (GSM) program in helping businesses to fill skills shortages and facilitate business growth.

2. The South Australian government monitors state nominated skilled migrants to understand their employment status, including alignment of their skills and qualifications with their occupations.

To continue to improve skilled migrant utilisation, the South Australian government is investing more than \$1.5 million and partnering with six organisations to unlock the full potential of skilled migration and address underutilisation and workforce shortages in priority sectors in South Australia. The Department of State Development will oversee and evaluate the outcomes of these initiatives, which also aim to improve the retention of skilled migrants in South Australia.

3. For the annual state nominated General Skilled Migration (GSM) program, the South Australian government undertakes detailed labour market analysis and industry engagement which underpins occupational planning levels for both onshore and offshore skilled visa nominations. The GSM program has clearly defined and published pathways under which skilled migrants can qualify for state nomination which align with workforce priorities for the state.