

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL****Tuesday, 13 May 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 land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to elders both past and present.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**ANSWERS TABLED**

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

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Regulations under Acts—

Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia Act 1995

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

Fee Notices under Acts—

Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Fees (2025)

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

Regulations under Acts—

Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994—Claims Management—  
Contractual Arrangements

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

By Laws under Acts—

Corporation of the City of Adelaide—No 10—Miscellaneous Amendment 2025

Regulations under Acts—

Passenger Transport Act 1994—Transit Barring Orders

By the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. E.S. Bourke)—

Regulations under Acts—

Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009—Exemption

*Ministerial Statement*

**SOUTH AUSTRALIA SOCIAL STATEMENT**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:18):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the South Australia Social Statement made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

**ACCESS TO THE PORT OF WHYALLA**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:18):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to access to the Port of Whyalla made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

*Personal Explanation***METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:27):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Last sitting week, I gave answers in question time regarding the payment of travel allowances by the MFS. Given the interest in this matter by the council, I can now provide a further update. At the outset, I am deeply regretful that firefighters were delayed in receiving payments of their travel allowances. Every worker in South Australia deserves to have their wages and entitlements paid in full and on time, not least our extraordinarily hardworking firefighters.

While I am advised this situation was a result of an administrative error rather than any deliberate intention by the MFS to withhold payments, clearly it should not have happened. It took too long to correct and it is simply not good enough. I am advised that the MFS has taken active steps to put processes in place to ensure that this does not happen again.

I am advised that following the orders of the South Australian Employment Tribunal all outstanding travel allowance payments have now been processed by the MFS. Further, I understand that payments are scheduled to be paid by Shared Services in tomorrow's pay cycle. I am advised that a dedicated email has also been provided, so any firefighters with concerns about travel payments can contact a staff member within the MFS.

In the course of question time last sitting week, I was asked some questions about the proceedings in the SAET. I take this opportunity to clarify the answers I gave, based on more detailed advice I have now received. I am advised that the MFS offered to settle the proceedings before SAET on the basis of orders for the payment of arrears within a specific timeframe. I am also advised that at the hearing before SAET the MFS did not oppose the making of orders for arrears and the payment of interest, although there was disagreement between the parties about the relevant timeframes for payments, as well as further orders sought by the UFU.

I am grateful for the advocacy that the UFU provide for their workforce and the feedback that they provide us. I understand the chief officer of the Metropolitan Fire Service and the UFU are in regular communication about a wide range of issues, and I am advised there were a number of meetings between the MFS and the UFU in relation to travel allowances. I have also met with the UFU as minister to hear their concerns about this matter.

I am advised the MFS chief officer has written to firefighters acknowledging the problem, apologising for the delays, and confirming the MFS was working to resolve the issue. I understand the chief officer has since provided several updates to firefighters about the matter, including an update sent earlier today to confirm that payments have been processed to Shared Services.

*Question Time***CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on the topic of departmental workplace culture.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** The Consumer and Business Services Review Report 2025 was released on 4 May following an announcement in September of last year that the department

would undergo a review into its workplace culture and leadership. Many respondents to the review of Consumer and Business Services, which is a division of the South Australian government's Attorney-General's Department, described the department as having a culture 'curated and based on personality, relationships, influence and informality, rather than one based on robust management practices and decision-making'.

When asked about intention to leave CBS, 80 per cent of respondents responded in the affirmative, citing three primary factors influencing their thinking: workload, leadership and workplace behaviours. There was also a theme throughout the review of unreasonable expectations held and demands made by some in the executive and senior management team. So my question to the Minister for Industrial Relations and the Public Sector is: how will the minister take responsibility for this toxic workplace culture?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:31):** I thank the honourable member for her question. Of course, as the minister having responsibility for the public sector, systemic issues across the public sector are always of concern. In relation to a particular area of the public sector, Consumer and Business Services employees are, of course, employees of the department overseen by my ministerial colleague the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, the member for Enfield, the Hon. Andrea Michaels, but, because I take a keen interest in many public sector matters, I am happy to provide some information for the honourable member.

On 30 September 2024, Ms Rosslyn Cox and the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment launched a review by way of presentation to Consumer and Business Services employees. Current employees and former employees who have left CBS (Consumer and Business Services) in the past two years were invited to participate in the review. The review achieved a participation rate of 61 per cent for current employees and 28 per cent for former employees. I am advised CBS employees had the opportunity to participate in a confidential survey designed to explore various elements of workplace experiences, including culture, communication, workload management and how individuals and teams work together.

CBS employees also had the opportunity to meet one-on-one with either Ms Cox or the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. I am advised that in total, 85 individual meetings were held with CBS staff. I am advised that Ms Cox has now completed the independent review and I am further advised that she has provided a final report. I am advised this final report was provided to CBS staff on 2 May 2025, and it has also been placed on the Attorney-General's Department internet site.

#### **CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:33):** Supplementary: is the minister concerned that the toxic workplace experience in CBS could be widespread and being experienced right across the public sector?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:33):** I am happy to answer the question. Certainly when there are experiences in particular areas, difficulties in workloads and other matters—I think it was only last year that the same person, Ms Rosslyn Cox, performed a review of the Director of Public Prosecutions office, given the workloads that they are under. So when there are concerns, I am very pleased that the government, in cooperation with the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, is able to do these sorts of reviews to give staff the opportunity to provide feedback to produce reports that can address issues.

#### **CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:34):** Supplementary: is the Attorney-General aware of complaints by CBS staff, who say the most serious concerns they raised with Ms Cox about the culture within CBS were not reported in the review? Is Ms Cox a hired gun for the department?

**The PRESIDENT:** You can choose to answer if you wish to, Attorney, but I don't see, really, how that is a supplementary question.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:34):** Again, I am always very happy to assist my colleagues and comrades in this chamber with information. In relation to the report, I think the reviewer who conducted the review into CBS and who also conducted the earlier review, as I mentioned, into the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions is very highly regarded. I think that the response rates to this particular review, from not just current but former employees, indicate that.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The PRESIDENT:** Before we go to the second question, can I acknowledge in the gallery the former President of the Legislative Council, the Hon. John Gazzola.

*Question Time*

**CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on the topic of departmental workplace culture. Will the minister ensure the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment is fully empowered to negotiate scope, resources and timeframes for public sector employees within the CBS with the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs and the Attorney-General's Department?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:35):** I thank the honourable member for her question. I didn't quite understand the question, but I will try to answer it as best I can. I think the fact that there was such a thorough overview with such high participation rates shows the confidence that employees had in that review.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! When you are both finished, the honourable Leader of the Opposition ask your third question, please.

**CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on the topic of departmental workplace culture. Do all public sector executives undergo leadership, capability and behavioural expectation training as a condition of holding senior roles? If not, will the government be mandating this in the future?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:36):** I am happy to take that largely on notice and find an answer as to the sorts of training that senior executives undergo. I have certainly addressed leadership training forums, leadership training courses and leadership training programs in the public sector, so there is quite extensive leadership training, and of course there are contracts that senior executives sign. But I am happy to bring back a full answer for the honourable member.

**ELDRIDGE, MS P.**

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:37):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General tell the council about the retirement of Judge Penny Eldridge from the role of judge of the Youth Court?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:37):** I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. It is an honour to be able to update the council on significant movements in the Youth Court and also the remarkable career of Judge Penny Eldridge, judge of the Youth Court. After being appointed a judge of the District Court in March 2016, Judge Eldridge then sat as the judge of the Youth Court and has remained there since, being in the position for almost 10 years.

In that time as judge of the Youth Court, Judge Eldridge has played a central and critical role in the lives of some of South Australia's most vulnerable young people and in her retirement is leaving a lasting legacy of her notable work. Judge Eldridge is well-known and rightly highly respected for her focus on mediation and having a hands-on approach in working with parents during proceedings, particularly in the Reunification Court.

Under Judge Eldridge's leadership, the Youth Court implemented the recommendations from the 2020 Reunification Court evaluation in 2021, which as a result now sees the court with a specific Aboriginal Reunification Court list that was further expanded in 2022. Judge Eldridge's regular utilisation of the Youth Aboriginal Community Court Adelaide (YACCA) was also to her great credit. Prior to her career as a judge of the Youth Court, Judge Eldridge was appointed as a magistrate in August 2003 and sat in the Civil Division at the Adelaide Magistrates Court for more than six years. Before these appointments, Judge Eldridge practised as a solicitor for 27 years, mainly in the areas of commercial litigation, defamation, estate litigation and education law.

As members may be aware, the Youth Court is a court of criminal and civil jurisdiction with powers conferred under a range of acts in South Australia. In addition to the jurisdictions conferred by legislation, the Youth Court may place the restriction or restraining orders under the Criminal Procedure Act or the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act. These significant powers and functions vested in the court have the ability to shape the course of young people's lives and are potentially very emotional and complex for children and their parents to navigate, so the particular focus of Judge Eldridge's practice on clearly explaining the law and its implications with children and their parents is critical.

I would like to wish Judge Eldridge the very best in the next chapter of her life and thank her and pay tribute to her career that has impacted on the lives of so many. I am pleased to share that District Court Judge Michelle Sutcliffe has been designated the new judge of the Youth Court. Judge Sutcliffe has previously managed the Magistrates Court's specialist domestic violence list and is extremely well-placed to take over the leadership of this important jurisdiction and continue the court's work with young people in South Australia.

#### **HIGH-RISK OFFENDERS**

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:40):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General about high-risk offenders.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE:** In October 2018, Michelle Foster was tragically killed by Jayden Lowah, a man with a severe mental illness. Despite expressing homicidal thoughts after his release from prison, Lowah was discharged into the community without adequate support. On 30 April 2025, the Coroner's findings highlighted multiple missed opportunities to address Lowah's mental health needs, and significant systemic failures in mental health, prison and hospital systems.

Fragmented information sharing between agencies and limited resources for psychiatrists contributed to this tragic outcome. Improved coordination and legislative mechanisms are essential to prevent similar incidents in the future. These issues underscore the urgent need for reform to manage individuals with chronic mental health conditions who pose a risk to public safety. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Will the Attorney-General consider the Coroner's recommendations and seek to broaden the definition of 'high-risk offenders' under the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015 to include an additional category for public risk and/or public interest?
2. Given the Coroner's findings on the fragmented information-sharing capabilities between various agencies managing mentally unwell individuals, what steps would the Attorney-General take to improve the coordination and communication between the prison system, the health system, mental health system, and community services?
3. Will the Attorney-General consider implementing a legislative mechanism for a level of supervision upon release, such as an extended supervision order, to ensure high-risk prisoners are adequately monitored and supported in the community?

**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 thank the honourable member for her question. We will, of course, examine the recent coronial recommendations in relation to the matter the honourable member has spoken about, and have a look to see what can or should be implemented. As the honourable member has pointed out, there is one area that particularly concerns the Attorney-General's Department—my portfolio—being recommendations into the High Risk Offender Scheme. Other matters, largely in terms of communication between health departments, will be led primarily, I expect, by my colleague the Minister for Health, the Hon. Chris Picton, member for Kaurana.

In relation to level of supervision and extended supervision orders, I am happy to let the honourable member know that extended supervision orders are one of the types of orders that can be made under our high-risk offender regime. The high-risk offender legislation contemplates a number of ways that people who pose a risk to the safety of the community can be put on orders, particularly after their original sentence has finished.

An interim supervision order is often requested and made while an application is being processed, which can then form an extended supervision order. Breaches of extended supervision orders, particularly in extreme cases, can end in continuing detention orders, where someone is then incarcerated for breaching their extended supervision order. Certainly under the High Risk Offender Scheme (HRO Scheme), we will have a look at what the Coroner has said, and have a look at how that might apply to this case.

#### STATE DEBT

**The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:44):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, regarding government debt.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.L. GAME:** In the 2024-25 state budget the Treasurer advised that general government debt would rise from \$19.1 billion on 30 June 2024 to \$33.6 billion by 30 June 2028, an extra \$12.4 billion in four years. This represents a 56 per cent increase in interest repayment expenses for taxpayers. The South Australian Government Financing Authority raises money from lenders by issuing pieces of paper that are government-backed promises to repay the lender. The South Australian Government Financing Authority is now issuing bonds under a 'sustainability' label program. This means money can be borrowed by the government for climate change programs under the Paris Agreement. My questions to the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, are:

1. How much money has been borrowed under the government's sustainability program and specifically for what projects?
2. Has the government borrowed money to fund energy rebates to South Australian taxpayers?
3. Has the government been transparent to taxpayers that the interest repayments on Paris Agreement support projects will be paid before patients in hospitals have their needs met, for example, and before contracts to upgrade public schools are signed?

**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 am happy to take those questions on notice and seek some responses from the Treasurer and bring them back to the chamber. While I am doing that, I might also ask the Treasurer about the former Liberal government's complete mismanagement and inability to deliver services and include them in the answer as well.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** I am trying to be helpful.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** We are waiting. The Hon. Ms Girolamo, you have the call, when you are ready.

**CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on departmental workplace culture.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO:** The review identifies leadership behaviours within CBS, described as favouritism, cliques and decision-making based on personality and relationships rather than merit. My question to the minister is: will the government initiate a whole of public sector independent review into workplace culture and leadership accountability?

*The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Hunter obviously wants to answer the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter, it's not chat time; it's question time. Stop the chatting.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:47):** I am happy to answer the question, but I will just note, before I do, that clearly the state opposition in the Legislative Council miss their former deputy leader, who would not have ever asked almost the identical question to the leader following on. They obviously don't compare notes. While it's an almost identical question, I am happy to largely repeat a previous answer. When there have been issues identified—and each department obviously has different issues identified—action can be, and often is, taken. As I have said, Ms Rosslyn Cox, who did the review in relation to CBS, also did a review I think about a year ago in relation to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

I think what the honourable member is suggesting is: are all departments absolutely identical, and should you do exactly the same thing in each one? I think that's a fundamental reason and a mistake that would be made. But in relation to the question she has asked, almost identical to one of her leader's questions, when there are problems identified or concerns raised, of course action is taken, and that is shown on the reviews that have occurred.

**CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49):** Supplementary: has the minister read the report?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:49):** The report is available on the AGD's website, and yes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr Gazzola, help! Order! Enough. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition! I don't want to have to stand up today, but I will.

**SOUTHERN BLUEFIN TUNA**

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:49):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the MSC certification awarded to our state's iconic southern bluefin tuna industry?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:50):** I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this important part of our economy. It was an absolute pleasure to attend the event a few weeks ago for our state's Australian southern bluefin tuna purse seine fishery as they celebrated

their achievement of attaining the prestigious Marine Stewardship Council certification. It is well known that South Australia is highly regarded for its premium aquaculture and wild-catch species, and sitting comfortably alongside southern rock lobster in terms of world recognition is our iconic southern bluefin tuna industry.

From the pioneers in Port Lincoln who brought foresight and innovation to the way they caught, ranched and developed a massive market around the world to the sector of today that has carried on in that tradition, southern bluefin tuna is a South Australian success story. South Australia already has an incredible reputation for quality and sustainability through our rigorous fisheries management. In attaining Marine Stewardship Council certification and the famous blue tick, southern bluefin tuna have added further confidence for customers and prospective markets that their product is sustainable and from healthy wild fish populations assessed against world-recognised MSC standards.

South Australia's tuna sector mainly uses the purse seine fishing method, where a net encloses on schooled fish that are then towed to Port Lincoln—as opposed to being landed on boats—where they are grown out in floating sea cages and fed their typical diet of sardines provided in large part by our state's sardine fishery, which is another example of an incredible South Australian and Port Lincoln success story. In South Australia, farms that are approved to operate for the farming of southern bluefin tuna are located within the Lincoln aquaculture zone, which is identified by the state's Lower Eyre Peninsula aquaculture zone policy, which in 2023 was improved to allow for the growth of our state's aquaculture industry in those highly sought-after waters.

Currently, there are seven aquaculture licences for farming the tuna in that zone, collectively occupying over 1,522 hectares of state waters. Farmed SBT makes up our state's largest aquaculture export, with Japan typically the largest market and Korea, China and our own domestic market growing quickly. Southern bluefin tuna joins other South Australian fisheries in attaining the prestigious MSC certification, including Spencer Gulf King Prawns, Goolwa Pipi and the sardine fishery. Clean Seas Seafood has attained the aquaculture equivalent, the Aquaculture Stewardship Council certification, for its yellowtail kingfish operation.

Southern bluefish tuna contributes an enormous amount to our state in terms of jobs and economic activity, with 330 direct and 593 flow-on FTE positions, and accounts for 45 per cent of the state's gross value of aquaculture production, which was \$120 million of the total \$264.4 million in 2022-23. In attaining MSC certification, the southern bluefish tuna sector further highlights their commitment to sustainability and to best practice, which underpins their stunning success as an industry.

The event at West Lakes was a great evening and a worthy celebration of an incredible achievement. It was great to hear on the night from my federal colleague Senator Karen Grogan about the federal Labor government's keen understanding of the importance of the southern bluefin tuna sector to our state and the importance of our fishing sectors as a whole. While we are talking about federal colleagues, I take a moment to congratulate Minister Collins on her reappointment and look forward to continuing to work with her in her role as Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. I was also pleased that I was joined by the Hon. Connie Bonaros on the night as well for what was an incredible evening.

Once again, congratulations to all involved in this achievement as well as the CEO of the Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association, Dan Casement, who has filled what I absolutely agree are huge shoes left behind from industry legend Brian Jeffriess, who I note even in retirement is still playing a key role in our state's fisheries in a number of ways.

#### LEGAL PROFESSION

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:54):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney a question in relation to the legal profession.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** The 2024 Review of Harassment in the South Australian Legal Profession was provided to the Attorney in December 2024 and released publicly on 23 January 2025. The report, which is a response to the 2021 review, includes 16 recommendations in total. At



least four of those recommendations recommend amendments to existing legislation, including the Equal Opportunity Act, the Legal Practitioners Act and the Evidence Act. A private member's bill has been introduced earlier this year in this place dealing with some of those recommendations. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Has the government responded to the Equal Opportunity Commission review and, if not, when does it expect that such a review will be provided to the commission?

2. Has a decision been made as to whether the government intends to adopt any of the legislative amendments and policy recommendations set out in the review?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:55):** I thank the honourable member for her question and pay tribute to her work in relation to this matter and acknowledge much of what has occurred has been because of her advocacy in this place and outside of it in relation to shining a spotlight on harassment in the legal profession.

I do note that in the recent review there was an anonymous survey that ran in the earlier part of last year with, I believe, some 600 in-scope survey responses and 43 written submissions. It was a very extensive review looking at what had occurred earlier. The honourable member points out that there were a number of recommendations made—I think 14 recommendations in total—some of which relate to suggested amendments to the Legal Practitioners Act, the Work Health and Safety Act and the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act and the government is currently receiving advice on the suggestions that were put forward.

I do not want to put an absolute timeframe on it, but I can assure the member that we are looking at it, we are receiving advice and if there are things that we think are workable that we can progress we will do that as soon as we practically can.

#### **CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:56):** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. What actions has he taken personally since the review was tabled in relation to CBS to make sure there is immediate change and accountability?

**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 question. As I pointed out, I think, in relation to the very first question that was asked in relation to this matter, Consumer and Business Services falls under the Minister for Consumer and Business Services, although it forms part of the Attorney-General's Department. The honourable member would be aware from her time in government, as the only person in the opposition who has spent any time performing executive functions in the government, that there are some departments that various parts of the department report to different ministers, as is the case with CBS under the Attorney-General's Department.

Over the almost 40 pages of the report there were, I think, 26 recommendations made. I understand they have been accepted and are looking to be implemented, but I am happy to go away and if there is further advice about the implementation of the recommendations by another minister I am happy to bring back a further response.

#### **CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:58):** Supplementary: can the minister advise what the most serious consequences from this review will be?

**The PRESIDENT:** I'm not quite sure how that can be a supplementary.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:58):** I was happy to indulge others, but this is so far away from it.

**CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:58):** Supplementary: what is the government's timeline for implementation of those 26 recommendations?

**The PRESIDENT:** You spoke about the 26 recommendations.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:58):** As I have said, the implementation of the recommendations falls under the purview of another minister, but I am happy to go away and see if there is anything further that can be added.

**ELITE WOMEN'S BASKETBALL**

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister inform the council about the future of elite women's basketball in South Australia?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:58):** I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in women's basketball and to speak about the future of one of South Australia's most iconic sporting teams, Adelaide Lightning. Since entering the Women's National Basketball League in 1993, Adelaide Lightning has carved out a legacy as the most successful club in its league's history. With five WNBL championships and a track record of developing world-class athletics, including Olympians and WNBL champions, Lightning is not just a team, it is a symbol of excellence and an opportunity for community pride.

Many remember the glory years: the championships in 1994, 1995, 1996 and again in 1998. Names like Jan Stirling and Rachael Sporn have become famous for South Australian basketball greatness. Rachael represented Australia at three Olympic Games and was a part of four Lightning championships in the nineties. The team was consistently in the finals and its contribution to women's sport in Australia is unmatched.

Despite its rich history, the future of the Adelaide Lightning was recently cast in doubt, putting South Australia's representation in the WNBL at serious risk. That's when the Malinauskas Labor government stepped in. We knew it was unthinkable to let the Lightning disappear. We acted decisively, working in partnership with the WNBL and a new ownership group to ensure this team continues to inspire the next generation of women and girls across our state.

Through a combined financial and in-kind support package, we are not just keeping the lights on, we are keeping the Lightning thriving. Under this agreement, the team will now train at the newly opened \$88 million South Australian Sports Institute facility at Mile End, with a world-class high-performance gym, testing lab, elite courts and dedicated recovery zones. The Lightning will also receive access to coaching support, office space, medical services and a nurturing environment to elevate their game.

In addition, we have committed \$100,000 a year over three years to support community-based programs that inspire girls and women to take up basketball and pursue elite pathways. Our partnership with the THINK! Road Safety initiative, valued at over \$100,000 annually, will also be continued.

This investment is about more than saving a team, it is about what the team represents: resilience, ambition and excellence. It is about ensuring that young girls across South Australia can look to the Lightning team and see what is possible. This is a win for the club and the community who fought so hard for its future. The Adelaide Lightning is not just staying in the WNBL, it is entering a new era backed by a state that believes in women's sport and is proud to see our champions shine on a national stage.

**SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM**

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:02):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of South Australia's toxic algal bloom.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS:** The algal bloom that is causing marine deaths across the South Australian coast has been reported by the ABC to be nearly the size of Kangaroo Island. According to a statement released by PIRSA, the effects of the algal bloom are being felt right across Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula and Fleurieu Peninsula. The statement claims that a marine heatwave has been a contributing factor for the harmful algal bloom.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released a report back in 2019 that cited harmful algal blooms as being a risk to human health and marine health that is projected to increase along with the increase in global warming and rising CO<sub>2</sub> levels. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, therefore, are:

1. Has the minister's department undertaken any modelling to look at whether harmful algal blooms will become more prevalent in the years ahead as climate change worsens?
2. What is the Malinauskas government doing to prevent these algal blooms from having future impacts on our coastlines, in particular in our regions?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:03):** I thank the honourable member for his questions. It is certainly the case that there is grave concern across the state because of the algal bloom. We have seen a number of deaths of various sea creatures, many of which have been associated with the *Karenia mikimotoi* algal bloom which has, as the honourable member referred to, been described as almost the size of Kangaroo Island.

As a government, we have been working across agencies because, of course, this is not something that simply falls neatly into one government agency. My department, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia, has been working with the Department for Environment and Water, the EPA and SA Health.

Some weeks ago, the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Environment, and I hosted an update meeting with local councils and we have another meeting scheduled for later this week to provide further updates and discussions. I think it's an interesting reminder of how much bigger than ourselves nature is. I have said so publicly I think on radio, and the Minister for Environment, the Deputy Premier in the other place, has made similar remarks.

We can't do anything to dissipate this algal bloom. As referenced by the honourable member, a marine heatwave is considered to be responsible for it, with sea temperatures being about 2½° more than usual. That means that until we have a change in the weather, essentially, we cannot expect there to be a significant reduction in the size of the algal bloom. We need certain winds, we need certain swells to be able to see that happen.

Fortunately, algal blooms are not new; there is a lot of experience from around the globe in regard to them. Often, they will only last a few weeks, but when the temperatures or the weather patterns are different, then obviously the behaviour of the algal bloom will be different as well. I am sure we all hope that those changes in weather conditions will occur in the near future and dissipate this algal bloom.

#### SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:05):** Supplementary: how is the minister and her department working in particular with the oyster farmers to ensure that they have clarity and certainty in regard to the *Karenia brevis* algal outbreak?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:06):** The department has been working with various industry sectors that are being affected by this. On 5 May, PIRSA received results of tissue samples collected in the Stansbury aquaculture oyster harvesting area. The preliminary tissue sample test results have indicated the low-level presence of brevetoxins, which is a neurotoxic shellfish toxin, at a rate of 0.36 milligrams per kilogram.

This was part of routine testing undertaken by the South Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (SASQAP), a joint initiative by the state government and the shellfish sector to assure consumers that South Australian shellfish is safe for human consumption. SASQAP will continue to undertake further testing.

It's important to note that at this stage there has been a precautionary closure. That doesn't mean that there is a risk to human health. It is not unusual for closures to be done on a precautionary basis to ensure that there is no danger. Results so far in shellfish remain under the levels of the food safety Australia and New Zealand standards. SASQAP will continue coordinating sampling and testing of areas and we will share those results as they become available.

### **CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:07):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on the topic of departmental workplace culture.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B.R. HOOD:** The Office of the Commissioner of Public Sector Employment conducts an annual People Matter Employee Survey to monitor organisational culture and workplace wellbeing. My question to the minister is: what processes are in place to act upon the annual survey findings from the commissioner, and in relation to the CBS review, does the Attorney-General believe that these processes have failed to identify or address the issues that were found in the report?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:08):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, in relation to the People Matter Employee Survey, I am aware that individual statistics and reports are provided by the commissioner to individual agencies and I understand there are meetings with heads of agencies to go through what the findings are in particular areas to make improvements where they can in particular areas.

I am happy to go and check to make sure, but in relation to things like staff satisfaction, CBS in particular and the Attorney-General's Department more generally, did, as they often do, feature quite highly in the People Matter Employee Survey. I am not sure to what extent some of the issues that were raised in the Rosslyn Cox survey of CBS were apparent from the People Matter Employee Survey, but I am happy to go and check to see if there is any data that could have been meaningfully applied. As I say, from my memory both CBS and the Attorney-General's Department more widely did quite well in that People Matter Employee Survey. But if there were things that were there, I am happy to see if that is the case.

### **INTERNATIONAL WORKERS' MEMORIAL DAY**

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:09):** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. Can the minister tell the council about this year's Workers' Memorial Day events?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:10):** I would be most happy to do so. As many in this chamber would be aware, 28 April is International Workers' Memorial Day. This is a day when we remember and commemorate workers who have been killed and injured at work and recommit ourselves to the essential task of ensuring every worker comes home safely at the end of each day.

The commemoration of Workers' Memorial Day is bookended by two notable events in Adelaide. The first was a service on the morning of 28 April at Pilgrim Uniting Church in the city, hosted by Voice of Industrial Death (VOID), a support and advocacy group for families affected by workplace deaths. This year's VOID event was very well attended by a cross-section of the community, including trade unions, health and safety officials and regulators, and many members of this chamber of parliament and other members of parliament and, most poignantly and importantly, the families who have suffered incredible loss from workplace tragedies.

The event included a range of readings and reflections, as well as the honour roll of workers who have lost their lives at work. It cannot go without noticing that the list of workers grows longer

and longer every year. It is a stark reminder of the importance of safe workplaces. The founder of Voice of Industrial Death, Andrea Madeley, would be well known to many members in this chamber. Since the tragic death of her son Daniel in a workplace incident, she has been a staunch champion for the health and safety of workers.

This government, and myself as minister, have certainly benefited from Andrea's insights, and I am very pleased that she is a member of the SafeWork SA Advisory Committee, representing the interests of victims and their families. Andrea does incredible work on behalf of those families, and the significant time and effort that goes into organising the Workers' Memorial Day service is a testament to her commitment.

The other significant event bookending the Workers' Memorial Day events was the ceremony on the morning of Sunday 4 May at the Port Adelaide Workers Memorial. Each year, a single name is inscribed on the monument of the statue of Justice on the corner of Commercial Road in Port Adelaide, to commemorate a person who has made a significant contribution to promoting workers' rights.

Nobody could be more fitting of that honour than this year's recipient, Mick Tumbers. While many have described him as a giant of the labour movement, Mick Tumbers certainly took on that mantle in the work that he did. He was a towering figure, both physically and in his zeal and commitment to improving the lives of working people.

Few who encountered Mick will forget his deep, resonating, booming voice and his passionate call to action. Even fewer would probably follow everything Mick Tumbers said, because he had a mastery of the English language that few could intellectually keep up with. I strongly suspect some of the words that he used were actually made up, but I can't be certain because I don't understand most of the ones that were actual words that he used as well.

After beginning a metal trades apprenticeship at the age of 13, Mick became engaged in union activism and ultimately became an official of the Metal Workers' Union and its successor, the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union, for nearly 40 years. Mick was a true leader, someone who could effortlessly command the attention of an entire room and lead his members fearlessly through the most challenging industrial fights. He could also command the absolute attention of rooms like the Labor Party state convention, where I know ministers in this government have been on the receiving end of some of his views that he put so forcefully.

He was also an irreplaceable friend and mentor to countless members, officials and activists within the broader labour movement, and particularly the left part of the Labor Party. His commitment, wisdom and guidance were a clear beacon in difficult times to many, many people, including myself. Mick sadly passed away two years ago from mesothelioma, after a lifetime of fighting for the health and safety of other working people. He is survived by his partner, Max, and his daughter, Shauna, who both spoke powerfully at the Workers' Memorial Day event about not only his commitment to the progress of working people but also his private life as a deeply loving and supportive father and partner.

We are all poorer for having lost Mick, but this Workers' Memorial Day the commemoration of his achievements reminds us of the refrain that is often repeated on the day: remember the dead, fight for the living.

#### **POLICE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:14):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Police in another place, a question about workplace harassment and bullying.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** On 12 September last year, police commissioner Grant Stevens announced SAPOL had launched an investigation into shocking claims that serving officers and police union staff were regularly bullied and belittled by a boys' club of senior union officials. The investigation followed disturbing allegations I made in this place that female union staff were labelled

'old', 'fat' and 'ugly'. Female members were called 'menopausal and histrionic' and 'silly cows' and some members suffering PTSD were referred to as 'broken biscuits'.

To this day, those who were the subjects of that abuse still carry the emotional and psychological scars. At the time, police commissioner Stevens said, and I quote:

Anyone using the type of language referred to by Mr Pangallo has no place in any modern workplace. Communications in a workplace should be open and civil. Furthermore, there is no place for behaviour or language that demonstrates a lack of respect, compassion and empathy for any worker experiencing a psychological injury.

Mr Stevens went on to say, and rightly so, that all employees had a right to a workplace free from bullying, harassment and discrimination. My questions to the minister are:

1. Eight months later, what is the status of the investigation?
2. How many people were interviewed as part of the investigation?
3. Has the investigation been completed and has any disciplinary action been taken against any staff of the Police Association? If so, what action and if not, why not?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:16):** I thank the honourable member for his questions and I will pass them on to the police minister in the other place and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

#### **CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE**

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:17):** My questions are to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Minister, following the release of the Consumer and Business Services Review Report recently:

1. Is the minister concerned that the report showed some 80 per cent of respondents indicated they will leave the CBS, and is such a high number acceptable to the government?
2. Outside of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment survey, does the minister have any data to ensure that such high levels of dissatisfaction and intention to leave do not exist across the public sector?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:17):** I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. I think the other Hon. Mr Hood asked a question that went to the People Matter survey, which is a regular survey that gauges the sentiment and the outlook of public sector employees in South Australia. Certainly, that is a useful tool for the public sector generally but specifically for individual agencies that can then compare how they sit and the reflective views of their employees.

The statistic that the honourable member quoted from the publicly released report of Ms Cox into CBS shows that there are a number, I think, if I am remembering rightly, and I think the honourable member has quoted correctly, 80 per cent who consider leaving. I think we do see higher than usual intentions of workplace mobility in times of very full employment, which we are fortunate that we have had across Australia and, in particular, South Australia for some time, South Australia having recorded, I think, historic levels of being above the national average and in fact having led the nation in low unemployment rates, which does make it a competitive work environment.

In relation to other metrics or statistics or surveys, I do not think we would consider replacing the People Matter survey. It is a comprehensive survey that measures a whole range of areas. Would we consider further surveys? I think the answer is no. It would be replicating what already occurs, but it does provide a useful tool.

#### **FORESTRY CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE**

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:19):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the council on the recent milestone achieved in the development of the Forestry Centre of Excellence?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:19):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Members

in this place will be aware of the Malinauskas Labor government's ongoing commitment to the forest industry in South Australia. The South Australian forest industry is a key source of employment for many South Australians, particularly in the South-East of the state. In total, the industry employs 21,000 people, both directly and indirectly, and contributes around \$3 billion to our economy each year.

It is often said that the forest industry is the ultimate renewable and, at a time when governments across the world are seeking to decarbonise their economies, it's important that we continue to advance critical research and development within the forest sector. That is why the state government is investing over \$16 million in the establishment of the Forestry Centre of Excellence at a permanent purpose-built facility at the research, education and training precinct in Mount Gambier.

I was pleased to be able to participate recently in the sod turn for the start of construction of the new facility, which is the latest chapter in the Malinauskas Labor government's investment in the forest industry, which now totals more than \$21 million. I was pleased to be joined at the sod turn by the Acting Vice Chancellor of UniSA, Professor Marnie Hughes-Warrington; the Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Forest Products Association, Nathan Paine; and the Forestry Centre of Excellence Director, Professor Jeff Morell.

The Forestry Centre of Excellence is a 10-year collaborative project between the state government, the University of South Australia and industry. The aim of the centre is to create long-term research and development capability for the Green Triangle forest industry to enhance its economic prosperity and to generate more jobs and more investment in the region. The facility is co-located within the Mount Gambier research, education and training precinct, providing close proximity to the UniSA Mount Gambier campus, the new Mount Gambier Technical College and the Mount Gambier TAFE site. This provides a unique opportunity to link with a broad range of community, educational and research partners.

I am delighted that the Forestry Centre of Excellence will showcase locally sourced timber materials, and I once again thank and congratulate industry for their input on this key feature of the centre. The centre is due to be complete in early 2026 and, once completed, will also accommodate the Green Triangle Forest Industries Hub and Tree Breeding Australia.

Our local plantation forest region in the South-East is one of the powerhouses of the Australian forest industry. This year marks 150 years of innovation and experience in growing and producing world-recognised forestry products in South Australia, and the work and research that will emerge from this advanced facility will help ensure the industry is well placed for the next 150 years.

### GREYHOUND RACING

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:22):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing on the topic of increasing greyhound racing deaths and injuries.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** The Ashton inquiry commissioned by the Malinauskas government identified many significant failings in animal welfare, governance and integrity in the greyhound racing industry in our state, making over 85 recommendations. Greyhound Racing SA were given a period of two years to address these or face losing their social licence and the industry being shut down. We are now almost a year into that period. On 18 February this year, I asked the minister:

...what is the greyhound death and injury rate per thousand starters that the Malinauskas government will deem acceptable for this cruelty to continue?

The minister undertook to take on that data and get a response back to me. I have yet to hear a response to that question. Since that time, the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector has published his third quarterly progress report, highlighting that another four recommendations had been completed and one partially completed, meaning that a grand total of 16 out of the 86 recommendations have now been completed. That is 70 still to go and, again, we are almost a year into that two-year window. One of the recommendations that was completed in the last quarter was No. 24:

GRSA publish a quarterly analysis of greyhound injury data in the same manner as [the Greyhound Welfare Integrity Commission of New South Wales]. This analysis must be published to the community.

My questions to the minister therefore are:

1. Is the minister aware that the analysis of greyhound racing injuries from 1 October to 31 December 2024 shows that the quarter's injury total of 305 is 13.4 per cent higher than the July-September 2024 figures?

2. At what point will GRSA be put on notice that their go-slow tactics are unacceptable and their failure to adopt even the simplest recommendations, such as limiting the number of dogs to six per race, will not be tolerated?

3. Does the minister have confidence that the board of GRSA are on track to deliver the reforms that Commissioner Ashton identified as essential if the industry is to retain its social licence?

4. Can the minister advise whether the vacancy advertised for a welfare compliance officer, currently shown on the GRSA website, that had an application deadline for 17 January, has in fact now been filled, and, if not, does the minister have confidence that the functions of this role, namely, ensuring compliance with animal welfare standards, are currently being carried out by the GRSA?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:25):** I thank the member for her question. As she has highlighted, we have taken steps in South Australia—through this parliament as well—to make sure that we can make change in this space. I know that Greyhound Racing South Australia is wanting to make change, and I agree that they do need to move at a rapid pace because, at the end of the day, the industry is in their hands.

We know that Sal Perna, who is the GIRI inspector in this space, has been overseeing what these recommendations are doing and how they are tracking, and it is something that I am very intrigued to see how this does start to move faster. They do need to move at a rapid rate to make sure that their industry can survive. I do know that the members of this organisation are committed to doing that. They have tried to find steps to make sure that these recommendations can be met and I will continue to work with them to make sure that we can get updates on how they are progressing.

#### GREYHOUND RACING

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:26):** Supplementary: given the current animal welfare position appears to be unfilled, is the minister confident that GRSA are doing all that they can to comply with the recommendations?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:26):** I will have to look into that further regarding that position.

#### CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:26):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector on the topic of departmental workplace culture.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Recommendation 1 of the Consumer and Business Services Review Report is, and I quote:

That CBS, in conjunction with AGD, consider developing a budget bid for additional resources.

Given the budget is to be handed down on 5 June, my question to the minister is: will the minister be transparent with the public in regard to what extra funding will be required in that budget bid to fix the cultural dysfunction, and whether taxpayers are now footing the bill for mismanagement?



**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. I have attempted to be as generous as I possibly can be with questions that are directed to another minister's portfolio, but I understand it is very difficult because, as we have traversed today, the Hon. Michelle Lensink is the only, the single person opposite, who has come anywhere near executive government and sitting around a cabinet table. I do understand that the Leader of the Opposition is at a very significant disadvantage from some of the other people in this chamber, not having been anywhere near executive government and not having—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** As I was saying, I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is doing the very best that she can, but not having had the experience and the understanding of actually how government works, how budget processes work, about how ministerial responsibility works, it is very difficult to construct questions. Even if the questions are just a slight variation and a repeat of questions that have been asked before, budget processes for individual ministers are put up by those ministers and worked through by those ministers.

### **AFL GATHER ROUND**

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:28):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister inform the council about the ongoing legacy of the Gather Round?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:28):** I thank the honourable member for his question and interest about the ongoing legacy of the AFL Gather Round, an event that not only brought national attention to South Australia but continues to deliver real, lasting benefits for grassroots sports across our state. AFL Gather Round 2025 was another standout success with more than 269,000 fans attending matches across the Gather Round weekend. It brought record hotel bookings and full flights into Adelaide and vibrant activity to our city streets, regional venues and local businesses.

But what I am most proud of is how the success is now translating into tangible support for our local clubs and communities. That is the vision behind the South Australian Football Facilities Fund, a collaboration between the Malinauskas government, SANFL and the AFL. Round 2 of the fund delivered almost \$3 million to 37 football infrastructure projects right across South Australia, including 20 in regional areas and 17 in metropolitan Adelaide. These grants are helping to deliver female-friendly change rooms, upgraded lighting, new irrigation systems, improved turf quality and vital supporting infrastructure like scoreboards, goalposts and umpire amenities. They are all designed to make our football clubs more inclusive and more accessible.

A highlight for me was recently visiting the Booleroo Melrose Wilmington (BMW) Football Club and meeting Joe, the president, along with Lachie, Cameron, Jess and Carly, to celebrate their successful grant of over \$60,000. The funding will go towards upgrading irrigation and drainage at the oval in Melrose, a project that will significantly improve playing conditions. It is another fantastic example of this program.

In addition to the success of this program, we also know the Albanese Labor government, through their election commitments, will invest over \$3.5 million in the Glenelg Football Club's second oval at Seaview High School. This major investment will deliver improved training spaces and even better access for both Seaview High School and Glenelg Football Club. These investments go into showing how we can invest not only in our elite athletes but also in our grassroots sport.

### *Bills*

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

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2025.)

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:31):** I rise to place some remarks on the record in relation to this particular bill. The Liberal Party has had some longstanding concerns that the implementation of the environment and food production areas (EFPAs) in 2016-17 had problems. There is a prevailing view in the community that the insertion into the PDI Act at that time was a hasty deal done between Greens MLC Mark Parnell and the planning minister, the Hon. John Rau. At that time, the Liberal Party opposed clauses which brought EFPAs into effect when the PDI Bill was being debated. My understanding from the process is that some of those clauses were recommitted and the EFPAs were inserted through one vote in the Legislative Council.

It is also worth bearing in mind that the impact for South Australia of having this unique legislation is that EFPAs prevent subdivision, but they do not change local planning zones; that is a separate process through code amendments. EFPAs do not impact on the ability to sell or continue to use land for primary production purposes or any other purpose, but the impact of the sum total of EFPAs in South Australia has restricted land, which has contributed to the increase in land prices in the Greater Adelaide region. It is a simple Economics 101 matter that, if you restrict supply, prices increase.

The legacy of the hastiness with which they were brought in in that period is that details regarding the process of developing the boundaries for the map which was entered into legislation are scant—and that is being polite. There are significant parcels of land that are contained within the EFPA which are unlikely to meet any of the tests of being, if I quote directly from the PDI Act clause 7(3), 'areas of rural, landscape, environmental or food production significance'—land purchased by developers for the purpose of greenfields housing before the EFPA had been retrospectively locked up in the EFPA scheme in perpetuity.

It is also of note, as I think I said, that the EFPA does not prevent building and construction: it only prevents subdivisions. In that sense, areas that are within the EFPA could in theory have significant construction, industrial things and the like; it just essentially prevents housing. This was a matter that I raised when we had a briefing sometime in 2022 at the Environment, Resources and Development Committee from the Chair of the State Planning Commission, Mr Craig Holden, and Mr Brett Steiner from PLUS in the department. One of the comments that was made by one of those two gentlemen in evidence is:

We do know that not all land is equal within the EFPA. It does a couple of things, though: (1) connect primary production, (2) land that's got environmental value, and (3) essentially tries to make the urban form of Adelaide more efficient by utilising land within that existing urban boundary before looking further afield at other areas.

For some time, I have been interested in whether the claims about the original boundaries reflected our most valuable primary production and environmental areas, so I asked whether PIRSA or the State Planning Commission had done a really good assessment of land productivity to prioritise the development of less productive land before pursuing better farming land. This was the answer given:

—we are...familiar with the land north from Roseworthy—that the minister—

that is, Minister Champion—

says is the golden mile. That's where the cereal farmers [have] very productive land. We want to hear from the community and from the farmers to say [to them]: 'This land north of Roseworthy is highly valued productive land and we should think long and hard before that becomes any future housing.' Equally...the trunk road up through Dublin and the like is lower value productive land, and so we need to think about where we actually plan for growth.

I just pause there from my notes because what that says to me is that the thinking in 2022 was that the minister—and I have heard this said several times at different conferences by the minister himself, referring to the golden mile, which is that region of Roseworthy and that part of productivity that some of the public servants had indicated he wanted to stay away from. For the planning experts to come into a parliamentary committee and identify Dublin as a specific area would have indicated, I would have thought, that there was merit in one of the amendments particularly that we are proposing through the amendments that we have before us today.

The draft GARP raises a number of potential growth opportunities, including Roseworthy; however, given the minister had previously made those quotes expressing scepticism about new housing being located there, that might explain why there were not more fervent submissions to the

draft GARP to explicitly express opposition to Roseworthy or other townships in the Adelaide Plains. The impact of EFPAs is limited to areas located within the Greater Adelaide region, which sets out areas of growth for housing and employment with a 30-year horizon.

Varying the boundaries of the EFPA is challenging. There is one of two options. Firstly, there is a statutory review, which is set out in existing section 7 of the act. This means a variation is through the State Planning Commission and is exceptionally prescriptive, as it is at the moment. Section 7(3)(a) states that the commission may only vary EFPAs within the Greater Adelaide region if there is inadequate land available in the next 15 years. The bill seeks to amend '15 years' to '30 years' to align variations with the GARP. The commission conducts a review every five years, but it is still restricted to certain parameters in the act.

The second way of changing the options is an amendment bill, which must be passed by both houses of parliament as per this bill. This effectively means that EFPAs are frozen and variations for significant changes or anomalies are likely to be few and far between under the current rules and potentially even as amended by this bill.

Successive ministers responsible for planning would have received numerous representations regarding EFPAs and various opportunities that could potentially be in there. Minister Champion was asked about this issue publicly at UDIA conferences, which are held annually in March, so one last year and one this year. His responses at both have been very similar in saying that it is too hard to change the EFPA as it needs to go to parliament, which was met with disappointment by the people in the audience.

After his comments at last year's conference, I spoke to his adviser and offered my support for some changes that we could make in a bipartisan way. We followed that up with a meeting later that month in March. We agreed to a pathway, including for our local MPs, who are the ones who often receive representations and who understand the areas quite well and can test on the ground the validity of where the boundaries are. They then made submissions directly to the minister's office by July last year or via me.

We did not advocate for productive land to be taken out of the EFPAs, just for the record, and after those submissions were made last year we did not hear anything back from the minister. I think I might have sent him the odd message encouraging him to bring these matters forward and did not have a response.

When the minister was asked at this year's UDIA conference and gave the same responses that he did last year, I took the opportunity to state publicly that the Liberal Party is ready and willing to work with him. A couple of weeks later, there was an announcement made. Unfortunately for everyone, including a number of the stakeholder groups, this bill that is before us was released very quickly, surprising many, particularly primary industry groups that had been working towards what they thought was a 2027 review.

Industry would love to see more detail about the reports that sit behind these decisions and councils would as well because a number of them have done their own growth plans, many of which were ignored and I will speak to that specifically in relation to the Adelaide Plains, which has been very receptive to growth but supports land west of Port Wakefield Highway, which is what we are seeking to have included.

We also know that in that Adelaide Plains region there is significant difficulty already because in some areas that are slated for growth there is a lack of water pressure, such that some of the farmers there cannot actually access their water. Sewage is tanked from many homes to Murray Bridge. Stormwater is already a problem in that region, and it is anticipated that Two Wells and Virginia will be flooded. So why the government has chosen those particular areas we would all like to know more about.

Further, the bill amends the trigger for variations, as set out in clause 7, from 15 years to 30 years to align with the GARP. As I said, there is apparently a potential subdivision loophole that has not been tested that will be closed through these amendments and it gives effect to a revised map that alters some of the existing EFPA boundaries, which is the proposed map known as G9/2025. The locations that are impacted by the change are, firstly, an expansion of the land around

township boundaries for Murray Bridge, which has been enthusiastically supported by the council and the local member, the member for Hammond, Mr Adrian Pederick. It supports the proposed development known as Gifford Hill or the racecourse.

Secondly, there is expansion of land around township boundaries at Victor Harbor and Goolwa, which is not enthusiastically supported by the local council or the local member, Mr David Basham, because it goes into areas that are not well serviced and we are proposing to add areas that are currently better serviced than those. There is then the issue of land around township boundaries around Roseworthy and Two Wells, which is not supported by locals.

We were advised in the briefing that the process by which the government's bill was determined was that they were agnostic about who owns the land and that there was a multicriteria analysis of a number of factors, including productivity of land with some 20-plus assets—which were not weighted differentially—with investigation reports. We asked for those reports to be provided. They have not been provided, unfortunately, so there is a lack of transparency about how this has been arrived at.

I would have to say that this is very much the Labor government's bill. It is fairly typical of the way that I have come to expect the minister to behave: that things are done in a great big hurry and pushed through without having everybody, including the stakeholders who had input to—in fact, I think some of them received phone calls the day that it was announced and they were very surprised. If it had been a bill that we had put together, we would have taken a very different approach and conducted a proper audit of all the land that is in the EFPA's to test that, because that has been the question that has arisen time and time again.

It is disappointing, I think, that the government is not going to be accepting our amendments. They showed reluctance to support our amendments in the House of Assembly and they will once again, so in good faith we have tried to do the best in the time available. Our threshold question, of course, in any of these debates is whether we support the bill or oppose the bill. It is not really a question of 'subject to conditions' in this case—particularly given that we thought the EFPA's were spurious in the first place and do not necessarily protect things, particularly if they are not areas that should be validly agreed to under the conditions in the act.

Obviously, we are in the middle of a housing crisis, so of course we are going to agree for land to be released for subdivision. The Premier speaks about pulling every lever available for the housing crisis, yet he has a golden opportunity to accept the Liberal Party's amendments to this legislation which would see a significant amount of additional land provided.

I would also like to refer to the Demographia International Housing Affordability index. This is done on a regular basis. It is an annual report that assesses housing affordability in 94 major markets across eight nations: Australia, Canada, China, Ireland, New Zealand, Singapore, the United Kingdom and the United States. This is the 2024 edition and it rates the affordability of each of those housing markets, roughly. Affordable is—whatever their metric is—3.0 and under, through to moderately, seriously and severely unaffordable, with the most being impossibly unaffordable, which is 9.0 and over. This is what it has to say about Australia. It says the median market is 9.7, so that fits into the impossibly unaffordable market. I think it is worth reading out this paragraph:

The least affordable market in the English-speaking world in 2023 was Hong Kong...followed by Sydney...Vancouver...San Jose...Los Angeles...Honolulu...Melbourne...San Francisco and Adelaide...

Adelaide is at ninth out of 94 across the globe. What they go on to say is, and we know this:

Middle-income households face rapidly escalating housing costs, which is the primary cause of the present cost-of-living crisis. For decades, home prices generally rose at about the same rate as income, and homeownership became more widespread. But affordability is disappearing in high-income nations as housing costs now far outpace income growth. The crisis stems principally from land use policies that artificially restrict housing supply, driving up land prices and making homeownership unattainable for many. Urban containment policies—

which is what this is part of, in addition to what we already have, which is the Hills Face Zone and the character preservation districts of McLaren Vale and the Barossa, but this one in particular, which, personally, I think is short-sighted—

are designed to limit sprawl and increase density. While well-intentioned, these policies severely constrict the land available for housing. In constrained markets, high land values translate to dramatically higher house prices.

So it should come as no surprise to anyone that this has made a significant impact on housing affordability in South Australia. I will not read all of this, but it does talk about the Australian market. It states:

Australian markets have a median multiple of 9.7, having deteriorated from 6.9 in 2019. This represents an increase of 2.8 years of median household income, in just three years.

Melbourne, with an impossibly unaffordable median multiple of 9.8, is the 88<sup>th</sup> least affordable of the 94 markets. Even far less renown Adelaide had an impossibly unaffordable median multiple of 9.7, ranked 86<sup>th</sup> among the 94 markets.

So we are reaping what was sowed by the Labor Party and the Greens. We have had a number of requests and submissions from a range of people in relation to this bill. I do appreciate that some of the requests sit outside of this particular legislation and therefore we would not be able to include them as they would be ruled out of order.

We have been asked to oppose the clause in the bill which amends the trigger for variations as set out in clause 7 of the act, from 15 years to 30 years. We are not able to agree to that request because for some time we have been of the view that the existing test is already too high and I think it makes sense that if we have a Greater Adelaide Regional Plan (GARP), which looks to 30 years, that the test that is in the act should be aligned with that.

We have been asked to introduce more rigour into the process of identification of primary production land, which we are seeking to amend with one of our amendments because we believe that better transparency is absolutely critical in this process. I think there is a number of people who feel betrayed by what has taken place with this bill just being lobbed into the parliament two years earlier than anyone expected.

We have been asked to address buffer zones, and we want that to be part of what is considered into the future. I think the correct language is 'interface management', and that forms part of our amendments. We do not think that it is within the scope of the planning act to prescribe the actual buffer zones, particularly if some of these matters relate to noise and spray drift issues because they sit within the EPA Act, but I am pleased to see that in the debate in the other place there have been commitments that they will also be considered.

This bill will not stop infill—let's just say that for the record—because it does not actually change the general neighbourhood zones that apply across most of metropolitan Adelaide. It is not going to stop developers turning a traditional quarter-acre block into three townhouses, so let's not accept the spin from this government. We would like to ensure that these boundaries fulfil their purpose, not be what they were: very random lines on a map that do not actually do what the act says they are supposed to do. We think the future reviews are incredibly important.

This government is not moving fast enough in this housing crisis if you compare it to how fast we moved in the crisis we handled, which was the pandemic. Let's consider that by the time of the election, in just a few months' time, Peter Malinauskas' government will not have built a single house on any of the land releases that were announced in February 2023 and, without seriously addressing workforce and materials, they remain empty. There are constant references to Seaton and Prospect Corner, both of which were Liberal initiatives.

For a bit of history: Prospect Corner was one of the sites that was owned by the German supermarket chain Kaufland, and in the middle of the pandemic we made the decision to purchase the Prospect site and Forestville, because they were only offered as a package deal. From memory, the Forestville site was quite attractive, but the Prospect one was a bit of a stranded asset. As it turns out, the Steven Marshall government decision to purchase both and to develop them for housing was a very sensible one.

Seaton is a more complicated story. That suburb is a great case for renewal, replacing the existing very outdated housing stock with new high-density housing, with a replacement one-for-one of all of the public housing, mixed in with affordable for sale and some market sales, so much more of a blended suburb.

That project, quite frankly, should have been commenced long before the Marshall government came into government, because the housing was in bad condition. I did forums in the

electorate of Lee and I think those community forums were the best attended that we had across the state, because people who came from that particular part of the public housing had some houses that were in really poor condition, with gutters and draughts, and falling down. The member for Lee, who had part of that portfolio, did not actually approve any new housing there because, I was told, he preferred to keep what was there as it was—in disrepair.

The Seaton redevelopment was approved by the Marshall Liberal government in 2021. Steven and I actually did a press conference down there on the site, where one of his sets of grandparents had lived, for the first two stages, which included a village green. When Labor returned in 2022, they did what they have done on a number of our projects and sat on it. They have tried to reannounce it as their own multiple times, even though people would have been living there years ago if they had not delayed it.

We have also asked for a report card against the road map, which needs to be made public. We are running short some 6,000 houses of the Albanese government housing accord target. In fact, this state government does not even have any targets for the number of houses to be built. It does not have a workforce target and it does not have a target for the amount of construction materials that should be produced in South Australia. If you fail to plan, you plan to fail.

We might think that water rates are high now, but additional greenfields is going to add to the infrastructure costs into the future. While we have welcomed all of the greenfield developments, it certainly does bear in mind that the cost of travel, the cost of housing and the cost of infrastructure is something that has to be figured out into the future. I understand Minister Close has a report on trunk infrastructure, which should be released posthaste.

I will briefly explain the spatial amendments that we have, and I might provide more detail when we move those individually. The one at Murray Bridge is the simplest one. There are two parcels of land which are close to the Murray Bridge town boundary which have never been used for food production and are currently zoned rural living. The local member and the community believe that this was an anomaly dating back to when the maps were drawn up, which largely followed town boundaries, so there is no reason why they need to be included in an EFPA.

In relation to the south coastal Fleurieu Peninsula, there is additional land around Victor Harbor and Goolwa that is no longer suitable for long-term viable farming. Most of these allotments have single dwellings, are currently well serviced with existing water and electricity infrastructure, and are well known to locals, including the local member, Mr David Basham. They are better supported by the local community than Goolwa North, which has been the government's big plan and is opposed by the locals.

The final GARP, so separate to this, identifies significant housing growth for areas north of Adelaide, which includes Evanston Gardens, Angle Vale, Kudla, MacDonald Park and the Riverlea Park area in Virginia. These areas, as I said, are already outside of the EFPAs, but the areas within the EFPAs, which Labor is proposing to remove, are at Two Wells and Roseworthy. I have already talked about Minister Champion's reference to the Golden Mile. This is why we were surprised that these were included in this bill.

In relation to trying to do some fine-grained identification of the ownership of local parcels of land or whether land had been placed under options prior to the introduction of the EFPAs, that was a very difficult process to do indeed, and would have been quite a patchwork. We were certainly not given any assistance in that by the Labor Party. We are aware that there was land that had already been identified for housing, which had been placed into the EFPA, which is regrettable and reflects poorly on the behaviour of Mr John Rau. We have suggested alternative areas to be included which are not suitable to farm, including all of the land west of Port Wakefield Road, which is north of Riverlea along the coastal corridor.

If this is included, it could certainly take some of the pressure off areas to its east. It is serviced by a dual carriageway, it has some good water infrastructure and good water pressure, and it has a logical proximity to Osborne, so it would be a useful place for people who in the future are employed through AUKUS. If we look specifically at Dublin, it has better pressure than some of the pipework further east. I will talk about this in more detail when I move that specific amendment, but the proposal that the proponents have there is that they would pay for their own infrastructure, so

that would be great. It would take the pressure off all the infrastructure that is required to be provided by SA Water.

I did read the comments of the member for Light, Mr Tony Piccolo, I think in his third reading, about our amendments with bemusement. I think they were entirely disingenuous. He is a member of the government introducing this bill and yet he made some comments along the lines that we did not try hard enough to change Roseworthy. He cannot have it both ways. Where are his amendments? We did not see any amendments from the member for Light. Where did he reserve his right to support the EFPA bill? He even stated that he had concerns about Roseworthy but then did not do anything about it. He has also used some spurious arguments about the cost of infrastructure delivery for our amendment for west of Port Wakefield Road yet all of the greenfields housing is going to generate huge costs for infrastructure.

If you will excuse the pun, Dublin is going to be barely a drop compared to everything else which I believe the northern areas are going to need: roads, schools and a new hospital just to service the births for young families out there. Mr Tony Piccolo's comments remind me of when the Liberal Party proposed opening up reservoirs, and part of Labor's opposition, through the then minister, Ian Hunter, was to tell us that it would cost \$200 million. Nowadays, we see the Hon. Emily Bourke hosting community meetings at Hope Valley, and the member for Davenport, Erin Thompson, is a great enthusiast for the SA Water site because it is a great idea—you are welcome.

We as a party, in a short space of time and without the government's tools being made available to us, have, I think, done the best that we possibly could to make some sensible amendments, which I encourage all members to support. In addition to the spatial amendments, we also have broadly a requirement for an audit process for all primary production lands which we want to be published.

The audit would follow a number of principles to identify land that is crucial for current and future agricultural production. This includes providing maps detailing existing and potential agricultural land uses, with a SWOT analysis across various regions and offering information on land uses, infrastructure, etc., and requiring that these reports be published.

We would like this done in time for the five-year statutory review in 2027. I think some of this work exists. Certainly not the primary production work (I am not sure that is being done properly) but some of the other things—which are really mapping exercises about where various roads and stormwater and pipeworks are—are already available, and some of it is available on the website. I know that planners do very thorough reports of many pages, and we would like to see them.

Also, to give a little bit more confidence in primary production in the future, we think that it is worthwhile to ensure—because it is already in the act, regarding the Planning Commission—that there is a range of expertise that must be provided through the membership of the Planning Commission. The existing list is in section 18(2), and we would like to add primary production and require that, in the appointment of someone with primary production experience, the government must consult on that appointment with Primary Producers SA and the Local Government Association. With those comments, I endorse the bill and look forward to the committee stage.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:06):** I rise to speak on the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025 as the shadow minister for primary industries in this state.

This legislation comes at a time when South Australia faces real pressure to accommodate population growth in housing demand, particularly in Greater Adelaide. The 2025 Benchmarking Adelaide Report, commissioned by the Committee for Adelaide, underscores a pressing concern, namely, Adelaide's declining affordability and liveability. The report reveals that Adelaide has dropped four spots in global rankings for liveability, affordability and wellbeing, now ranking among the bottom 8 per cent for home ownership affordability in the English-speaking world. Notably, Adelaide has the third highest share of income spent on rent, with residential vacancies below 1 per cent indicating a severe housing shortage.

We understand the importance of planning systems that are responsive to these needs; however, any changes to the environment and food production areas must be approached with care

and evidence. The environment and food production areas were established to protect land vital for agricultural production. Once this land is lost to urban development it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to recover. That is why it is essential that any variations to these protected zones are based on rigorous assessments of land quality and long-term strategic planning.

It is crucial to balance any future housing development with food security. Preserving productive agricultural land ensures long-term sustainability and food supply. Therefore, any legislative changes should be informed by comprehensive land audits and stakeholder consultations to identify suitable areas for development that do not threaten vital agricultural zones.

To support more informed and responsible decision-making, the opposition has put forward amendments—which the Hon. Michelle Lensink has already spoken about in this chamber—that would introduce such a comprehensive land audit. This audit would evaluate all primary production land in Greater Adelaide, identifying which areas are crucial for ongoing agricultural use and which may be more suitable for future development. It would also assess infrastructure capacity, land use constraints and other key factors to guide better land use planning.

We have also proposed amendments to strengthen the representation of primary production expertise on the Planning Commission—again, as the Hon. Michelle Lensink has spoken about. This is really about ensuring that agricultural perspectives are not an afterthought but an integral part of land use governance.

These proposals are about enabling the right development in the right places, and our focus is on ensuring that housing growth does not come at the irreversible cost of South Australia's agricultural future. I do hope that the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development and, indeed, the Labor government choose to support the opposition's amendments to establish a comprehensive land audit.

These amendments, and in particular the land order amendment, are specifically designed to protect our state's agricultural future by identifying and preserving the most productive farmland whilst enabling responsive development on less productive areas. One would expect the minister charged with safeguarding regional development and primary industries to champion such an evidence-based, forward-looking approach. Their opposition to such an amendment would certainly raise questions about the government's commitment to protecting food security and supporting the long-term viability of our regions and agricultural sectors.

I think it is also interesting to note that in the other place, and it appears so in this chamber, the opposition has put forward amendments to provide greater flexibility for housing developments by allowing further areas within the EFPA in Greater Adelaide to be opened up, specifically where the land is identified as nonproductive. These amendments are aimed at easing housing supply pressures whilst ensuring that development does not encroach on that prime agricultural land. Our intent with these amendments is to strike a responsible balance between the need for growth and the imperative to protect South Australia's vital food-producing regions.

Unfortunately, these sensible amendments have been rejected in the other place by the minister responsible, Mr Champion, and the Labor government, a decision that, I think, again raises serious questions about their true commitment to increasing housing supply. If the government were genuinely serious about addressing the housing crisis, I would have thought it would have embraced this practical approach that opens up low-value nonproductive land whilst safeguarding other better agricultural areas. Instead, their resistance suggests a preference for developmental strategies that perhaps avoid politically sensitive areas, perhaps areas that overlap with their own electorates, rather than making the hard but necessary decisions for the broader public good. This selective approach certainly undermines the very objective of increasing housing availability where it is most needed.

This debate has laid bare the government's deep hypocrisy when it comes to housing. On the one hand they speak loudly about the need to address housing supply and affordability, but when presented with a balanced, evidence-based solution that enables responsible further development on nonproductive land, they shut it down. Their refusal to consider amendments that protect prime agricultural land in regard to a land audit, while still expanding housing options, suggests that their priorities lie not in solving the housing crisis, but in avoiding political inconvenience. This is not leadership; this is avoidance. Ensuring that future generations have access to both affordable homes



and secure local food production is not a choice; it is a responsibility. Our amendments are responsible amendments, and it is incredibly disappointing that the government refuse to support them.

In summary, I am a strong supporter of development, and particularly of growing our regional towns and communities. There is much within this bill that aligns with those objectives. However, I do hold concerns about certain aspects of the legislation, particularly the potentially long-term challenges it may create in managing the interface between agricultural land and expanding urban areas. I do hope that I am wrong in that respect, but I fear that, without regular comprehensive land audits, this is a risk, because it is critical that we understand that a balanced approach, informed by data and inclusive of community input, is essential to ensure both housing needs and agricultural preservation are met.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:14):** I rise today to speak on the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025. This bill aims to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. This bill seeks to bring the environment and food production areas (EFPAs) in line with the new Greater Adelaide Regional Plan (GARP) that the Malinauskas government released earlier this year.

EFPAs were introduced in the 2016 legislation to protect vital agricultural lands surrounding metropolitan Adelaide from urban encroachment. The EFPAs operate in a similar way to character preservation areas in the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale. Land within the boundaries of an EFPA cannot be subdivided for residential purposes.

The Greater Adelaide Regional Plan has identified sufficient land for housing and urban growth for the next 30 years, with much of the land required for medium and long-term growth currently locked up within the environment and food production areas. This bill intends to designate new EFPA boundaries based on the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan and ensure that variations to the EFPA are consistent with GARP and provide for a 30-year land supply, rather than 15 years as it currently stands.

The bill would confirm that the limited land division overlay would be applied on any land removed from the EFPA to prevent an unorderly fragmentation of the land. It would also remove the current urban consolidation test for future variations to the EFPA boundaries and require the GARP to consider population growth and to identify land to be developed in the short term. Land removed from the EFPA will still need to be rezoned before it could be used for residential development, and the government has highlighted that this rezoning would take place in a staged and orderly approach over the next 30 years based on demand and taking infrastructure provision and cost into account.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that every day in this place and every time we are out and about we are talking about the housing crisis facing South Australia—the financial impact it has on families and communities and its stifling effect on the state's social and economic growth. It is vital that we address the housing problems using every lever at our disposal. Certainly, unlocking suitable land that is close to existing urban areas and infrastructure is seen to be a sensible measure.

The minister has argued that the 15-year land supply rule that previously formed the government's planning policy is uncompetitive and monopolistic for those outside the EFPA and, therefore, these proposed changes will bring more land into the potential development pipeline, increasing competition and addressing the mounting challenges of providing housing supply.

What I think this debate really highlights is the lack of proper consultation and the imperfect and rushed nature of the initial introduction of EFPAs in 2016. At the time, the opposition argued that locking land away within EFPA boundaries would have a detrimental impact on future development needed for population growth. The government is now conceding that this has in fact been the case, necessitating the amendment bill that now lies before us.

I want to acknowledge the high level of media, industry and community interest in this debate, particularly surrounding the potential impacts that these changes could have on farmers and producers in the EFPA boundaries. I met with Grain Producers SA and wholeheartedly thank them for raising their concerns, providing their assessment of the bill and also their strong advocacy for South Australian grain farmers. Grain Producers SA raised a number of issues with me, particularly

in regard to their concerns about the precedent for future encroachment on highly productive cropping land and the need for better protections for existing farms which may suddenly find themselves neighbours with new residential developments.

We have heard many cases of farmers facing complaints from residents in nearby housing developments about their usual farming practices, from noise, dust, spray drift and even using lights when harvesting at night. These are real issues that impact on how farmers operate and show that better buffers and policies are needed to improve the interface between residential and farming areas. I do hope that the government will consider all those concerns and address them in a proper way.

I have also received correspondence from stakeholders in the primary production sector who are calling for more detail about how changing the EFPA boundaries would impact on their properties and the investments they have made in their business operations, some for many generations. These stakeholders question how the government intends to ensure continued investor confidence in operations that rely on continued maintenance of those rural landscapes and environmental areas. Once again, I think the government needs to provide some answers to some of those farming businesses.

Given all that, I indicate that I will be supporting the opposition's amendments that will require a detailed audit of primary production land to be undertaken in consultation with Primary Producers SA and the Local Government Association by no later than January 2027. Such an audit would promote the optimal use of agricultural land in Greater Adelaide and address interface management policies related to urban development. An audit would then be required at least once every 10 years following the publication of the first audit.

I also indicate that I will be supporting the opposition's proposed spatial amendments, which would see additional land removed from the EFPA boundaries around Murray Bridge, Goolwa and Victor Harbor and west of Port Wakefield Road between Riverlea and Dublin. These changes will see more land that is less suitable for farming freed from EFPAs, allowing greater options for future developments and ensuring the EFPAs serve their intended purpose of protecting highly productive farming land into the future.

My understanding is that the Liberal amendments have been considered and consulted with important stakeholders and are welcomed by the HIA, UDIA, Master Builders SA and also the Property Council. Greater transparency and more detailed investigations and assessments of the suitability of land in Greater Adelaide for different land uses will greatly improve our ability to plan and develop in a considered way so that we can achieve a balance between protecting our land's vital food production and addressing South Australia's housing crisis. With those remarks, I commend the bill.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:22):** I rise to speak on the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill and acknowledge at the outset what the reason for this bill is. The government in its own second reading has identified the issues that have already been canvassed in relation to the GARP. It has identified that when the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act was first introduced in 2015-16, the government policy strongly supported urban consolidation, with a target set for 85 per cent of all growth to occur through infill development.

On that basis, the act is, it says, currently drafted to ensure new greenfield land is released from the EFPA only where urban consolidation opportunities have been exhausted. It then goes on to say that this is no longer consistent with government policy, with the GARP identifying ample greenfield and infill land over the next 30 years. It is on that basis that there is a disconnect between the EFPA provisions and the preference towards urban consolidation, infill and the GARP.

I am glad it starts with that because I have had quite a bit to say about the infill plan that we have adopted here for some years now. I have spoken publicly about some of the areas around town that have become barely recognisable. If you are a visitor to some suburbs from interstate, you would be forgiven for not knowing where you are. Certainly, I have used the example of my own street, where 11 out of 17 homes, all on about 1,000 square metres, have been bulldozed to make way for 57 townhouses in the one street. It is not a big street, but there are 57 townhouses on 11 blocks of

about 1,000 square metres. From recollection, the minimum that has been built on that street are three properties on one bulldozed block. The maximum, and indeed it is becoming the norm now, is one house being replaced by five.

It has completely changed neighbourhoods and, in my mind, I think there has been some very selective picking in terms of the areas where this has occurred. Certainly, if you take a drive down Anzac Highway and anywhere to the left or the right of Anzac Highway in those back streets of Glandore and onwards, the areas of Plympton, Glandore and Kurralta Park have become completely different neighbourhoods to what they once were and, of course, that comes with a cost. I appreciate that this is something the Premier has spoken of in relation to people's choice of how they live, particularly when we get to another issue, which we will be debating no doubt at some point, in relation to garage spaces. Navigating those streets is interesting to say the least.

I recall that when the first development went up in my street, which was only three extra townhouses across the road, we were worried about water pressure and the extra cars that may have come from that. Since that time, there have been another 54. The water pressure has not changed, but with the parking it is a challenge getting into and out of your own car park every day and that is something that has been replicated across the state. So I absolutely accept that this idea of reaching full infill and completely changing the landscape of existing neighbourhoods has not always, for me at least, had great outcomes.

You are also talking about the price of those townhouses and I can tell you that in the areas I have been looking at and keeping a close eye on each one of those townhouses is now selling for about \$850,000. At the moment, you bulldoze one house, build four or five, and you are selling them for anywhere between \$790,000 and \$850-odd thousand and those values are only expected to grow. That is an issue that I do not think can be taken lightly, given that by 2050 our population is expected to grow by an additional 670,000 people.

I think it is against this backdrop that I want to look at some of the data that was discussed on ABC radio, which I listened to quite keenly the other week, by CoreLogic Australia. Eliza Owen is the head of research at CoreLogic. It made for very interesting listening in terms of where Adelaide sits on the national front now in terms of the housing market. She said that we have notched up a third month of growth in April, with values hitting new record highs.

Adelaide is an extraordinary case, according to CoreLogic, at 0.3 per cent. Yes, it does not sound like a lot, but that is bringing our annual growth rate up to nearly 10 per cent. In the year prior, the 12 months to April 2024, it was about a 14 per cent uplift. As Ms Owen explains, a 10 per cent lift on top of that is quite extraordinary. Over five years, the growth rate for Adelaide values is up over 70 per cent. That is quite astronomical. Over 10 years, they are up by 93 per cent.

We have now become the second least affordable capital city, when you take into account local incomes and the median house price across the city going into median dwelling values of nine times. We are sitting at about \$880,000 now. Pre-pandemic, I think we were sitting at about \$500,000 to \$600,000. We are, quite surprisingly, miles in front of where Victoria is; in fact, Victoria has not only gone backwards, it has actually become an affordable state compared to South Australia. That in and of itself is quite extraordinary.

The CoreLogic data looks at specific areas and how they are performing nationally. I was quite surprised to hear that Gawler and Two Wells are the two second highest performing regions nationally. The median value of properties in those areas is around \$710,000, with an annual increase of 14 per cent. Playford is not far behind in those stats either. In regional South Australia, it is not much better. According to the data discussed by Ms Owen, in the past month home values were up by 1.5 per cent and the annual growth rate was 13 per cent. The median house price in regional South Australia is now effectively half of what it is in metro, at about \$475,000.

The report itself talks about how we got to this point where we are talking about these extraordinary figures here in little old Adelaide, and points to the problem of looking at the symptoms of housing affordability rather than addressing the underlying issues that have created such an unaffordable housing sector: a long-running undersupply of appropriate housing relative to demand and, by extension, an undersupply of land.

Interestingly—and I think these are important stats and I am going to refer to them—in addition to being the most unaffordable capital city, we then have the compounding issue of how expensive rent is becoming. Hindmarsh, which is about 3 ks from the city, has actually become the most expensive place to rent in South Australia, having increased by about 48 per cent over the last five years. We know there is a new development earmarked to go next door there, in Southwark, so I can only imagine what the prices of those properties are going to be worth.

Other examples such as Kingston have price tags of about \$780-odd thousand and 12-month changes in value of around 12 per cent. Rental markets in those areas are in fact not far behind Hindmarsh, at about \$615 to rent there. Other places north of Adelaide are sitting at around \$631,000 with about a 14.8 per cent increase.

Then we go to the Property Council's report, which was also released a couple of months ago in March. It is absolutely no surprise to find that according to the Beyond Reach report that was released by the Property Council, many workers simply cannot afford a home in Adelaide anymore. There are Adelaide suburbs that are priced well above the affordable 30 per cent threshold of household incomes required to service a mortgage.

You might recall that at the time this report was released the Property Council gave some examples of the sorts of people who have effectively been priced out of the Adelaide market. An ambulance officer and a nurse with a combined income of just above \$150,000 would be priced out of the housing market in Tea Tree Gully, Port Adelaide, Seaton, Mount Barker, Christies Beach and Hallett Cove.

A childcare worker in a single-income household is unable to afford a median house price or unit in any of the suburbs surveyed. A dual-income household comprised of an electrician—and electricians earn a decent penny these days—and a shop assistant earning a combined income of about \$133,000 would find all suburbs in this report unaffordable. A police officer on a full-time wage of approximately \$87,000 is unable to afford a median price house in all surveyed locations.

It is these sorts of examples that the Property Council says underscore the urgent need for policy intervention to ensure that Adelaide's key workers can access affordable housing, that new housing comes within the reach of Adelaide working families, and that is not going to happen by continuing to bulldoze what is left of metropolitan Adelaide and replacing one property with four or five and selling them off at \$850,000 a pop.

We all know that young people of today are going to struggle to buy a home if we do not do something. I do acknowledge that the government's legislation that we are debating today, in conjunction with legislation that we passed in the last couple of sitting weeks and in conjunction with some further changes that are due soon, are actually intended to address these sorts of issues. In this instance, we are dealing with the changes around the EFPA. In total, we are talking about 1 per cent of land from the EFPA.

I appreciate the angst that this comes with and what I would call the conservative approach that has been taken in relation to where we are actually identifying and the processes that we are going through to identify this additional land, because once that land is gone from primary producing it can never be replaced. There might be other primary-producing land, but it may not be as viable as land that we are potentially giving up.

So there are a lot of things to be taken into account all at once. My view is that the government has taken a measured approach on this issue. I have to say, when I first received the Liberal amendments I was a little bit confused—with respect to the mover—because my initial take on this situation was that the Liberals had some concerns about what the government was proposing in relation to the areas that had already been identified. I certainly did not anticipate those areas broadening in scope to include other areas.

I have spoken to both the government and the opposition in relation to these. I have looked at the material that the opposition has provided to me and tried to seek some advice against that. I guess my concern is that adding other bundles of land outside of what has been the subject of consultation and work by—

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

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Well, the mover may not say that. I think the Planning Commission may have a different view on that, though, with respect to the work that has gone into identifying the parcels of land which we have said are appropriate for release. I certainly am not in a position to say that outside of those processes I am going to take the word of the government or, indeed, the opposition, or anybody else to say that they should be extended.

That is my view and one that I am willing to stick by because the government will say one thing, the opposition will say another, but, frankly, I would like us to be guided by some expert evidence in this debate. I am not convinced—in fact, I do not need to be convinced. We just simply do not have that here because I am sure that the areas that the opposition and the mover have identified—in fact, I know—have been part of those processes in terms of identifying them as to their viability for falling within this bill and the response has been that at this stage, for whatever reasons, whether it is infrastructure or otherwise, they simply are not suitable.

Simply including additional parcels or areas into this so that there is more does not make it better, from where I sit, and certainly it does not make it better because the opposition has said that it has consulted with its primary producers and anybody else who says the land in Dublin is—

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

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** Yes, and that is fine. This is where I say it is a balancing act, because I would not expect the Property Council to say anything other than it is a great idea. All these stakeholders obviously want to open up as much land as possible for these purposes, but it has to be measured and it has to be considered and thought out.

If we need any example of why it needs to be measured and thought out, we need look no further than Mount Barker. We have spoken about this before. Mount Barker might be a great place to live today, but when it was first built we saw what the results of building for the sake of building because we needed homes—in the absence of infrastructure, in the absence of medical services, in the absence of pharmacies, in the absence of transport—leads to.

Mount Barker is a great example of how not to do things and what playing catch-up looks like when you go and put houses somewhere where you simply should not be putting them, in the absence of a well thought-out plan. I personally, from this side, do have some faith in the Planning Commission and its role in that process, and I certainly have more faith in those processes than I do in either major party in this place, and I will continue to have more faith in those processes than either of the major parties in this place.

It is on that basis that I say that at this point in time, and until there is a further review, I do not consider it appropriate to extend beyond the scope of what the government has proposed. That is my position in relation to those amendments that do seek to do that, and it is on that basis that I will not be supporting those amendments.

We have not even touched on the fact that aside from the fact that we have a housing affordability crisis we also have a rental crisis. We have not touched on the fact that by 2050 we are going to need to be able to home an additional 670,000-odd people who are going to be living in South Australia, but any response to those issues has to be measured.

I have made my thoughts in relation to infill quite clear. I do not think it has been the great success story that some others think it has been, and I think we are seeing the repercussions of that now. I think the Premier's next suite of legislation on this issue when it comes to garages is going to create an even more interesting discussion than this one, frankly, but I can see the logic in these things. We do not all want to live in these infill metropolitan areas, and we certainly cannot all afford to live in these infill metropolitan areas, in the townhouses and so forth that have been created, and, by extension, we cannot afford to rent them if that is the position we are in.

Not only is home ownership gone for many people, the idea of even being able to rent is as well. This is an issue that needs to be addressed. I absolutely agree with the sentiments expressed by Ms Owen and the report that was conducted into housing data by CoreLogic, that up until now we have had a lot of bandaid fixes and not very many solutions. That has been driven largely by politics, and we need to get on with ensuring that we address those issues in a much more robust and measured way. I appreciate that there are concerns around this bill. I do not see anyone, though,

saying that they are opposed to this bill—although that might be due next. I have not heard that yet. I think we have to be realistic about these things as well.

It is also important to note, and certainly from the discussions that I have had with many of the same stakeholders that the mover of the amendments refers to, we need to be building houses where people work as well. This idea that everyone is coming to the city to work is just not correct. The idea that everyone needs to be in inner metropolitan Adelaide is not correct. We need to be providing affordable solutions to those people who are choosing to live further out from the city. With those words, and I am sure I will have more to say when we get to the committee stage, I indicate my support in principle for this bill.

**The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:45):** I rise to speak on the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill. This bill has been challenging to navigate for a range of reasons, not only because of its scope and complexity but also its significance for future housing development in this state and, most importantly, its ongoing impact on farmers, both graziers and growers. Our rising population, both here and across the country, is destined to continue into the future, putting further pressure on the availability of affordable housing and infrastructure as well as health and education, services and essential resources such as food, water and power.

What is concerning is the lack of coordination from both current state and federal governments, given the increase in population is a direct result of an immigration policy that has seen 1.4 million new migrants enter this country since 2022. We are now confronted with the urgent need for more housing and GARP is a major step towards resolving the housing affordability crisis in this state, which is something that I do wholeheartedly support; however, I am also aware of the risk involved in getting this right and the challenges associated with selecting exactly the right land for development.

The state government has now announced that our population will reach 2.2 million by 2051 and that sufficient land will be needed to meet the current and emerging housing demand, with 61,000 dwellings to be developed on land that is currently locked up under legislation designed to protect environment and food production areas. I do appreciate the government's briefings and information regarding its plan for the Greater Adelaide region and I support cutting regulations that create inefficiencies for the building and development industry, but I am also fully aware of the importance of identifying and assessing the most appropriate land for development and the need to preserve our state's prime agricultural land.

It was only 10 years ago that the Labor government and this parliament passed provisions under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 to protect agricultural land from the urban sprawl and now in 2025 we are already in a situation where we seemingly need to amend these protections to release the land for housing development. This is a significant change in policy and direction and one which should be approached with caution. While the government insists that there is no mandate for farming activities to cease just because land has been removed from the EFPA and that existing rights are as important as ever, it should be noted that GARP is a 30-year plan and that this bill includes a mechanism to ensure that EFPAs remain consistent with GARP well into the future.

I have been involved in discussions with a broad range of stakeholders regarding the government's plans, and it is clear that many farmers have been concerned about the immediate and future consequences of removing these protections. Crop growers are particularly concerned due to the limited availability of suitable land to grow particular crops that require prime agricultural land and many have suggested that further analysis and assessment of soil types should have been conducted before proceeding with the proposed development.

In response, the government has ensured that key agricultural lands will be protected and that changes under the EFPA would represent a loss of less than 1 per cent; however, some representatives have informed our office that only 10 per cent of available land is suitable for cropping and therefore the loss of 1 per cent of this prime agricultural land is not insignificant. In short, we have another situation where the government has claimed to have listened and consulted with all

stakeholders and is acting on that advice, yet many stakeholders have continued to have legitimate concerns.

In the end, it would seem that the devil is in the detail and without a crystal ball it is difficult to predict exactly how this removal of protection will influence government actions and decision-making, given that a significant barrier to development will be removed and the pathway to acquire prime agricultural land made easier, despite the government insisting that some level of protection remains under rezoning rules and character preservation laws. It must be noted that under these new rules, any further variations to the EFPA must be consistent with GARP to ensure a 30-year land supply and new provisions in section 64 will require GARP to consider population growth and to identify land to be developed in the short term.

As housing development grows in these regions, it is inevitable that farmers and residents will be competing for resources, and unfortunately, with increasing costs and regulations, it is often farmers who sell and move on, leaving our state with less food and less fertile land for future generations.

With this in mind, I thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for the amendments proposed on behalf of the opposition, which will go some way to addressing the concerns raised by farmers by establishing a compulsory audit to be conducted in consultation with Primary Producers SA. The government has suggested that such oversight is not necessary, given such concerns are already covered in section 64(2c).

However, the inclusion of compulsory consultation with a representative body for farmers is a worthwhile safeguard, and consequently I offer my support for the insertion of section 7A, regarding some kind of compulsory land audit to be conducted in consultation with Primary Producers SA. I am also supportive of the proposed amendment to section 18, which will ensure that primary producers have some representation on the commission.

**The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:50):** I rise to speak as the Greens voice on this bill. The bill aims to open areas of the environment and food production area to accommodate new housing projects. This approach is an urban sprawl approach to our housing problems and will result in more housing being built on some of the state's most precious farming areas. South Australians should not have to choose between farming land and housing affordability.

The Greens believe that land use policy should prioritise the protection of prime agricultural land against competing uses. The environment and food production area was established to protect our most usable farming land from this exact scenario. We want people to be able to access affordable housing more easily, but we do not believe it is necessary to carve up the areas that feed us to do so. There are plenty of parcels of vacant land that should be activated, and we could incentivise returning short-term accommodation back to the housing market. Indeed, I am chairing a parliamentary inquiry to look at that. There are also plenty of options that we could be looking at that do not impact on parts of South Australia that have some of the highest rainfall and best growing conditions in the state.

I think it is instructive here to look at some of the comments that were made back in 2016, when the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Bill was debated under the Weatherill Labor government. The now Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher, said of the environment and food production area at that time:

There are strong environmental, economic and public integrity reasons to support the introduction of the environment and food production areas...The strong environmental reasons include the fact that the Greater Adelaide region contains some of the world's best food and wine areas.

We need to protect these farmlands, environmental areas and character landscapes from the encroachment of urban sprawl. Once developed for residential development, those lands are lost forever.

He went on to say that:

The EFPA will encourage building of new homes in our inner and middle ring suburbs, which market research shows is, in fact, where more and more people want to live. Such infill...compared with greenfield developments, generates more jobs, costs less to service and provides more affordable living options.

I agree with the comments that the Attorney-General made on behalf of the Weatherill government at that time. I think they still hold true today.

Urban boundaries are an important part of Adelaide's geography. Our capital city is situated amongst some of the state's prime agricultural land. Independent analysis from Grain Producers SA shows that the areas proposed to be removed from the environment and food production areas are 33 per cent more productive than the state's average. The government continues to argue that the area being removed from the environment and food production area is only 1 per cent of the Greater Adelaide food production area.

According to PIRSA data, primary industries and agriculture contributed \$7.78 billion to South Australia's gross state product and supported 78,000 jobs in 2022-23. The field crop sector represents 42 per cent of total state revenue for the year. Data released by Grain Producers SA shows that the affected areas produce nearly 23,000 metric tonnes of grain annually—enough to bake over 57 million loaves of bread. Their report claims that this equates to \$8 million in annual production value.

Climate change has the potential to create issues of food security, moving forward, for our state. Right now, we are seeing the impacts of drought on primary producers, resulting in lower yields. The low rainfall this year continues to have devastating impacts for agriculture, and we are here considering concreting over some of our higher rainfall areas. Is this really the best way for the government to deal with our housing crisis?

The parliament saw fit in 2016 to protect areas that produce our food, and here we are less than 10 years later ready to open it up. The Greens have been pushing hard for reforms to enable more people to access housing, but this is not the answer.

One of the issues I am very concerned about is vacant land, and developers and landowners who are known to land bank vacant property that they own. As land increases in value while it sits there empty, landowners can capitalise on vacant land without any incentive at all to activate it. Indeed, I have a bill before this chamber that will give the Minister for Planning new powers to step in and activate long-term vacant land.

This was an issue that my predecessor, the Hon. Mark Parnell, took up, and I have taken up in this parliament. I do intend to bring it to a vote in a future parliamentary session, and I hope that all members of this place will give it due consideration because we should be focusing on what is happening with that vacant land rather than focusing on more sprawl and potentially carving up our food bowl.

It is appalling that prime real estate in the CBD can be left vacant for years and years. There are numerous examples of this. For instance, there is a lot on Sturt Street that has been vacant for years and years. There is one on Grote Street, and who could forget, of course, the Le Cornu saga, with land that was vacant for nearly 30 years in North Adelaide. Surely we can do something about that long-term vacant land.

In the middle of a housing affordability crisis, we need to take action to stop developers land banking and ensure that land is put to good use. Indeed, the Greens have also advocated for developers to face additional taxes if they leave their land to languish without good reason. Not only do we need to take action on vacant land, I also encourage the government to look at vacant property.

On census night there were 83,000 dwellings that were vacant while we have people sleeping on the street. The minister has commented on this many times. He will say to me, 'Rob, you are overexaggerating the figures there.' Of course, not all of those 83,000 homes are going to be vacant, and indeed some people might be staying with a friend or whatever. Many of those homes may not be long-term vacant, but even if a small portion of them were, then it makes sense to look at what we can do to incentivise putting them back onto the housing market. To that end, the Greens have called for a vacant property tax to encourage owners to sell or rent their property. Building houses takes time and bringing vacant properties back into the market could have an immediate impact in terms of making housing more affordable and accessible.

I also want to touch on some of the concerns we have around planning. I think it is fair to say that the Labor Party in particular has a checkered past when it comes to housing developments.



Look at places like Mount Barker and, indeed, Gawler. These developments have not worked well in the past, and I believe the Malinauskas government has conceded that there were mistakes made in planning areas like Mount Barker under the previous Labor government.

Activating medium to high density closer to the city does not leave us with the types of transport problems Mount Barker has seen. As a largely dormitory area, Mount Barker is heavily car dependent and the community have been calling for rail transport for years now. Areas like Mount Barker, parts of Gawler and some southern suburb areas were once prime agricultural land, and it is true that once they are gone, we will not get them back. All of those places have struggled with access to services, jobs and transport, and more urban sprawl only exacerbates those challenges.

I understand this government likes the idea of people living on three-quarter acre blocks in the suburbs and see it as some sort of aspirational goal, but for many that type of goal is simply beyond their reach. Many young people do not believe they will ever be able to buy a property, let alone a spacious suburban house, and lifelong renters are increasingly common, although not always by choice. Some people do want to live in smaller places closer to the city so that they can spend their income on other necessities. Additionally, older people who are looking to downsize are struggling to find suitable options. Affordability is key and opening up suburban-sized properties is not necessarily going to suit most people.

I understand my colleague the Hon. Michelle Lensink has some amendments on behalf of the Liberal Party. I indicate that I will not be supporting those. These amendments seek to further release areas for food production in Murray Bridge, Goolwa and near Two Wells. I will not be supporting these amendments for the same reasons that I have already outlined with respect to the substantive bill.

I also hold some environmental concerns for the area to the west of Two Wells. The St Kilda mangroves, for instance, and the coastal area along Gulf St Vincent to the west of the Port Wakefield Highway hold significant environmental value and are also subject to flooding. This area is home to conservation sites, including the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park. This area should be protected and should be conserved rather than being subject to more development. I do not think it would be wise to introduce housing into those areas.

I am further advised that the area near Victor Harbor is not aligned with the growth strategies of Victor Harbor and Alexandrina councils, where there is a desire to include interurban breaks as green spaces between coastal settlements. There is also no planning for transport or other social infrastructure in those areas. Regarding the Murray Bridge area, which constitutes 10 hectares, I am advised it is not suitable due to the steep topography but that it is also bounded by the railway and the Murray River. Regarding the audit process, I have also been advised that there is a duplication of the process that has already been undertaken as part of the five-year review, so in that sense the Liberal Party amendment is superfluous.

The Greens, of course, recognise the need for planning for future population growth and for housing, but we do need a more balanced approach, and South Australians should not be forced to choose between affordable housing and food security. One of the passions that I have, of course, is around social housing and affordable housing, and I have been having discussions with the Malinauskas government about what we can do to incentivise more social housing—constructive discussions with the government that are ongoing in that regard.

Planning is about more than simply releasing land to developers. There are opportunities to deal with the housing crisis by implementing vacancy taxes, activating vacant land and looking with long-term vision as to how we can create better connected communities. Local food production will be vital as we move to a future with a less certain climate.

It is for these reasons that the Greens do not support this bill. We are disappointed that the Liberal opposition have indicated that they will be supporting the bill, and therefore the government have the numbers to get this through. We would really like to see a focus on what we can do to activate vacant land in the CBD and improve infill, which was traditionally the Labor Party's position.

Might I say, infill does have a bad reputation in South Australia. It is a dirty word among many people in our community because it has often been done badly. But if it is done well—high-quality

homes built sustainably that are energy efficient—then I think that would be popular with the South Australian community. Indeed, the Greens have put some options on the table to suggest how we might do this differently.

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:03):** I rise on behalf of the government to speak on the amendments to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, which was first drafted in 2015-16. Government policy at the time promoted urban consolidation, aiming for 85 per cent of new growth to come from infill developments. The current act ensures that new greenfield land is released from the environment and food production areas (EFPAs) only where urban consolidation opportunities have been exhausted.

Some 10 years later, we are in the midst of a housing crisis and there is a disconnect between the environment and food production area provisions and its preference towards urban infill and the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan (GARP). The Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025 aims to overcome this disconnection. As we are all aware, South Australia has become an attractive place to settle, and the numbers prove it. Since the 2022 state election, nearly 12,500 additional businesses have opened and about 73,000 new positions have been created, 54 per cent of them full time.

A key initiative of the Labor Malinauskas government's Housing Roadmap and the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan is to ensure there is an appropriate supply of serviced land to meet both the current and future housing demand. The Greater Adelaide Regional Plan (GARP) identifies where 315,000 new homes will be built over the next 30 years. It also preserves land for future infrastructure requirements. Areas identified for new homes are either already connected to infrastructure, have infrastructure commitments in place or are located in areas where future investment in infrastructure is planned. SA Water has committed \$1.5 billion between 2024 and 2028 to unlock these new growth areas.

One of the misconceptions is that we are cutting away our food bowl. However, we are not sacrificing productive farmland: existing farmland rights remain intact even when land shifts out of the EFPA. It is not a mandate for farming to cease. The aim is simply to align Adelaide's expansion with the EFPA, ensuring growth is logical while safeguarding current agricultural and other land uses.

Based on GARP investigations, there are likely to be approximately 61,000 dwellings developed on land that is currently within the environment and food production areas. Consequently, this Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025 aims to achieve the following:

- amend section 7 of the act to designate a revised GRO plan, setting out new environment and food production area boundaries based on the GARP;
- confirm that any land that is removed from the EFPA on commencement of the bill has the limited land division overlay applied through the Planning and Design Code, which is a safeguard against unordered fragmentation and will stop ad hoc splits that would chip away at farmland or disrupt planned growth patterns;
- remove the current urban consolidation test for future variations to the EFPA boundaries—the current test essentially prevents amendments to the boundaries unless Greater Adelaide is unable to support infill development;
- ensure that future variations to the EFPA are consistent with the GARP and ensure a 30-year land supply rather than the existing 15 years; and
- insert new provisions in section 64 of the act requiring the GARP to consider population growth and to identify land to be developed in the short term.

It is important to note that only land that met multiple planning, environmental and cultural criteria was considered suitable for removal from the EFPA in order to support future growth. A thorough evidence-based process was used under the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan and involved detailed land assessments that focused on protecting valuable farmland; avoiding risk-prone areas, such as land at risk of flooding, bushfire or other natural hazards; preserving sensitive environments, including areas with important ecosystems or biodiversity; respecting Aboriginal cultural heritage,

ensuring land of cultural or spiritual importance to First Nations people is not rezoned or developed; and prioritising efficiency, choosing land close to existing roads, utilities, schools and other infrastructure so that development is cost effective and suitable.

What we are seeking to do is to coordinate Adelaide's growth plans with the environment and food production areas to ensure Adelaide's growth is well planned, sensible and continues to safeguard current land uses. The Malinauskas Labor government has committed \$53 million towards the first stage of the Northern Park Lands. These 70 hectares will include open green space for greater biodiversity and habitats for native animals, as well as sport and recreation areas. It will be the equivalent size of 31 Adelaide Ovals, which will serve the emerging growth areas of Angle Vale, Kudla and the Gawler River.

The revised environment and food production areas will continue to protect key agricultural land around Greater Adelaide, with changes affecting less than 1 per cent of these areas. The release of land within the GARP will ensure a proper, structured planning process for new housing releases, ensuring that planning preparation is up-front and correct from the outset. As the Minister for Housing, the Hon. Nick Champion MP, stated in the other place, if we are to provide a clearly defined housing supply that is planned for the decades ahead, it is very important that this bill passes parliament. On that note, I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (17:11):** Firstly, I would like to thank the number of speakers who have spoken on this bill today: the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Rob Simms and the Hon. Tung Ngo. I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the minister in the other house, Nick Champion, and his team on the significant work that has been undertaken to get to this point to help address our housing supply in South Australia.

No matter how people will vote at the end of today, I think we can all agree that we need more housing, we need more affordable housing and we need more rental supply, but we also need a plan to make sure that can be achieved. What we are seeing today is a plan that will provide a balance to not only achieve those outcomes of a housing supply but also to preserve our agricultural areas. I welcome the support that we will be getting, but I would just like to put at this point that we will be unable to support the opposition's amendments.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I have just a quick comment, which the Hon. Jing Lee said in her second reading speech. Given I have got lost in the detail many times on this bill in the last few weeks, I forgot to mention the important part—which I think was actually picked up by the Hon. Connie Bonaros—that the stakeholders who represent building, construction and housing in this state have all expressed support for our amendments; that is, the UDIA, the Property Council, the Master Builders Association and the HIA.

I do have some questions—and I understand that my leader, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, may have some as well—on the ongoing consultation, if you like, that sits behind the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan. The minister would have heard some of the criticisms I have made that reflect views within the community that, for want of a better word, inadequate work, particularly in relation to identification within the EFPAs of the most valuable primary production land, has not taken place and has not been informed. I was wondering if the minister might be able to make some more detailed comments, firstly, in relation to primary production and then, potentially, on the multilevel analysis that informed the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan and hence this bill.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I am advised that this has been an ongoing process for a number of years. Obviously, the GARP is the starting point, and this is a part of that consultation as well. In regard to the stakeholders who were able to participate in the overall discussion of what GARP is,

my understanding is Grain Producers SA, Primary Producers SA, South Australian Forest Products Association, Local Government Association, Greater Adelaide Regional Organisation of Councils, Southern and Hills LGA—there were a number of stakeholders who were engaged throughout this process that has gone on for quite a number of years.

Obviously, we are now also talking about the EFPA and the process that has been undertaken there. There is methodology that has been put behind how we have been able to get to this point which I am happy to go into, more so maybe when we get to the maps that you are proposing and the zones that you are proposing.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** The Liberal opposition has received through FOI a number of documents that relate to the consultation process, and I understand that Minister Champion had briefings for a meeting with Primary Producers SA in March. Can the minister outline what their view is in relation to specific areas that the government has put to be extracted from the EFPA—obviously, Roseworthy is the one that has raised the most attention—and whether GRSA or any other primary producer groups expressed a view in relation to the bill before us?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I think what has been shown over the last few years through this consultation period is that there has been a willingness to take on feedback from stakeholders, including Primary Producers SA, and now there have been ongoing discussions and commitments to work with appropriate buffers that can now be put in place to protect our farming communities and where the new developments will be. I think that is a key point to take away from this: yes, there will be different feedback, there will be different views, but the fact that there has been time given to have that consultation period has enabled us to create an even better outcome.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Can the minister provide the chamber with the methodology that was used, in particular for the government's proposed areas of extraction from the EFPA, particularly those around Roseworthy, and can the minister, in doing so, indicate what weight was placed on the productive nature of that land?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** The review of the growth areas was conducted through a comprehensive methodology to ensure the investigations were undertaken in a robust manner, building an evidence base and an assessment of available options. A core focus of the methodology, I am advised, was an emphasis on ongoing collaboration and engagement with the Department for Housing and Urban Development team, the local government, state agencies and infrastructure providers, ensuring that a series of clear implementation recommendations were made for the GARP.

There was a detailed analysis and process undertaken in identifying land for the growth through its plan, which was in the following stages: stage 1 was engagement with the councils that occurred to undertake bespoke drivers for growth, localised characteristics and opportunities that strengthen why people and businesses would locate to an area now and into the future. This exercise fit into the refinement of growth areas and boundaries and provided an evidence baseline for supporting the investigation and recommendations.

In stage 2 of this process, the land suitability assessment considered key planning constraints and the environmental risk. It included flooding, bushfire, high-value agricultural land, state significance, native vegetation and environmental protection areas, and concerns that we heard that were raised in regard to those new areas put forward by the opposition and from the Hon. Rob Simms to determine the suitability for the future development within each of the 46 growth areas. The boundaries of each growth area were reduced where required, resulting in refined mapping for residential employment in both high and low suitability categories. A first run of the yield numbers for residential employment land were calculated at this stage.

Then we moved to stage 3, which involved an infrastructure analysis, which tested and identified the land against capacity in key infrastructure networks, including transport, water, sewer and social infrastructure. The analysis drew upon a combination of desktop study and engagement with infrastructure agencies. This allowed for understanding existing and planned provisions of infrastructure for growth areas and analysed the additional infrastructure needed to unlock development within the growth areas. Following the results of the land suitability infrastructure analysis, the targeted stakeholders engagement yield results were checked and tested against the goals to ensure a significant quantum of land had been identified.

Then we moved into stage 4—so you can understand this was a lengthy process. A multicriteria assessment was then undertaken and compared to the residential land in the growth area to provide a high-level prioritisation. Over 100 constraints and datasets were considered and prioritised through engagement with PIRSA and DEW to inform the identification and prioritisation of these growth areas.

The MCA was undertaken at two levels: strategic and local, to provide different viewpoints on how the areas can perform and contribute to the estimated growth. We then moved on to stage 5 to generate recommendations for the draft GARP, with a direct alignment with the evidence base that the outcome sought by the commission with respect to the land to be used. I think that was the last step.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** In regard to stage 2, that is land suitability assessment, was there a higher weighting for higher value land?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Just to further break that down, in terms of the land suitability, each of these components were weighed in a different way, including good quality agricultural land, land subject to natural hazards, environmentally sensitive land and land of cultural heritage value to Aboriginal people, and locating land near the existing services and infrastructure. I understand there is further information available online with regard to how this process was undertaken.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** I appreciate that, but the minister still has not answered my question, which was: was there a higher weighting for that higher value agricultural land?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** As I highlighted at the beginning of those comments, each of these components had a different weighting.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Higher than the others?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I would have to seek clarification on that.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Again in regard to that stage 2 land suitability assessment, were Primary Producers SA or Grain Producers SA consulted specifically in regard to stage 2 of that methodology?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Primary Producers were consulted throughout the process. In regard to the weightings, that is done with in-confidence.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** That is interesting. In terms of her comments about Primary Producers SA or Grain Producers SA being consulted throughout the process, can the minister give an indication as to what their feedback was, specifically in regard to that stage 2 process?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** My understanding is that Primary Producers SA, I am advised, did not lodge a formal submission into this process, but there has been ongoing engagement. As I said earlier, the important part of this engagement is that the government has been able to take on that feedback and been able to make changes to the process and take on some of their recommendations on how we should ensure that our agriculture buffers are put in place.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** You said PPSA did not provide a submission to the process. Were they asked to provide a submission to the stage 2 land suitability assessment process?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Like all stakeholders, they had an opportunity to participate, I am advised.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Just going back again to the weighting in regard to land suitability assessment. Why is the weighting scale confidential?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I am advised that because of the commercial aspect of this, in regard to what land might be worth in some places versus others, it is kept in-confidence for those reasons.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** I appreciate that, but I am not asking what specific areas are worth. This is in regard to whether or not there was a higher weighting for productive land versus nonproductive land. I am not asking about the value of the land; I am asking about the weighting scale and why that is confidential.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** As I said in my previous statement, if the value is released it is suggesting what the commercial value is for that land, because if we go through the weighting it is going to be very clear then what that land is valued at. I think the sense of what this bill is getting at is that we have gone through significant steps in regard to how we decided what land would be used.

As I said earlier, this is not just about the quality of the agricultural land; it is taking into consideration a range of factors from the land's natural hazards to the environmental impacts. A lot of different things have been considered. I have stepped through, was it, the five stages that the government has considered in regard to why the particular land has been set aside for a 30-year plan. It is not just that we decided to pick spaces; there has been considerable thought and engagement opportunities about why this land has been chosen.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Can the minister advise which was the lead agency for this work?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Sorry?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** The lead agency for the report.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I am advised it was undertaken by the independent State Planning Commissioner and assisted by the Department for Housing and Urban Development.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** In relation to the—I cannot remember the language that she used—multilateral reports, were there formal appointments from PIRSA, SA Water and each of the other relevant bodies to have input to truth-test the input?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** As there have been a range of consultation periods throughout this whole process, it is important to note that multiple agencies have been able to engage in this process. For the first time, it aligns with the 20-Year State Infrastructure Strategy prepared by Infrastructure SA and the SA Transport Strategy prepared by DIT, and provides coordinated infrastructure and greater confidence because of that working across all the agencies.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I was listening keenly while the minister was responding to my colleague Dr Centofanti. I appreciate she may not be prepared to provide more detail on that particular aspect, but is the government prepared to publish something which is more detailed than the interactive maps which are on the website too, and I think give some indication to the community and a level of transparency about how they have arrived at it?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I am advised the technical guide with the methodology is published online on how we were able to get to this point, so that is all publicly available. So you can go through that process and find out how we were able to use that method to get to where we are today.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I thank the minister for that answer. It was more the actual reports that informed the decisions that I think people in the community have expressed they would like to see. I am sure the view is that the full thing cannot be published, but is the government prepared to publish something that is more detailed that people would be able to look at and understand the decision-making process?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** As I said before, you can go through the technical guide, but in regard to going into further detail about why this is in, why this is out, there is a commercial aspect to this. We need to protect the decisions that were made because we have followed a method here, a quite rigorous method that I am advised has gone through multiple steps about why we have been able to get to the point that we are at. So the information that is provided is that balance of finding how we have been able to achieve the spaces that have been allocated, whilst also protecting that commercial component of this discussion.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Can the minister appreciate, though, that there is a difference between consultation with agencies such as PIRSA on land suitability methodology compared to input from agencies like PIRSA on land suitability methodology?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** My understanding is that, from the very beginning, there were multiple agencies who were able to put into what this method would look like. Then we have obviously

been able to make sure that we have started there and then become broader with the stakeholder engagement, so people can participate in that process. It was an ability for people to be able to participate. As we have gone through, this has started with GARP and has got to the point we are at now, with the consultations going on for quite a period of time.

**The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI:** Was PIRSA part of that early methodology?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I understand that a number of agencies were a part of that methodology. PIRSA was one of those agencies, as well as DEW.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Just a quick comment, if I may: in response to one of the minister's responses—and again I appreciate that particular productive value might not be something that can be published in detail—I do not accept that having a detailed understanding of where the pipework and the roads are excludes more detail from being published on the website. I will just leave my comments at that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

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

Amendment No 1 [Lensink–2]—

Page 3, after line 15 [clause 4(1), after inserted subsection (1)]—Insert:

- (1a) Despite subsection (1), with respect to land in and around Victor Harbor and Goolwa, the environment and food production areas are as defined by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered G20/2025.

Note—

The environment and food production areas (other than those in and around Victor Harbor and Goolwa) are defined by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered G9/2025 (see subsection (1)).

Except in relation to land in and around Victor Harbor and Goolwa, the environment and food production areas in Greater Adelaide defined by the plan numbered G20/2025 are identical to the areas defined by the plan numbered G9/2025.

This relates to additions to Victor Harbor and Goolwa, which I will speak to in a moment. Just to backtrack on perhaps a couple of issues, I note that the Hon. Connie Bonaros referred to Mount Barker. I do not think it is a fair comparison. I do not think she was directly drawing the analogy that our amendments would result in a Mount Barker, but I would like to point out that that is a separate issue. What we are talking about here is land that is or is not able to be subdivided. There is a whole process that goes on, which is code amendments—determining what uses can be applied to land—and also master planning. I think Mount Barker was a classic case of master planning that will haunt the Labor Party for years to come, as will its infill target, I might add—which infill will not be changed by this bill. But I should not let myself get distracted.

In relation to this particular amendment, it is something that is keenly supported by the member for Finnis, Mr David Basham, and his local community and is supported by the council. There is a proposal for a whole swag of land to be used for housing at a site known as Goolwa North, which the local community have the view is in the wrong place. What we have thought to do, ultimately, with all of these amendments is not to substitute land that we believe should be in or out, according to what the government has, but to provide additional land according to the principle of taking pressure off areas where—and there are genuine anomalies as well, which is part of the process that I referred to, where we took direct representation to the minister's office last year.

There are clearly anomalies throughout the EFPAs, and this partly falls into that category and is also a means of providing alternative land, which we believe would better suit housing that already has some services available and better connectivity, as far as the local community is concerned.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** As I indicated earlier, we will not be supporting the opposition's amendments. In regard to the zones that have been suggested, if I was to look at the west of Port Wakefield Road—

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** This is Goolwa.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Sorry, we are up to Goolwa. In regard to this particular new area that has been suggested by the opposition, I guess we have heard already that boundaries between communities are seen as significant. In regard to the feedback that has been put forward in regard to expanding and almost making Port Elliot part of Middleton, and Middleton part of Goolwa, this was a concern that was raised. There are also conservation areas within this area that have an important role for local conservation, native vegetation and wetlands, and perform an important stormwater management function between the major coastal settlements in Victor Harbor, Port Elliot, Middleton and Goolwa.

There was significant consideration given in regard to the areas that we have proposed, and considering some of the feedback I have put forward already, the landowners as well. David Basham is one of those who may be from that local area, but we also know that there is land in that area very much named after the family—Basham Road, Basham Beach—so maybe that is where the consultation has come from regarding this rezoning. In regard to those significant portions that I have mentioned before in regard to native vegetation and wetlands, it was not seen as an appropriate space.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I will just respond to that. My understanding is that there were no areas that had conservation value that we sought to have excluded. I am not sure of the relevance of talking about the Basham family. They have just happened to have lived there for a very long time and perhaps they know the area well, but I will leave it at that.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes .....7  
Noes.....10  
Majority .....3

#### AYES

Centofanti, N.J.  
Hood, D.G.E.  
Pangallo, F.

Game, S.L.  
Lee, J.S.

Hood, B.R.  
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

#### NOES

Bonaros, C.  
Franks, T.A.  
Maher, K.J.  
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)  
Hanson, J.E.  
Ngo, T.T.

El Dannawi, M.  
Hunter, I.K.  
Simms, R.A.

#### PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.  
Scriven, C.M.

Martin, R.B.

Girolamo, H.M.

Amendment thus negated.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Just for the benefit of members, I do not mean to be belligerent—far be it from anyone in this place to ever be belligerent about calling divisions—but I will be calling divisions on each of these amendments because I think it is important that—

**The Hon. B.R. Hood:** I'll allow it.



**The CHAIR:** The Hon. Ben Hood, that is a relief for everybody that you allow things to happen in this place.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I will be calling a division on each of these because I think it is important. The next amendment is probably the simplest one, which is two parcels of land that are close to the Murray Bridge town boundary that have never been used for primary production and are currently zoned rural living.

I think I can anticipate what the government is going to say, which is that that land will be allotted to something else, that this is part of a big development. I think what is going to happen is if these two allotments are not allowed to be managed within that entire development as appropriate, that there may be things anticipated down the track—they may want to move things around but it will be stuck in the FPA. Some of this stuff is more frozen than Elsa's castle. I move:

Amendment No 2 [Lensink-2]—

Page 3, after line 15 [clause 4(1), after inserted subsection (1)]—Insert:

- (1b) Despite subsection (1), with respect to land at Hume Reserve Road, Murray Bridge, the environment and food production areas are as defined by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered G25/2025.

Note—

The environment and food production areas (other than those at Hume Reserve Road, Murray Bridge) are defined by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered G9/2025 (see subsection (1)).

Except in relation to land at Hume Reserve Road, Murray Bridge, the environment and food production areas in Greater Adelaide defined by the plan numbered G25/2025 are identical to the areas defined by the plan numbered G9/2025.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I thank the member for her feedback. As has also been highlighted as concerns by the Hon. Rob Simms, this particular parcel of land has a very steep topography and is bound by the Melbourne railway line, which is to the south of Swamp Road to the west and is also within the Riverbank recreation zone to the east. It is a unique parcel of land that has been identified by those opposite, but we are unable to support this amendment.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes .....7  
Noes.....10  
Majority .....3

#### AYES

Centofanti, N.J.  
Hood, D.G.E.  
Pangallo, F.

Game, S.L.  
Lee, J.S.

Hood, B.R.  
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

#### NOES

Bonaros, C.  
Franks, T.A.  
Maher, K.J.  
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)  
Hanson, J.E.  
Ngo, T.T.

El Dannawi, M.  
Hunter, I.K.  
Simms, R.A.

#### PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.  
Scriven, C.M.

Martin, R.B.

Girolamo, H.M.

Amendment thus negated.

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

Amendment No 3 [Lensink–2]—

Page 3, after line 15 [clause 4(1), after inserted subsection (1)]—Insert:

- (1c) Despite subsection (1), with respect to land in the area of the Adelaide Plains Council west of the A1 Highway (known as the Port Wakefield Highway or Princes Highway), the environment and food production areas are as defined by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered G27/2025.

Note—

The environment and food production areas (other than those in the area of the Adelaide Plains Council west of the A1 Highway) are defined by the plan deposited in the General Registry Office at Adelaide and numbered G9/2025 (see subsection (1)).

Except in relation to land in the area of the Adelaide Plains Council west of the A1 Highway, the environment and food production areas in Greater Adelaide defined by the plan numbered G27/2025 are identical to the areas defined by the plan numbered G9/2025.

My explanation will be a little lengthier. I think all honourable members had access to a couple of the reports which were prepared on behalf of the proponents for this area west of Port Wakefield Road. If I could also address comments that the Hon. Rob Simms made in his debate, the area in question that he is talking about is covered by parks legislation, so it has that particular protection. It is worth reminding people that all these EFPAs do is prevent people from subdividing. They do not remove any other statutory protections that apply to parcels of land within it.

There are two proposals that I think have merit and are worth talking about for this area. The word on the street that we have had is they have been told, 'Wait for the 2027 review.' Let's not slow things down, Labor, because they have done enough of that with housing. If I talk first about the Dublin area, there is a significant proposal for a green circular economy precinct at Dublin, which is to transform underutilised land into South Australia's first green industrial, residential and clean energy economy precinct—which should be enough to make the Hon. Mr Simms take note—using sustainable technologies.

Key parts of the vision include the creation of a new employment precinct and housing growth for some 1,300 new dwellings. There is already a code amendment in progress for that. My understanding is that if that is agreed to then this is going to have to be revisited, so I do not know why we would wait for that.

My advice is that the Adelaide Plains Council supports the realisation of this particular development. It would provide for a future population of 3,250 people through 1,300 dwellings. The proponents have sought that Dublin be identified as a growth area, so that is through a separate process. This would provide for a significant master planned opportunity rather than waiting for the next review.

Part of the argument against some of our amendments is probably about infrastructure. It certainly was by the member for Light, Mr Piccolo, and yet these proponents have determined that they would at least do their own sewer, so it is no cost to the government in terms of infrastructure. The consultant's report has certainly identified that a lot of the other infrastructure issues would be able to be readily addressed.

If I talk about Two Wells west, that development would allow for a large number of houses—some 19,000 dwellings for 22,500 residents. There have already been traffic studies done for the area, which would enable plans for that to support that, and their own work highlights that the site is well placed to leverage off allocated investment in trunk infrastructure to unlock the outer-north growth region. They go on to say, 'Given lead times associated with removal of land from the EFPA, coordinated master planning and upgrades could also be completed with SA Water ahead of growth.'

So I do not really understand the government's reason for opposing any of this, particularly, as I said, given we already have the significant development at Riverlea, and we have all that land northwards, which has proximity to Osborne for potential housing for AUKUS employees and for other purposes. With that, I commend this amendment to the house.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** As has been highlighted, the government will be opposing this amendment. Some of the consideration in relation to this comes again to what the Hon. Rob Simms highlighted earlier: it is home to a conservation site, including the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park. Area 1 features delicate coastal ecosystems with high conservation values, and national or conservation parks were considered a hard constraint on future urban development potential in the investigation undertaken to inform this plan.

Other considerations that were also put into the determination of this area were the concerns around flat, low-lying topography that is subject to flooding and also the significant infrastructure cost due to poor water waste management networks.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes .....7  
Noes.....10  
Majority .....3

#### AYES

Centofanti, N.J.  
Hood, D.G.E.  
Pangallo, F.

Game, S.L.  
Lee, J.S.

Hood, B.R.  
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

#### NOES

Bonaros, C.  
Franks, T.A.  
Maher, K.J.  
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)  
Hanson, J.E.  
Ngo, T.T.

El Dannawi, M.  
Hunter, I.K.  
Simms, R.A.

#### PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.  
Scriven, C.M.

Martin, R.B.

Girolamo, H.M.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

New clause 4A.

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

Amendment No 1 [Lensink-1]—

Page 3, after line 38 —Insert:

4A—Insertion of section 7A

After section 7 insert:

7A—Greater Adelaide—primary production land audit

- (1) The Commission must conduct an audit of all land used primarily for primary production purposes (*primary production land*) in Greater Adelaide—
  - (a) in the case of the first audit under this section—by no later than 1 January 2027; and
  - (b) in any other case—at least once in every period of 10 years after the publication of the first audit.
- (2) The audit must be conducted in consultation with Primary Producers SA (or its successor body) and the LGA.
- (3) The audit must—

- (a) identify land in Greater Adelaide that is critical for current and future agricultural production purposes and assess constraints on its development; and
- (b) include maps detailing existing and potential agricultural land uses in Greater Adelaide; and
- (c) evaluate strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in relation to agricultural production and development in various areas in Greater Adelaide; and
- (d) include other information on land uses, infrastructure and biophysical conditions in relation to land in Greater Adelaide and constraints on development of such land; and
- (e) promote the optimal use of the agricultural land in Greater Adelaide, including by—
  - (i) identifying areas of less productive land from an agricultural perspective (that should be developed for housing and infrastructure before other land); and
  - (ii) informing decisions and other processes (whether under this Act or otherwise) relevant to agricultural land in Greater Adelaide, including in relation to interface management policies relating to urban development.
- (4) An audit under this section must include investigation reports and assessments (including multicriteria analysis) relating to the suitability of land in Greater Adelaide for different land uses (such as residential, primary production, commercial, industrial or other uses).
- (5) The audit must be published on the SA planning portal.

This is our audit clause. Given how these processes transpired, particularly from the view of primary producers, stakeholder groups and local communities as well, there is a distinct lack of confidence in how the government has gone about it. It is, 'Trust us; we're from the government.' So this codifies how that audit must take place, ensures that it is in place in time for the five-year statutory review for 2027 and then provides that it has to be done every 10 years. Quite frankly, if a clause like this had been put in place when the amendments were made in 2016, I think we would have seen quite a different process and there would be a lot less angst in the community.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** As was indicated at the outset, the government opposes the amendment. The reasoning is there is already a robust process and methodology to review the agricultural and primary production land within the Greater Adelaide region. The Greater Adelaide Regional Plan (GARP) and the review of the EFPA boundaries was conducted through a detailed multicriteria analysis involving over 100 datasets and engagement with 175 key stakeholders through the broader GARP process. The opposition's amendments are an unnecessary duplication of the existing land use review conducted with GARP.

Additionally, they seek to introduce strengths and weakness, opportunities and threats, a swat test or analysis, which is subject in nature to relying on opinion rather than fact. There is no clear understanding as to how this subjective information will be used to inform our land use planning for Greater Adelaide, undermining the rigorous GARP and environmental food and production area review process.

The committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes .....7  
 Noes.....10  
 Majority .....3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.  
 Hood, D.G.E.  
 Pangallo, F.

Game, S.L.  
 Lee, J.S.

Hood, B.R.  
 Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

## NOES

Bonaros, C.  
Franks, T.A.  
Maher, K.J.  
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)  
Hanson, J.E.  
Ngo, T.T.

El Dannawi, M.  
Hunter, I.K.  
Simms, R.A.

## PAIRS

Girolamo, H.M.  
Martin, R.B.

Scriven, C.M.

Henderson, L.A.

New clause thus negatived.

New clause 4B.

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

Amendment No 2 [Lensink–1]—

Page 3, after line 38 —Insert:

4B—Amendment of section 18—Constitution of Commission

(1) Section 18(2)—after paragraph (f) insert:

(g) primary production.

(2) Section 18—after subsection (3) insert:

(3a) In making a nomination that is relevant to the operation of subsection (2)(g) insofar as it relates to primary production, the Minister must take reasonable steps to consult with Primary Producers SA (or its successor body) before the nomination is made.

There is a whole range of expertise that is required to be considered in the nomination of members of the State Planning Commission. I think it is a gross omission that primary production is not one of them. There is local government and others, and so if anyone were to be inclined to support any of our amendments and consider it incredibly non-controversial, this would be it. I think what it all means is fairly self-evident.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I rise to highlight that we are opposing this, as we have indicated already. The PDI Act limits the number of members of the commission to at least four and no more than six persons. Aside from preparing regional plans, the other work of the commission requires limited specific knowledge of primary production. This work includes amendments to the Planning and Design Code, development of practice directions and practice guidelines, and assessments of compliance against assessments of the panel members.

The committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes .....7  
Noes.....10  
Majority .....3

## AYES

Centofanti, N.J.  
Hood, D.G.E.  
Pangallo, F.

Game, S.L.  
Lee, J.S.

Hood, B.R.  
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

## NOES

Bonaros, C.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)

El Dannawi, M.

Franks, T.A.  
Maher, K.J.  
Wortley, R.P.

Hanson, J.E.  
Ngo, T.T.

Hunter, I.K.  
Simms, R.A.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.  
Scriven, C.M.

Martin, R.B.

Girolamo, H.M.

New clause thus negatived.

Remaining clauses (5 and 6), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (18:09):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 18:10 the council adjourned until Wednesday 14 May 2025 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***NOARLUNGA DOWNS INTERSECTION**

**427 The Hon. B.R. HOOD** (19 February 2025). Can the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport advise:

1. How many annual vehicle-related incidents have been recorded at the four-way intersection of Patapinda Road and Church Hill Road, Noarlunga Downs, since 1 January 2015?
2. How many of the abovementioned incidents have occurred at night-time?

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

During the 2015 and 2023 period, there have been eight reported crashes at the intersection of Patapinda Road and Church Hill Road, Noarlunga Downs.

One property damage crash was recorded that happened at night-time.

**MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE**

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (6 February 2025).

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State):** In response to questions one to three, the Minister for Health has advised:

SA Health has guidelines in place to ensure staff know how to use artificial intelligence (AI) technologies safely and in accordance with current policy. An advisory document was issued to SA Health employees on 28 November 2024 regarding the use of AI technologies. This advisory stated that SA Health employees must not input any personal information or any official government information that is not suitable for public consumption into publicly available AI tools. This is to ensure patient information is not made available via open source AI and to protect SA Health staff and patients from information being inadvertently released.

SA Health has established a data governance program and an AI governance working group that develops policies and procedures for the secure use of confidential patient data and emerging AI technologies. The AI governance working group also defines standards and processes to assess research and evidence based clinical projects, ensuring compliance and patient safety.

Within this governance framework, SA Health is actively working on solutions to allow clinicians to use generative AI tools within a secure environment to ensure that no confidential patient data leaves its system. This may include using AI for the generation of clinical summaries and letters, and scribing, within a safe, secure, and protected environment. This approach allows clinicians to leverage modern AI tools while mitigating the risk of data breaches. Any AI tools adopted by SA Health will be robustly tested and evaluated prior to being released for routine clinical use.

Additionally, SA Health is developing a clinician education program to inform staff about the benefits and risks of emerging technologies like generative AI, promoting safe and responsible use in clinical practice.

In response to question four, I am advised:

The Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO), Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF), has published the Guideline for the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence and Large Language Model Tools. The guideline is publicly available on DTF's website. The guidance applies to all public sector agencies and assists them in considering the safe usage of this technology in their agency.

The Crown Solicitor's Office have a use of generative artificial intelligence policy, which is reviewed every six months to keep in line with emerging technologies. The most recent version was approved on 16 April 2025. It restricts any use of generative AI technologies to executive-approved use of Microsoft 365 Copilot with commercial data protection enabled. Any outputs generated must not be used for any legal work without first independent checking of its accuracy and correctness.

**WHYALLA DRY ZONE PROPOSAL**

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (4 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:

1. Whyalla city council recently joined the Safety and Wellbeing Taskforce (the taskforce)—a multi-agency committee supporting the needs of remote Aboriginal people and the communities they are visiting. Taskforce members identify and discuss matters with a view to developing strategies and place-based responses that support mobility, safety and wellbeing.

The Department of Human Services (DHS) is continuing to work with stakeholders, including taskforce agencies, through the Whyalla Services Leadership Group (WSLG) which includes representatives from:

- SAPOL
- Whyalla city council
- Plaza Youth Centre
- SA Health (Flinders and Upper North Local Health Network)
- National Indigenous Australians Agency
- Catholic Community Services
- Nuyara Aboriginal Health Service
- Services Australia
- SA Ambulance Service
- Mission Australia
- Department for Child Protection
- Centacare

The taskforce will continue to oversee responses in Whyalla.

DHS is working closely with Aboriginal tenancies in the and supporting people who are visiting Whyalla to return to community.

The Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs has advised:

2. The Whyalla city council has written to me advising that it is currently consulting on a city-wide dry area.

Should the council decide to apply to vary the existing dry area in Whyalla to a city-wide dry area, evidence would need to be provided of public consultation including consultation with relevant service providers to address displacement issues.

3. The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner has introduced a three-month trial restricting the sale of four-litre casks, five-litre casks and all fortified wine and port casks commencing on 14 April 2025.

The trial will see if the restrictions have an impact on antisocial behaviour and alcohol-related harm in Whyalla and surrounding areas.

Data from liquor licences and authorities will be reviewed to determine the next steps.

#### **PORT PIRIE, BLOOD LEAD LEVELS**

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (18 March 2025).

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

The diagnosis of acute lead toxicity was a result of laboratory tests conducted by PIRSA. Whilst no specific source of the lead was identified at the time of the reports, the condition of the animals suggested a point source rather than exposure over a long period.

PIRSA received approximately 14 reports of sick and dead birds and flying foxes observed in the Port Pirie area between 24 July and 14 September 2024.

The EPA was made aware of the sick and dead fauna by PIRSA as part of its investigations in October 2024. The EPA interviewed stakeholders, including PIRSA, the local council, Nyrstar, vets and animal welfare NGOs such as Bat Rescue SA. The investigation was unable to establish the specific source of the acute lead toxicity.

I am advised the EPA is unaware of any further acute lead toxicity cases having occurred since September 2024. Furthermore, the EPA met with Port Pirie Regional Council on 7 April 2025 who confirmed that they had not been notified of any additional acute lead toxicity cases since the 2024 incident.

#### **AVIAN INFLUENZA**

In reply to **the Hon. L.A. HENDERSON** (19 March 2025).

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

South Australia participated in the national Exercise Volare in August and September 2024. This was a series of three scenario-based discussions based on a hypothetical detection of H5N1 high pathogenicity avian influenza (HPAI) clade 2.3.4.4b (further referred to as H5 HPAI) in Australian wildlife in SA's Coorong region.



These exercises aimed to improve preparedness across agriculture, environment, health portfolios and respective stakeholders to manage future HPAI outbreaks, and more specifically to inform the management of H5 HPAI across wildlife, livestock industries and health.

#### FRUIT FLY OUTBREAK

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (19 March 2025).

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

Due to the detection of an adult Queensland fruit fly in a trap in the Glynde outbreak zone on 26 March 2025, the reinstatement date for that outbreak response has been extended to 28 November 2025.

#### TOXIC DUST

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (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 Minister for Housing Infrastructure and Minister for Planning has advised:

1. The Department for Housing and Urban Development has engaged an independent consultant to conduct an air quality assessment, to analyse potential impacts in the area considered for the Sellicks Beach Code Amendment.

2. The Department for Housing and Urban Development's role is to ensure the proposed urban growth area is suitable for residential development. In addition to the air quality assessment, regular planning processes will be followed in considering the rezoning of the site. Community consultation will be part of this process.

The Minister for Climate, Environment and Water has advised:

3. The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and the Department for Energy and Mining (DEM) co-regulate the Sellicks Hill quarry. Both agencies are responding to and investigating community concerns relating to dust from the facility.

The EPA undertakes regular site inspections of the Sellicks Hill quarry to ensure Adbri complies with its licence. The EPA also conducts regular visual observations within the local area to assess any visible emissions of dust.

The EPA and DEM also attend all Adbri Sellicks Hill Community Consultation Group meetings to ensure government fully understands the community's concerns.

The EPA licence is publicly available on the EPA's website. A dust management plan was approved by the EPA in January 2025. The plan requires Adbri to investigate options to improve dust management at the site and Adbri must submit a revised dust management plan to the EPA for approval by April 2025.

The revised dust management plan will be required to have:

- updated and tightened trigger action response plan dust levels;
- improved dust mitigations at the crusher and associated processing plant
- additional screening mound construction works; and
- revised dust controls around drilling and blasting activities.

The EPA has previously undertaken monitoring in relation to the facility. Findings from a study undertaken between January 2016 and February 2017 have been published on the EPA's website.

#### BULK-BILLING

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (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 Treasurer has advised:

There is no general practitioner (GP) payroll tax. Payroll tax is collected on the taxable wages of all businesses liable for payroll tax in South Australia.

As part of the 2024-25 budget, the government announced that from 2024-25, medical practices will be eligible for an exemption on the wages of GPs based on the proportion of bulk-billed services relative to total services provided by GPs. The measure is intended to provide protection for current bulk-billed patients and an additional incentive for GPs to bulk-bill patients.

Commonwealth data indicates that the average GP bulk-billing rate in South Australia is currently around 75 per cent. The federal Labor government has recently announced an initiative to extend bulk-billing incentives from

November 2025, expanding the eligibility for incentives to all Australians and introducing a new bulk-billing practice incentive program. It has been stated that these measures are expected to increase bulk-billing rates to around 90 per cent.

#### **DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (1 April 2025).

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

An approval process for new dams or alteration of existing dams is required to ensure that surface water resources are sustainably managed. Dams significantly affect the natural flow regime, delaying the onset and magnitude of flow events, which affects the availability of water to downstream water users, including businesses and the environment. Increasing the size of dams or constructing new dams would further alter the flow regime, further affecting the availability of water to downstream water users.

In a changing climate, water supply from dams is expected to become less reliable. As we plan for a hotter and drier future, punctuated by extreme weather events, alternative water supply arrangements will need to be considered. Constructing new dams or enlarging existing dams will not help landholders across the catchment secure additional water if rainfall totals are reduced.

For these reasons, relaxation of rules relating to new dams or the alteration of existing dams is not recommended.

#### **DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

In reply to **the Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (1 April 2025).

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

With the announcement of the additional \$55 million for drought support, an additional \$4 million has been allocated to assist charities with freight costs to transport donated fodder to assist farmers with feeding livestock.

Three of the five participating charities are continuing with their targeted hay deliveries under their existing funding agreements. Those charities are Rural Aid, Farmers Relief Agency and Rapid Relief Team.

#### **BIODIVERSITY LOSS**

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (1 April 2025).

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

SARDI's Crop Sciences Research division undertakes a range of applied research and development activities focused on improving outcomes for South Australian growers. These activities often focus on developing farming practices that are more sustainable for both the grower and the environment. Current examples include trialling new crop rotations to maintain yield in dry conditions and the use of soil amendments to enhance the soil microbiome and increase soil carbon. Wherever possible these trials are carried out in partnership with growers or at demonstration sites to assist with uptake and adoption.

#### **SARDI FISH DEATHS**

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (30 April 2025).

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

That SARDI did consult with an external veterinarian, 'Gribbles Veterinary Pathology', as indicated in appendix 3 of the report.

#### **ABORIGINAL CORPORATIONS**

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (30 April 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:

Native title legislation is governed primarily by the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) (NTA), which is federal legislation enacted in response to the *Mabo v Queensland (No 2)* decision of the High Court in 1992.

Under the NTA, native title occurs through a determination of the Federal Court. If native title is found to exist, the claim group must nominate a prescribed body corporate (PBC) to hold or manage the title on their behalf.

On 14 March 2023, the Federal Court recognised the Narungga people as the native title holders of the Yorke Peninsula.

Narungga Nations Aboriginal Corporation (NNAC), as required under the NTA, became the registered native title body corporate (RNTBC).

As part of the settlement of the claim, the state and the Narungga reached a settlement reflecting the state's existing compensation liability arising under the NTA for the extinguishment of native title by the state in the Yorke Peninsula. A settlement amount of \$50 million was provided to NNAC, with another \$5 million for administration support and the transfer of land in fee simple.

Compensation is determined through a carefully considered process which assesses the just terms compensation under the Native Title Act, and encompasses for both economic and non-economic (or cultural) loss, together with interest on the economic loss calculated from the date of each extinguishing act.

Prior to any payments being disbursed to a native title body from the state, due process is undertaken to ensure common law holders are ideally positioned to be the beneficiaries of the settlement compensation.

NNAC is also regulated by the federal independent statutory regulator Office of Registered Indigenous Corporations (ORIC). ORIC ensures RNTBC's operate lawfully, transparently, and effectively.