

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 29 April 2025

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell) took the chair at 11:00.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, 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.

The **SPEAKER** read prayers.

Bills

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 April 2025.)

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (11:01): In closing the debate, I would certainly like to thank the previous speakers, the 14 members who participated in the debate. It is an important debate for our state, particularly because it is important for housing supply and it is also important for the protection of the state's farming land, its food production area and the like. We have to get the balance right and we have endeavoured to get the balance right. We want to make sure that there is a long-term window for housing in this state, to make sure that housing supply—the huge investments that have to go into housing supply—is adequately catered for, and that means that by its nature you need to think in a very long-term way. You have to push your thinking out into the future decades in order to make sure that there will be the supply of land and, most importantly, development-ready land.

It should be noted that some of the land that Renewal SA has on the market in Playford Alive, for instance, was first bought with grants given to the state government by the Whitlam government in 1973-74 or so, so just two years after my birth—and it gives you an idea that we are putting that land on the market some 50-odd years later, just the nature of land supply in cities. We have to think very, very carefully in a very, very long-term way about that.

This bill basically realigns the EFP boundaries to ensure that there is a consistency between the GARP and the EFPA, and that is a very, very important thing to do for the state, for landholders, for developers, for farmers, for everybody. It is a consistent set of boundaries by which everybody can be guided, which is basically formed via the State Planning Commission's comprehensive analysis on this. To reassure members and the house, there was a robust methodology applied to the boundaries and to the areas identified for housing. Over 100 datasets were formed as part of that analysis.

The State Planning Commission engaged with local government to ground truth those datasets, to make sure that the council strategic plans were in alignment, to make sure that that analysis was not just done through a multicriteria analysis but that there was real ground truthing involved. The establishment of that multicriteria analysis put real rigour around the land identification process.

Of course, all of that land that was identified in the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan was reviewed and endorsed by the State Planning Commission and by the government. We have been through a rigorous process. It has been a longstanding process from the discussion paper, launched over a year ago, to today. Of course, that is an important process to go through. We have thought about this very carefully.

Among the matters that came up in the bill also was the issue for farmers. I grew up in a farming community. I have talked about Kapunda and going to Kapunda High School. Many of my best mates in high school, many of whom are still friends today, were farmers. They were people who were part of multigeneration farming families who had real ties to the land, and I can absolutely understand their apprehension about farming activities continuing.

Existing land uses will still remain after this bill. Nobody is forced to cease their farming activities. A person's farm will still be their farm and they can continue farming as long as they wish. Land that is identified for future housing, of course, will have a limited land division overlay over it to make sure it cannot be broken up into unusable allotments. We want things to be either farmland or housing supply. We do not want to end up in a middling area where neither purpose is fulfilled.

We want to make sure that the land that is subject to the changes in the EFPA and the land that is identified for housing will still have to go through a rigorous code amendment process. It will still have to go through the provision of infrastructure, which we know is challenging for this state. We know from practical experience, since the Housing Roadmap to today, how comprehensive, thoughtful and, frankly, how expensive and technically challenging it is to provide water and sewerage to new land coming on the market. It is not an easy process. We still have to go through all of that before this land is development-ready, and that will take some time.

I did talk a little bit about the buffer area between development areas and farming land, and I think this is something that the state has to think very carefully about. I have committed to putting in place an adequate planning overlay within the system to make sure that the buffer is there between residential housing ending and farming beginning. That will be particularly important at Roseworthy, and it is a concern at Murray Bridge as well.

Where we have residential communities, we want to make sure that we have a good buffer zone between residential land or housing ending and the farming beginning. I have also expressed that to developers through the UDIA and made them aware of that. I am confident that we can have the primary producers, the grain industry, the UDIA and the Master Builders all working together to get a planning overlay that works for the State Planning Commission. I am confident that some of the understandable issues that were brought up by members in their speeches can be addressed.

Just before I close the debate and we go into committee, I would like to take this opportunity to thank people for their tireless efforts on both the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan and this bill: David Reynolds, Craig Holden and the State Planning Commission. It has been an extraordinarily busy time for the State Planning Commission: they have been doing not just the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan but other matters as well. I also thank very important people in my department: Sally Smith, Brett Steiner, Ben Sieben, Ben Murphy, Marc Voortman and the whole GARP team at Planning and Land Use Services.

This has probably been the most intellectually challenging and busy time to be a planner in the state government's employ. I might add that with the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan we are really only getting the plan. As important a milestone as that is, it is just getting to halfway through the journey because, of course, plans are only as good as their implementation. We have a whole lot of actions coming out of GARP that will be particularly important and will keep planners busy for the next years to come.

It is really important that, as a state, we acknowledge we have a very good planning department in this state. They punch above their weight, they do really good works and I think it is important for both sides of the house who have benefited from their hard work over a number of years to acknowledge their hard work and continue to support them to do this really important work for our state. With that, I close the debate.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr TEAGUE: I might just take the opportunity to first acknowledge the government's work in this area. The minister has just summed up the second reading debate. It is understood that the amendments to planning arrangements, particularly in this area, are the source of fairly

thoroughgoing consideration, bearing in mind that there are very keenly felt views about how we manage the retention of our state's valuable food production areas and deal with the competing interests including, in this case particularly, the opportunities for residential growth in our state. It is with that in mind that there are amendments on file that we will get to at clause 4.

The opposition has given very careful consideration to the government's proposed changes and has identified in broadly three areas where augmentation with improvement resulting can be achieved. Those are, for the purposes of the debate, firstly, a couple of very discrete areas in the area of Murray Bridge, secondly, a block of area west of Highway 1 in the Adelaide Plains Council area that I might describe broadly as Dublin changes and, thirdly, on the Fleurieu and a number of individually identified titles in that area. So there are three categories of expansion to those areas that are the subject of expansion that the government has identified.

In terms of covering the field at this point, I think it is important to emphasise that the name of the game in this regard has been that we should at all times characterise our consideration of all this as productively as we can, with a view to avoiding, as far as possible, politicising what we all agree is a matter that we should all end up being proud of as South Australians, which is what direction our state is taking and how we are providing for all the interests that are apparent, whether they are characterised by opportunity or by challenge or by the balancing act between the two of them. The opposition is committed to that task and we will be interested to hear from the government about those three areas of improvement in particular.

I have received an indication just now from the government that, for the time being and as presently structured at least, they are inclined not to support the particular form of the amendment that I will put subsequently. But I just want to say at the outset that there is an opportunity that may occur in the course of this debate—and I hope that the contributions we will hear in the course of the committee will continue to shed light on those opportunities—if it is necessary between the houses and on return to this place, to look at the merits of those proposed changes.

Of course, it is the government that has the resources to be able to identify where there may be technical challenges notwithstanding an otherwise meritorious proposal. If there are substantive reasons why the government, as it has advised, has reasons to oppose particular changes then let us hear that in the course of the debate. But I want to emphasise the opposition's commitment to working towards improvement, so where there is bipartisanship that can be achieved the opposition will continue to work towards those outcomes. For the purposes of clause 1, I will perhaps leave it there.

I would otherwise flag that the amendments, such is the necessity of the structure of them, are consequential upon each other. The real core of the matter for the purposes of the debate is to be found in amendment No. 2, which sets out those particular areas. It would be I think to advantage for the purposes of the debate in the committee for there to be an opportunity to address each of those areas, albeit as a matter of process, if the house is so advised, and we would need to do so in the course of the debate on amendment No. 1. But we will get to that when we get to it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr TEAGUE: Again, I just hop up at the outset at clause 4 to set the scene. Clause 4 is where we find the government's substantive amendment to the environment and food production areas for Greater Adelaide. That is by way of an amendment to section 7 of the act according to the plan—and I do not know if it has been deposited or it is going to be, as presently advised—that is numbered G9/2025. That plan, G9/2025, is going to set out the government's proposed EFPA changes.

Because we are dealing with particular areas of land at a granular level we are describing certificates of title by volume and folio, and that is perhaps relatively easily seen in the macro view by looking at a map and seeing lines on it, but the subject of G9 is changes to those specific certificates of title and folio numbers one by one, and it may be that there are discrete issues associated with an individual certificate of title even, let alone broad areas.

To put it clearly, the opposition is interested in looking at both a broad area analysis, and if there are particular issues associated with those individual titles then let us identify them as best we can. As I say, without descending into a debate about the amendments that I will move in due course they would amend G9 in the three ways that I broadly categorise them: firstly, in relation to the Murray Bridge land; secondly, the land that I have characterised as Dublin; and thirdly, that that I would characterise as Fleurieu and that is the subject of very many certificates of title and folio numbers, so much so that it is the subject of a proposed additional schedule A1.

For the moment—and I know others will have questions going to those areas—I would ask the government perhaps to just give an indication as to how it came to land on G9. It might be an opportunity for the minister to indicate that by reference to the broad and if there are particular issues that might be associated with individual certificates of title, then I welcome that for the benefit of the committee as well.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I thank the opposition for their question. I did talk a bit before in my second reading explanation about the multicriteria analysis, which is always, I guess, planner speak for a good process by which to identify land. Essentially, the inputs they put into that multicriteria analysis are really about: is it flood prone, can you get infrastructure to it, is it sort of broadly contiguous with the city's growth, does it conflict with the Hills Face Zone, does it impose on good agricultural land? There is a whole range of analyses which the State Planning Commission, through Planning and Land Use Services, identified. That began with the discussion paper last year, which was a public document of 170-odd pages, and I think got, from memory, about 700 submissions from the public, councils and the like.

It began with that discussion paper. That is important, I think, for a debate of this nature because you do want a degree of public understanding and community consultation, knowledge and awareness. We endeavoured to do that. It had the areas that, broadly speaking, were identified for discussion and analysis. Then we took submissions and obviously made adjustments—the State Planning Commission, I should say. Craig Holden is the Chair now and was the Chair appointed by the previous government and a person of good standing in the community and particularly in the building/architecture area. That is the way we determined the land on which we were putting housing.

In terms of the boundaries of the EFPA, how we determine that in the course of this bill, of course we are looking at preserving good quality agricultural land. We want to put in land that is subject to natural hazards—that is basically flooding—environmentally sensitive land, and there is a fair portion of that in some of the areas under discussion in the amendments, and land that is of cultural heritage to Aboriginal people. Obviously, the issue of the cost of infrastructure is also factored into, in particular, the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, but also into the boundaries of the EFPA as well. That is broadly speaking before.

I talked about my speech. In terms of the datasets, in all those datasets there are constraints. Flooding is a constraint. Probably the best illustrative way of describing this is if you look at Two Wells. It grows north. The reason why it does not grow in the other directions is primarily because of it being flood prone. They are the things that the State Planning Commission has done as background assessments.

In terms of the opposition amendments, which we will get to, I think there are, broadly speaking, two reasons why the government will oppose them in the house. Firstly, I do not think it has been subject to the same kind of degree of consultation. That is not a criticism of the opposition: I just think it is useful to talk about these matters quite comprehensively.

The second issue is that all the areas are essentially in one amendment. Each of these areas is in quite a different part of the state and has different constraints or different issues that might apply to it. So that is the reason the government will be opposing the opposition's amendments, but I take what the deputy leader said about bipartisanship. It is certainly important in terms of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, and we have had previous iterations of the plan that both sides of parliament have adopted effectively in government.

I was talking before about some of the land that had been bought during the Whitlam government being sold today, finally being released today. Not just bipartisanship is necessary: multigenerational policy thinking, even within parties and across the party divide, is needed because cities are incredibly complex entities. Housing supply, from its debate, has lots of facets to it, lots of policy intricacy, challenge and complexities to it. There is a diverse range of opinions about how we

tackle those challenges. I suppose that is a longwinded answer to the opposition's question, but that is principally the approach the government has taken.

Ms PRATT: Minister, on the same clause, clause 4(1), I have some early observations with a question to follow, noting your contributions at the second reading. It was pleasing to hear a reference to Roseworthy and recognition that a buffer zone is likely to be considered by the government. But I will parrot back to you some comments that I have been capturing through the most recent discourse in committee about a commitment from the government to preserve good quality agricultural land, which I would argue is what my community is fighting for in the region of Roseworthy in consideration of this bill.

The term 'golden mile' has been used in committee by Craig Holden to the minister, I believe. It will not be lost on the minister that the farming community of Roseworthy—and when we say 'Roseworthy', not the township but, of course, the farming precinct as it extends east towards the Barossa, north towards Tarlee and west out to the farming fields of Mallala, Balaklava and Pinery. These are communities that, while they live a long way from the town of Roseworthy, feel very strongly about a bill that they see will affect them in not just their own farming lives but those of their children.

There is certainly no criticism from me about governments being required to be aspirational and visionary. A 30-year plan on anything is a good start, but to be a broken record, Roseworthy, Roseworthy, Roseworthy is a community that, whether it is on talkback or in the media proper, is a community that is heightened and concerned about its farming future.

In terms of the minister's reflections on the opposition's amendments, I believe that the government has in good faith considered the amendments as a package: the maps that I am referring to and the proposals by the opposition to propose more land to be considered within this amendment bill. I wonder if the amendments—even between the houses, but hypothetically the amendments as they are, or the maps—had been packaged differently to be presented separately or in isolation.

Can the minister speak to the government's reflection on maps relating to the Port Wakefield corridor, Dublin in particular? What concerns or impediments or objections does the government raise, and this is my question, about the amendment as it relates to the Port Wakefield corridor and the minister's comments that Two Wells, for example, can only extend to the north because it is flood prone? I note reflections in this house about the establishment of Riverlea and the traffic lights that exist there, but I would argue that was also a flood-prone area.

I see an opportunity for the government of the day to direct property developers in any of these areas to build that infrastructure first, whether it is a flyover or more slip lanes along the Port Wakefield highway. We see from Lower Light to Windsor all the way through to Port Wakefield extra U-turns or arrangements to accommodate a high-traffic area. In a packaged comment back to you, minister, as the member for Frome representing both Two Wells and Roseworthy, those communities have expected strong advocacy in the house on this bill and in good faith the opposition have put forward suggestions for some bipartisan debate.

There are good suggestions being made by the opposition to test the government's appetite to look more closely at Two Wells and the expanding community with infrastructure around water, freight and transport corridors, and that it is well positioned to carry more houses, more families, more business and more employment zones, and we see the proposal being considered for Dublin as an example of that. So if the amendments had been put forward separately, what objections has the government landed on that make the Dublin proposal unwelcome or unsupported?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I thank the member for Frome for her question. I guess this goes back a bit to what I said about the multicriteria analysis. We had a 170-page discussion paper and there was an opportunity for people to properly debate the State Planning Commission's discussion paper and all the different propositions that were put in there. I think that was a conscious decision by the State Planning Commission, one that I supported and I thought was important.

I think one of the issues for planning is that sometimes we have not been so good at talking about all the thinking that goes in behind any proposition. It does not matter whether it is in a township or in a city, the more you talk people through it—and the changes in composition of society alone are comprehensive. One of the biggest drivers in housing supply at the moment is the collapse of the household formation rate, for instance, which nobody talks about but is tremendously important, and

that is basically older people ageing in place, living longer, and the divorce rate. I am not making a comment about the divorce rate, but if you go from 70 per cent of families being nuclear to only 50 per cent, your housing supply has to expand to accommodate those constellation families.

In terms of the nature of the amendments, as I said before, they are all in quite different parts of the state, and so if you asked me about them separately I would give you different answers. In terms of the area the member identifies, principally there are these constraints: first of all, conservation. This is quite an important area for the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary. There are birds that fly all the way to Siberia from our coast. There are quite fascinating nature and conservation parks, so it is environmentally sensitive and important.

There are natural hazards. It is mostly flat, low-lying topography, shallow saline groundwater profiles, and it is traversed by the Gawler and Light River flood plains, and so that is an issue. There is also the cost of infrastructure, which is twofold. It is not just grade separations and traffic treatments, expensive as they would be, but also water and sewer. The difference in Riverlea's case is that water can flow from the tanks at Craigmore, and at Sandy Creek there are a bunch of tanks on the hill—a very famous pipeline on the hill. Water flows down the plain through Andrews Farm, down Curtis Road, out to Riverlea.

The other advantage Riverlea has is it is relatively close to Bolivar. Those two things make it somewhat different to land to the north. The infrastructure costs are high, once you start having to do what is called rising mains or pumping for water. They are the principal reasons why that particular section of the amendment would not find support with the government.

Mr PEDERICK: I am a little bit flummoxed by the government's opposition to this clause. We had multiple meetings on this side of the house in regard to trying to get some realistic outcomes to some amendments to this bill and where we thought we might end up in a bipartisan space, but obviously it sounds like that is not going to happen, which is disappointing, to say the least.

Before I get to my question, I want to reflect on what happened in 2016 when this planning bill was amended. As I have said in this place before, we were 50 clauses into committee when the environment and food production areas were introduced by the former Attorney and I could see then that there were going to be issues down the track. It is interesting, after we have seen the history of what happened with Monarto over 55 years ago and the proposal, which I think was quite visionary, but it should have gone another 15 kilometres down the road and enlarged Murray Bridge at that point.

One thing I was pleased about when the EFPA was introduced—because there was not much I was pleased about—was the fact that Gifford Hill was exempted because that will be very important as part of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan moving forward. I want to acknowledge the work of the Murray Bridge Racing Club. I am so glad they worked from 2003 to get that area in place; it will become the centre of a great development.

I also acknowledge that some significant areas will be exempted from the environment and food production area for housing and the Grange development plan moving forward. I met with Grange recently and they were very keen to get on with the project. It was announced last year that there will be 17,100 homes, and it is, as far as I am concerned, the right area to be getting developed. Obviously, it needs the appropriate infrastructure in place, and I will talk about that a bit more later. I certainly appreciate some of the exemptions being made there.

The minister is certainly aware of some of the food processors in the area who are a bit concerned about buffer zones. This may be decades out, but people do need to be cognisant of the fact that there are areas like mine, a value-add area, an agricultural producing area, but then that second tier of food processing, or food production. Certainly, not the least is the Costa mushroom factory, which probably supplies close to 50 per cent of Australia's mushrooms. It has made a significant investment in that area of at least \$200 million, and I would suspect it is wanting to invest into the future.

I appreciate there are also some amendments in this plan to develop the area around Northern Heights to the north of Murray Bridge. The issue I had at the time this was introduced was it was quite an arbitrary measure, from somewhere around Kapunda all the way to Goolwa and Victor Harbor. It was like a blanket position was put in place. If you look at what happens with housing development, rezoning and that kind of thing, there are a lot of hoops people have to go through

anyway in getting something done. In fact, it just seems ridiculous that sometimes a housing application in an area zoned for housing can take two years. It just seems ridiculous to me that it takes that long, certainly during a housing crisis. The minister outlined some examples of why that is in place, and I acknowledge that.

We certainly had some good thoughts. I did contemplate some other land. I thought, 'No, I will try to be realistic,' and I identified, as is written in the next amendment, two titles in Murray Bridge—Certificate of Title Volume 5941 Folios 798 and 799—which just border the current border of the Rural City of Murray Bridge. Because they were not in the Rural City of Murray Bridge, according to the planning bill that is currently in place, they cannot be developed. I was trying to be realistic and go with a minimalistic approach. I looked at these two sites of several hectares. I do not have the numbers with me at the minute, but it is not a very large area. I thought it would have been a realistic amendment in regard to directly adjacent land in Murray Bridge that could be developed if that was the way to go.

As part of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan—and it will be in decades to come—there will certainly have to be a lot more land opened up and realised. It is a long way down the track, I will admit, but we have the potential to be part of the growth, and I am happy to work with that as long as I am here. But I am a bit dismayed that I essentially looked at two titles, and the government is going to vote them away. In relation to these two titles, could the minister give his direct reasons why the government is not happy with the amendments in relation to these two titles in Murray Bridge?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I thank the member for Hammond for his speech, his passion for Murray Bridge and his engagement with council and the racing club. I think there is already a great deal of bipartisanship in regard to my interactions with him, not just in Murray Bridge but in other places. You have been a good contributor and a practical contributor to planning debates in your area, so thank you for that.

In relation to the two allotments the member identifies in the amendments, these areas are identified in the structure plan as providing future tourism accommodation, recreation and public open space uses, which are not inconsistent with the EFPA. The EFPA does not stop those uses; it just stops residential development.

In regard to the particular allotments the member talks about, if they were presented in a different format we might have been able to have a more agreeable conversation. In this instance, because they are grouped together with other areas, it makes it difficult for the government to support the opposition's amendment. That said, I do not think the inclusion of these areas in the EFPA will prevent the uses that will be of benefit to Murray Bridge, but equally if you took them out of the EFPA I do not think it would be the end of the world either. I think it is not of great consequence in terms of the overall integrity of the EFPA.

I would be happy, once we are through the house, to have further conversations with the opposition regarding Murray Bridge. I want to support Murray Bridge, because the rural city of Murray Bridge has been one of the best councils in the state—the first place an infrastructure scheme has been identified for instigation, and that is a really important thing. These infrastructure schemes are the way out of the sort of situation we see in Mount Barker and Angle Vale, where you have too many landholders, too many developers and land deeds are not keeping up; I do not want to see another Angle Vale or another Mount Barker.

I am happy to talk further with the member about Murray Bridge in particular—that would be fine. I understand his passion and practicality in the issue, but unfortunately in this case it is grouped together with Dublin and with the land specified in schedule 1A, so that by its nature means that the opposition has given us a package deal, so we have had to treat it as part of that package.

Mr PEDERICK: I acknowledge the minister's comments. Yes, I have had quite a bit of interaction with the minister and his office and I certainly appreciate that. It is involved in the next clause, but it is all part of the two clauses. The section involving Murray Bridge is exclusively 1A(a). I may be being selfish, but it could be exiled out on its own quite simply, because it is there in the amendment and I would ask the government to look at that.

Besides that, the minister indicated it is an area that could be developed for tourism or other suchlike. Could the minister expand on the potential use for these two blocks if they were not to be

part of our amendments. They come under their own discrete subamendment of a subamendment, as everyone can see from the amendments. I would appreciate more feedback on that.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The land in question is part of the Murray Bridge structure plan, so it is already identified as being ideally located for future tourism accommodation, recreation, public open space, and the like, and for housing, and the EFPA does not prevent that from occurring. The council is interested in using it for that purpose. I do not think this area is ruled out for the sorts of development that will support Murray Bridge. As I said before, it is an important issue, and I am happy to have discussions with the member subsequent to the bill passing and us dealing with the amendments. I think we have to treat the amendments as a whole, as a package deal. It is hard to extract things.

The second thing—and I do not want to be critical of the opposition—is the bill identifies a map submitted by the minister to the GRO, and the reason we have done that is because of the difficulty with putting the land into a bill. That is why we went with the map submitted to the GRO, because it would be hard to attach a map to a piece of legislation.

I think the way of moving forward with the land at Murray Bridge, in particular, if we were to look at that again—and I would want to talk to the council and others just to make sure that everybody was comfortable moving forward—if you were to deal with that on its own, you would do it via the minister's map in the GRO. It would be easier to do that rather than allotment numbers.

There is always a danger with an allotment number; not in this case, but I fear that in other sections of the amendment if you were to just deal with allotment numbers things could go wrong. I would rather deal with a map; there is a lot more clarity with a map.

Mr PEDERICK: I thank the minister again for his answer. Allotment numbers are quite specific: there are title numbers, and you register them with the titles office. I still do not quite get it that you can use a map and not use the individual title number approach. As I said, when the EFPA areas came in it was basically council areas from around Kapunda through to the South Coast around Victor Harbor.

I guess it is more of a comment than anything. You may want to expand on what you have just said, but I would have thought allotment numbers, as we have specifically identified not just with my two title numbers but others throughout the amendments, are as specific as you are going to get. That is my comment.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: One of the difficulties is that if you use CT numbers, as the land is divided the CT number will change and that will make it very hard to track back for future generations—because this will be a longstanding bill. That is why we went with the GRO map, because the advice from the department was that it was the clearest way of defining out the EFPA and making sure we have a practical bill.

One of the other changes we are making—I do not know if it is in this clause, but in other clauses—which I talked about in the second reading speech, is that the original bill had that if the EFPA ran through an allotment you could not divide anywhere along that allotment. It made it very difficult for landowners in that case. We have thought carefully about the way we would identify land in the bill, and I think the map submitted to the GRO is the right way to go and the most coherent way of doing it.

Mr BASHAM: Can the minister confirm that under the substituted section 7(1) there is no statutory requirement for an audit or an independent assessment of land quality for altering the EFPA boundaries via the new plan G9/2025?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Going forward there will still be the normal review of the EFPA—I think that happened most recently under the former deputy premier and minister for planning—and the State Planning Commission goes through a process to do that. The only change between previous reviews and future reviews will be that because we are removing the urban consolidation test that test will not apply.

It will be, I think, easier for the commission to fix known anomalies. I do think it is important for the State Planning Commission to have that flexibility. I know they take their responsibilities about the review very seriously, and all the other tests still apply.

Mr BASHAM: Given that clause 4 alters the variation criteria to rely on for the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, and I know the minister has touched on the multicriteria land suitability analysis that has been done, can the minister go into a bit more depth about that and is the minister prepared to make that assessment available to the opposition to actually understand what has gone on?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: In relation to the member's question, in terms of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan going forward, obviously it gets reviewed periodically and there are new iterations of the plan, and that is an important thing. It is a digital plan and helps guide government departments and the like, but one of the things we did as part of this process—and it was a comprehensive process with significant investment by the government to do that. We could have just done a more simple update with a less rigorous approach, but because we thought carefully about the urban consolidation target, the 85:15 rule, we did not think that was appropriate for the growth of this state any more. We thought that it was unnecessarily guiding development, and we think infill and greenfield are broadly the same in terms of housing supply, but the issue is: do you have housing supply?

We have accommodated housing supply to high population rates, so we do not think that the task for future iterations of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan should be challenging. We have identified effectively 60,000 extra homes that we thought would be needed, and we have done that. We have looked out into the future in the best way any government can in a very comprehensive manner.

In terms of the multicriteria analysis that the State Planning Commission used, as I understand it their criteria and part of their analysis is actually up on the PlanSA website now. The opposition raised this in a number of their speeches and in their briefings with me, and I think it is perfectly reasonable—I do not think there is anything to be gained by not having that as transparent as possible. There are some commercial-in-confidence things and cabinet processes which, by their nature, are confidential, but we have put as much of the information out there as we can, and I am happy to send the opposition a link to the relevant section of the website.

Mr BASHAM: Will the minister commit to a regular audit and publication process of primary production lands in order to ensure that the EFPA boundary decisions are based on transparent and up-to-date evidence going forward?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Future iterations of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan will be public documents and, of course, any changes to the EFPA that were recommended by the State Planning Commission to a minister. So you would need to have the regular review to have the State Planning Commission recommend to a minister to make changes. The minister would still then need to come into the parliament and table those changes, and they can be disallowed. So, importantly, there is still parliamentary oversight of those reviews. There is a government-stated policy position and then there is also a process of the parliament that would maintain that into the future as well.

Mr TEAGUE: I hasten to say it feels like hopping up and closing debate on clause 4. I think the government has heard from members in relation to specific matters, the subject of amendments that have not yet been moved, but I think we are all enlightened by the minister's response.

It is clear to say that there is a fairly obvious appetite for continuing constructive work in this space. At the high level, the minister has indicated two primary reasons for the government's attitude to the amendments, the first being that they might not have captured the same level of consultation as the 170-page document did. Perhaps an answer to that might be that as representatives we are each responsible for our different electorates and the response to the consultation as a whole has painted a picture about the various priorities—I think that perhaps almost goes without saying—so there might be a fair degree of confidence about proposals that have been put, albeit emanating at an amendment stage, from an opposition source.

The second one goes to the practicalities of it all being that they are put as an all-in-one and I hear the minister about that and obviously there are means of identifying those three aspects: as I have bluntly put it, Murray Bridge first, secondly Dublin, and thirdly the Fleurieu changes. I might just indicate that, from the opposition's point of view, that aspect of the committee stage is particularly helpful and we certainly embrace the minister's sentiments in terms of further work.

In terms of one other observation of the minister in that regard, this being multigenerational planning, I think we have all come to be familiar with the idea that the EFPA, from its conception, has been characterised as something that does not get changed very readily, or all that often, with the four-year review process, but otherwise we have this legislative opportunity. I indicate that the opposition will continue to work in the course of this process in the house and between the houses with a view to the possibility of meritorious change.

I just add, to the extent that any specific error has been identified in what has been put forward, in terms of the spelling out area by area, that is perhaps most apparent at (c), that it be the subject of the new schedule. If not in the course of this debate, then between the houses, if that can be done that may overcome a present barrier in the government's view of the matter. I am still conscious that the amendments have not been put, so I look forward to doing that in due course.

The CHAIR: As you will have noticed, I have allowed a free range in this debate for clause 4 in the spirit of bipartisanship, so I am happy to entertain both amendments Nos 1 and 2, if you like. You are moving that way?

Mr TEAGUE: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Teague-1]—

Page 3, line 4 [clause 4(1), inserted subsection (1)]—Delete 'On' and substitute 'Subject to subsection (1a), on'

Amendment No 2 [Teague-1]—

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

- (1a) Despite subsection (1), the following areas of land are not environment and food production areas:
 - (a) the land in Certificate of Title Volume 5941 Folio 798 and Certificate of Title Volume 5941 Folio 799 (being land at Hume Reserve Road, Murray Bridge);
 - (b) all land in the area of the Adelaide Plains Council west of the A1 Highway (known as the Port Wakefield Highway or Princes Highway);
 - (c) the land specified in Schedule A1.
- (1b) To avoid doubt, nothing in subsection (1) or (1a) is to be taken to prevent the Commission from varying an environment and food production area (whether the variation involves creating (or adding land to) an environment and food production area or abolishing (or removing land from) an environment and food production area).

For completeness, I indicate to the committee that amendment No. 3 is wholly consequential and, depending on the outcome on amendments Nos 1 and 2, I would not propose to move amendment No. 3. I just address those briefly. Amendment No. 1 inserts a reference to a new subsection (1a). That's all amendment No. 1 does for the sake of the structure of what would be the new section 7. Subsection (1a) then sets out, and importantly—discretely—those three areas, and that is the subject of amendment No. 2.

Amendment No. 2 includes what would be a new subsection (1a): (1a)(a) being the Murray Bridge changes, (1a)(b) being the Dublin changes and (1a)(c) being the Fleurieu changes, as I have characterised them. Subsections (1a)(a) and (1a)(b) are spelt out completely and are whole to the subsection. Because (1a)(c) involves so many discrete areas, it is described by reference to what would be the new schedule.

So for the sake of the record and for the committee, anyone who is wanting to see the land that is the subject of (1a)(c) will need to acquaint themselves with what would be the new schedule A1, which would be the subject of amendment No. 3, being the insertion of that as a new schedule after clause 6. I note that the subject matter of those discrete amendments has already been the subject of the debate in the committee and, of course, of the debate on clause 4 generally. So I move amendments Nos 1 and 2 standing in my name.

The committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes13
 Noes.....21
 Majority8

AYES

Batty, J.A.	Brock, G.G.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.	Gardner, J.A.W.	McBride, P.N.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G. (teller)
Pratt, P.K.	Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.
Whetstone, T.J.		

NOES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Brown, M.E.
Champion, N.D.	Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.
Dighton, A.E.	Fulbrook, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.
Hughes, E.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.	Koutsantonis, A.
Michaels, A.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)	O'Hanlon, C.C.
Pearce, R.K.	Picton, C.J.	Savvas, O.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.

PAIRS

Tarzia, V.A.	Stinson, J.M.	Hurn, A.M.
Boyer, B.I.		

Amendments thus negated.

Mr TEAGUE: Just to indicate the result of the division: as I indicated beforehand, amendment No. 3 standing in my name is wholly consequential, and as I said to the committee before—

The CHAIR: I want to actually move clause 4 as it is.

Mr TEAGUE: Sorry?

The CHAIR: We need to actually adopt clause 4 as printed.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, but we can do that. Just for completeness, I know I said earlier that I am not going to move amendment No. 3, therefore we are in a position to adopt clause 4 as it is.

The CHAIR: Alright, do you want to do the whole lot?

Mr TEAGUE: Sorry?

The CHAIR: What are you trying to tell me, member for Heysen? We need to finish clause 4 because we had actually put clause 4.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, I am indicating, as I did before—

The CHAIR: Yes, I understood that.

Mr TEAGUE: —for completeness, that I will not move amendment No. 3, and so you have a free hand, Chair, to get on with completing clause 4.

The CHAIR: Thank you; that is what I was trying to do. We are in vigorous agreement.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr PEDERICK: Minister, I just want some explanation around clause 5, which talks about the regional plans and the supply of housing and services, certainly in regard to the provision of infrastructure and the cost of infrastructure, noting the issues we have, just in general, in this state, both in getting supply of water infrastructure in and sewers installed as well.

The minister might be able to help me with this. I understand that private providers will be able to put in water and sewer infrastructure. That is fine, I guess, in the short term, but in the longer term there is one concern that because the private providers will put that infrastructure in they will get the funding for that—which is fair enough—like the on-costs of supplying water and sewer services.

But what will impact the state is the fact that SA Water—this is probably part of the problem—has consistently over the years, no matter what colour of government, probably put \$250 million to

\$300 million out of their revenue into general revenue. This probably would have not assisted with having enough infrastructure put in place over time.

I am looking for an explanation of how that private infrastructure works. It may not be just sewer and water; it may be road connections, for instance, or something else, I am not sure. Can the minister outline how that will work and what the effect will be on state revenue into the future?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The member has invited me to make, I suppose, observations about more than just the bill. What I would say is that the bill and the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan are just that: one is a plan and one is a piece of legislation. People often confuse them. I have a copy of the 1961 plan in my office, and there are elements of that plan that I think are great. The would-be northern expressway is like a gun-barrel highway. It is straight down. There is no weaving through around the salt plains. It is straight down to the Port River at what would be the Port River Expressway now. Then you look at what they might have done to Adelaide itself and you are less enamoured with it.

The difficulty is that you have your plan, but what the member is actually talking about is the implementation of it, which is by state infrastructure: utilities like SA Water, but also now NBN, SA Power Networks and gas. There is a whole range of services that are needed, notwithstanding council infrastructure and state government infrastructure.

One of the most important things in the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan is that we have identified what many of the growth areas will need in terms of social infrastructure. We have identified infrastructure benchmarks, but that does not actually build a school, it does not build a hospital and it does not build a road. That has to be done as part of the code amendment process.

What a good state plan will do is identify what needs to occur, but implementation and the doing bit of it is incredibly complex and difficult. Take the member's comments about SA Water over generations of government. I think that is true. I think the Premier of this state said that, and I think we are all broadly in agreement, but the problem is not that SA Water pays a dividend to government. That was part of the corporatisation process. It is inherent in having a state-owned corporation that they would pay a dividend to government. The issue is not that they pay a dividend to government. It is that we are not sufficiently looking forward to what growth actually costs

If we had been looking forward—and I have been critical of the previous government, but I am happy to be critical of the one before that as well—if I had a time machine and I could go back in time, I would get them to put in just \$250 million to \$300 million worth of infrastructure, because that is what it would have cost at the time. I am now putting in, I think, effectively the infrastructure for myself and two of my predecessors. That is effectively what we are doing in the southern suburbs.

In Southwark, we are putting in \$20 million worth of upgrades, and in the north of the state. But that does not get us around the issue that infrastructure provision is expensive, that we have many parts of the state that have infrastructure constraints, and I would just caution against the idea that private providers or council providers are some sort of Holy Grail.

I think local government needs technical assistance. I think some councils have done an excellent job, some have done a sort of middling job, and some have done a very poor job. If you go to Coober Pedy, it has a very challenging set of infrastructure issues there. I think where we have left this to the private sector, we would want to be careful. I do not support private sector provision of potable water in the metropolitan area, in the Greater Adelaide regional area. I do not think that that is intellectually coherent or economically effective or a safe thing to do for the state.

If private sector provision of sewerage is undertaken, I think we have to be very careful about two things. First of all, it needs to be done to SA Water's standard. That is absolutely critical because if it fails SA Water will inherit the system. You would not be able to have a suburb sewerage fail; the state government or whoever was wearing the minister's hat at that stage would not have any alternative but to intervene, so it has to be done to SA Water's standard.

The second thing, and I think we have to be very cautious of this, is you still get charged for the sewerage portion of your bill but you are just paying it to a private provider. There is regulation under ESCOSA to make sure they do not charge too much, but there is no provision for them charging too little. If a private provider charged too little for sewerage at the beginning to make it attractive to home owners but then you found that you had a very large investment upgrade at the end of the sewer system's life and so your bills would go like a hockey stick—they accelerate because

they are cheap at the start and very expensive at the end—I think that would be a public policy failure as well, so just a note of caution.

I suppose there are constraints in the system. We are doing our best as a government to deal with those constraints. The opposition's policy, I think, would be to exacerbate those constraints because they have a stated policy of rejecting a 3.5 per cent increase, which means that you would have to find that money from infrastructure or from somewhere else. It does not come out of the air. It would have to be found either by higher taxes in some other area or higher debt: they are the two choices.

Utilities around the world work in the same way. They borrow to put in infrastructure. They charge their customers for the use of that infrastructure. They pay a dividend to their owner, and that is no different to the arrangements we have in this state.

Mr PEDERICK: I acknowledge the minister's answer, but I think the stark reality is there is so much development needed and the state is certainly behind in sewer and potable water infrastructure. Surely—and I think it is going to be a reality—private suppliers, whether it is for potable water or sewer supply, can do that under a regulated operation with inspection or whatever, because I think it is going to be the stark reality for the developments we have. Obviously, there is the development in the north, whether it is Concordia, Roseworthy, and certainly at my end of town at Murray Bridge and Gifford Hill. Under a regulatory process, I think that is the stark reality of what it is going to have to be, but I am open for any further comments, if there are any.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Only that it is the next iteration of the discussions that we will have post GARP. There are a number of implementations that come out of this, and it is an issue that comes up nearly every week. Either local members bring it to me, developers bring it to me or local councils bring it to me. Knowing the northern growth front as I do, I am well aware of its effect around the place.

I am not against the private sector provision of wastewater. I think it can be done. It is done in other states and other parts of the world. The issue will be about having it done to SA Water standard and with good regulation around it. I think that is an important and ongoing conversation that the state will need to have.

Mr BASHAM: In relation to the new section 64(2b), can the minister confirm whether the identification of land for housing growth will involve an assessment of the productivity and suitability of agricultural lands before recommending expansions into the EFPA areas?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: For the State Planning Commission to do (2b), they have to be referred to (2c), and in particular to (2c)(f), which is about that exact issue. They would take advice from PIRSA and from other entities about the nature of that.

Mr BASHAM: In relation to that assessment of the land, will the assessment include looking at, yes, it may be good agricultural land, but is it actually achievable for it to be in agricultural production? There are many parcels of land around that are no longer used for agriculture because of their locality in relation to other developments, etc. Will there be the discounting of its suitability for agricultural land based on its rainfall, soil type and those sorts of things if its location is not necessarily suitable for it to be farmed because it is hemmed in by other constraints?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Again, the answer is the same. When the State Planning Commission is doing (2b), they have to take into account all of the provisions of (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) in their consideration. I know the State Planning Commission diligently apply themselves to this. It does not matter what the membership is. You tend to put people with a great deal of experience in this area, planners and the like, and they think carefully about all these issues before they release land from the EFPA.

Other than dealing with anomalies, there should be little cause to return to the EFPA because we have accounted for housing supply for the next 30 years. We have found areas in this process that were not previously identified. Kudla is a good example, with 11,500 homes, as is Northern Park Lands and the like. We have set out to find sufficient housing supply. We have identified that housing supply. What we are doing in this act is bringing those two things into perfect alignment over the next 30 years. What happens in subsequent reviews is we will be looking at areas of anomaly. From previous briefings that I have had, I think there are fewer than 10 properties that come up as true anomalies. Outside of that, that will be the process.

Mr BASHAM: Will the minister ensure that all data and investigation reports underpinning the regional plan's housing supply forecasts and land release proposals are made publicly available, to assist in parliamentary and community scrutiny?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The methodology is already online, and that is the amount of information that we can release without looking at commercial confidentiality and cabinet processes and the like. I would prefer, as we have done in this whole process from the discussion paper onwards—and bear in mind, the 170-page discussion paper is probably the most comprehensive discussion paper and identification of land that we have ever had. We were quite deliberate on that to ensure that there was a sophisticated, public discussion about planning in this state.

I think that we are challenged by our economic circumstances, because they are good at the moment and so that will inevitably attract people. In the previous 30 years there were industrial shake-outs and the like, and that has affected our population base. I think we have done a comprehensive job all the way along about being transparent. We have been as transparent as we can be and we have released as much information as we can. When members have asked me about specific reasons why we have excluded Port Wakefield or Murray Bridge, I have been happy to outline our concerns with that.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

Mr BASHAM: Can the minister explain why the exemption from section 125(10) for the EFPA-related land division proposals is necessary, and whether this risks increasing uncertainty for the affected landowners?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: What this is doing is closing a potential loophole in the previous acts. It is turning off deemed consent, because where you have planning applications in character preservation areas like McLaren Vale, the Barossa Valley or the EFPA, you need a concurrence of both the State Planning Commission and the local council, and if you keep deemed consent then it is possible to argue that, effectively, 'I had deemed consent because the council hadn't met,' or something like that. This is endeavouring to pre-empt a problem that might occur in the future and to make it very clear that if you have a planning application in these areas you have to get both SCAP and council approval. So it is a protection for local government, in effect.

Mr BASHAM: Is there a defined alternative timeframe for deciding development applications on land previously subject to EFPA restrictions but now outside those boundaries under the plan G9/2025?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I am advised that there are prescribed timeframes—but they are of varying length, depending on the nature of the application—and that there is a general requirement to act expeditiously.

Mr BASHAM: Will the minister consider setting a maximum timeframe for decisions relating to transitional EFPA lands to provide certainty for applicants during the boundary change process?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: In regard to land that is being removed, if they have a development application already in and there is a timeframe, and that is handled, I think, by the transition provisions in the act, going forward it will just be the normal process and they will be assessed against the planning act.

Clause passed.

Schedule 1.

Mr BASHAM: Can the minister clarify whether transitional protections for development applications lodged before the commencement day will be extended to ensure applicants are assessed under the most applicable land overlay?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If you have a development application in the system, the transitional provisions will basically protect people's existing rights, so if you are putting up a hay shed, or something like that, it will all happen as a matter of course. When we remove the EFPA provisions, we are putting in a limited land division provision. The reason why we are doing that is because we do not want land that we have identified for housing growth to be broken up into two-hectare blocks, or something like that, like rural living. We needed to take off one set of

constraints but we had to put in this new limited land division overlay so that the land was properly allocated for appropriate housing supply, which is essentially residential subdivision.

Mr BASHAM: In light of schedule 1 allowing for piecemeal disapplication of land division overlays, will the minister commit to publishing a forward schedule of when areas of former EFPA land will be reassessed?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The way it will work going forward is that a limited land division overlay will prevent a disaggregated move away from farming, so farming will continue in most of these areas as it does now and then what will happen is landowners, developers and others will apply for code amendments or the council will make code amendments or the government might make code amendments. That process will take some time.

The other part of it is the matter I was talking about with the member for Hammond, which is the provision of infrastructure. Even if a code amendment is initiated, as part of those code amendments you cannot get land rezoned effectively by code amendment unless you have infrastructure provisions in place, so it will be quite a comprehensive process going forward. I think that giving a full coherent timeline on that would be challenging because we are talking about vast areas, whole communities, and of course 30 years' worth of growth.

If I had my housing hat on, there is nothing I would like better than people competing on price and quality. I think that is important. But if you look at the infrastructure constraints, that is a challenge and also you would have to go through this comprehensive code amendment process, which we are going through in Concordia, for instance. Concordia was first identified in the very first plan in 2010 and I am the minister who in 2025 is going through the process of rezoning it. So I cannot give the member a timeframe. All I can say is the timeframe is the 30-year plan.

Mr BASHAM: Does the government intend to undertake any further plans or suitability assessments before amending the Planning and Design Code to remove overlays from the former EFPA land?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The code amendment process is the process that we would follow. Typically what happens with that part of that process is people make submissions to the State Planning Commission; the State Planning Commission will make recommendations to the planning minister, whoever that person is—hopefully it is me; it is me at the moment—and then the minister has a discretion about whether they initiate the code amendment as it is given to them or whether you initiate it with conditions. Then, obviously, there is a range of investigations as part of that: transport and a whole range of other investigations, such as local government, flood mapping, water and sewers, the whole works. There are a whole lot of investigations depending on the nature of the land.

There are no time limits on a code amendment, so sometimes code amendments go for some time. I recently signed off on one that was actually initiated when the honourable member was in government. Sometimes they take some time indeed. That is because you are doing all of these investigations.

Code amendments come in all shapes and sizes. Some are very small, discrete and easy to resolve, but when you are also using effectively the same mechanism to do Concordia, which is 10,000 homes and 25,000 people, it is a much more comprehensive and coherent process and thinking has to go behind it. So that would be the process, for instance, with Roseworthy, if you were going to expand Roseworthy. If you were going to expand Two Wells, there would have to be a code amendment, and when the code amendment was applied, the limited land division would be removed as part of that process.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (12:47): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:47): I would just like to make a few comments in support of the bill, and I would like to make some observations arising from the debate during the committee stage, which I think is really important. It is particularly important for the people who live in the area of Roseworthy and those surrounding farming districts which are affected by this proposed change.

The important point I think needs to be made is that in terms of the proposed Liberal amendments which were defeated by the committee and the house, they actually did not make any changes or amendments to that proposal. A lot has been said both publicly and elsewhere about how horrible this proposal is, but the Liberal Party amendments in this place did not alter that one iota. In fact, the proposal, as I understand it—and I am happy to stand corrected—is to actually take other farming land out of the protection zone.

I think it is really important to understand that if we are going to advocate for communities we should do it in a transparent and honest way. The judgement that has been made, as I said in my second reading speech, here is: how do we actually increase housing supply? How do we enable people to have affordable housing? Part of that affordable housing is the cost of infrastructure.

One thing that became very clear in the minister's comments and answers during the committee stage was that to actually agree to the Liberal Party amendments would come at a huge infrastructure cost, particularly in the Dublin areas. I am not so familiar with the areas south of the city or the areas of Murray Bridge, etc., but certainly the proposal to allow further expansion of housing development in the Dublin area would actually come at a huge cost to either the developer, which would make the housing unaffordable, or the taxpayer, which means that somebody has to pay for that infrastructure in the end. It just does not happen. The transport infrastructure could perhaps be shared, but the reality is it would cost a lot more than what has been proposed by the government.

If we do believe in affordable housing and the right of everybody to have a house, I think it is important to make sure the land supply is such that it is at the lowest cost possible to the people who need to build a home. With those comments, I would like to reinforce and support the bill. I also acknowledge the weaknesses in the Liberal Party amendments because they do not actually save Roseworthy from development but add a lot of infrastructure costs to any potential buyers in the Dublin area. In other words, it is two negatives rather than any positives at all.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Ivan Venning, the former member for Schubert.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2025

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 April 2025.)

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (12:52): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition and I rise to speak today on the Supply Bill and to take the opportunity to speak in detail about the perspective of the opposition on not just the supply as it continues on, but the expenditure of the government so far and where we are afraid this state is careening towards without proper intervention from a proactive government. Those who understand the processes of this place and of the state understand that this bill is one which assures the government of the day the funds to be able to effectively run the state in between the budget for the new financial year being accepted and the time when the allocation from the previous one is finalised.

I reflect on the expenditure of the last financial year in particular and recognise that it continues to be an incredibly challenging time for the people of South Australia in this cost-of-living crisis faced by them under the Malinauskas state Labor government and his good mate, Anthony Albanese, the Labor Prime Minister, in Canberra. As we stand, South Australia has the lowest

household disposable income per capita of any state or territory in the nation. That means that there are fewer dollars in the pockets of everyday mums, dads and workers than anywhere else in the country. That is a damning reflection of the state of affairs where the cost-of-living crisis has been faced not just across the nation under this federal Labor government but magnified even more so here in South Australia under this state Labor government.

Our state has recorded the second-weakest growth in the nation for the last financial year. So all the talk that they try to do on the treasury benches, and the Premier over on the other side talking about how great things are—well, the figures tell a different story with the sorts of challenges that are being faced at the moment by families, by individuals, by businesses. A lot of it is caused, unfortunately, by some of the business failures that we have seen in South Australia. They have now reached their highest point since the COVID pandemic. The rate of businesses that are actually going under because of the challenges being faced particularly in this state is really astounding.

With these business values on the rise, it would be expected that perhaps the government would step in, recognising those challenges that are being faced, and perhaps ease the burden on business owners. Sadly, this is not the case at all. In fact, according to the South Australian Business Chamber's Survey of Business Expectations at the end of last year, the impact of government regulations went from the fifth biggest issue being faced by business to the third biggest in the last 12 months. One respondent said that they believed more small and medium enterprises would decide that it was not worth running a business in South Australia with the amount of red tape. That is a damning assessment from a business owner.

You may be asking: what red tape might that be? According to the South Australian Business Chamber's Survey of Business Expectations, more than half of all respondents said that the time taken to address tax compliance has increased, and with tax compliance concerns, more than 60 per cent of respondents said that their major tax compliance concern was related to payroll tax, which this government have leaned into well and truly when it comes to trying to prop up their budget that we speak about.

In this government, they continue to rake in the cash with a significant increase in the revenue from taxes such as these at the expense of businesses, workers and their customers right across South Australia. With so much negativity surrounding business expectations, it should not be a surprise that the South Australian Business Chamber's survey also found that less than 16 per cent of South Australian businesses felt the South Australian economy would be stronger or somewhat stronger in the next 12 months. Less than 16 per cent had any sort of optimism about what the next 12 months mean for them and the challenges they are facing within the South Australian economy.

The Premier, as I said, continues to try to reflect back on any sort of potential positive economic outlook that may have been provided by the commentariat or the experts that make assessments of where the economy is at both in the state and nationwide, but unfortunately at the moment they are all being superseded by ones that have a very different perspective. The latest is the CommSec State of the States report. This is one that those of us in this place would know. The Premier often refers to the CommSec measure point as a shining light.

Unfortunately, now the CommSec State of the States report says that South Australia is slipping well and truly when compared with the other states, with the report now highlighting what we on this side have been talking about for months, things like the significant drop in business capital investments. This is a real concern. If a business is not investing its funds back into the ongoing work of its business or even the expansion of its business, it reflects the challenge that is being faced right across the South Australian economy.

It reflects those concerns that I have been talking about: the lack of business confidence, their frustration with excessive regulation, excessive obligation from government. Unfortunately, there is no positive news in sight from this state government. This goes along with some of the other reports that we have been highlighting on this side. The NAB report says that business confidence is the weakest in the nation. Let us be truthful about it: South Australian business is mainly small business, small and family business. The challenges that they face mean that their confidence is the lowest in the nation. That should be alarm bells for this government.

To go with it is the latest Deloitte report, which highlights those exact challenges, exactly the same. They are starting to pile up. The rose-coloured glasses that the Premier might have when he is trying to commentate on where business is at at the moment in South Australia surely are

becoming more dim because of the facts that are being presented by the experts in this field. Numbers like this can only lead to a drop in business confidence. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

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

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of former Senator Dr Baden Teague and Mrs Kathy Teague—welcome to parliament—along with former tourism minister Joan Hall; former member for Schubert, Ivan Venning; and former member for Hartley, Joe Scalzi. Of course, Dr Baden Teague and Kathy Teague are the parents of the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party.

Condolence

LEGGETT, MR S.R.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:03): By leave, I move:

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

I rise to pay tribute to Stewart Leggett, former member for Hanson, who passed away on 11 April at the age of 80. A Bordertown boy, Stewart was driven by a fierce determination to excel at everything to which he turned his attention. Even a serious car accident that ended his high school studies in year 10 barely slowed him down, completing years 11 and 12 through night school while holding down a full-time retail job in Adelaide.

During his time in Bordertown, Stewart had made the acquaintance of a visiting teacher, Marion. The pair married in 1964 and were to welcome two children, Sarah and Paul, both of whom went on to become accomplished classical music performers and teachers themselves. Stewart was to become an educator himself, earning a degree in theology in 1970 and rising to senior academic positions at Pulteney Grammar and Temple Christian College, and finally headmaster of the Aldinga campus of Southern Vales Christian College until his retirement in 2005.

His time as head of drama at Pulteney also held him in good stead for the silver screen, with roles in two SA Film Corp productions: *The Sound of Love* in 1978 and *Wrong Side of the Road* in 1981. Throughout his career Stewart was also living his faith. He had been verger at one of Adelaide's oldest churches, Holy Trinity of North Terrace, and after his retirement he maintained his connection through Victor Harbor Trinity Church, and regularly filled in as pastor of the Victor Harbor Church of Christ, where his memorial service was held last week on 24 April.

Stewart also had a lifelong passion for sport—tennis, cricket and particularly the AFL. A dedicated player throughout his youth, he served as a premierships coach of the North Adelaide Central District amateur league and was later to contribute further to SA football as chaplain for the Norwood Football Club.

Somehow, amongst his duties to education, church, sport, drama and family, he also found time to pursue a career in politics. Stewart ran for the Senate in 1974 under the banner of Steele Hall's Liberal Movement, formed by the former Premier during the Liberal and Country League's internal ructions, and chose to follow Hall into the Liberal Party of South Australia. His longstanding commitment to the Liberal Party was vindicated by their landslide victory in 1993 when he entered state parliament as the member for Hanson, a now vanished seat in the western suburbs, whose boundaries once covered a good chunk of the divisions of Badcoe and West Torrens.

Stewart's time in this chamber was brief but impactful. During that time, he proved himself a man of strong principle, unafraid to take stands on principle, even if they clashed with the government of which he was a part, most notably on the introduction of Sunday trading, which he believed would benefit large traders at the expense of Adelaide's small businesses.

He was also a passionate advocate for the recruitment of more women to run and serve in parliament, and his unwavering religious convictions guided his staunch opposition to the decriminalisation of sex work and voluntary assisted dying. These principles also guided his brief return to the political sphere in 1999, running as a Legislative Council candidate for Fred Nile's Call to Australia Party.

His retirement at Victor Harbor did not mark the end of his public life. He ran a close second in the district's 2010 mayoral campaign, and was a long-time presenter on the region's community radio station Happy FM. His pursuit of all these professional, political, sporting and spiritual endeavours was made possible by the stability offered by his beloved family.

Tragically, Paul Leggett drowned in a freak car accident near Alice Springs in 2016, and Stewart's beloved Marion passed away in 2019 following a long illness, calling time on 55 magnificent years of marriage. But appropriately enough, it was his work with Happy FM that Stewart was to find new joy as a friendship with fellow volunteer Jackie blossomed into love and then marriage.

We offer our sincere condolences to Stewart's family and loved ones, particularly his beloved Jackie, his daughter, Sarah, and his grandchildren Ellen and Sam. I move that the motion be commended to the house.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): I second the motion and today rise on behalf of the opposition to also pay tribute to the life and legacy of Stewart Leggett, the former Liberal member for Hanson from 1993 to 1997, a man who certainly served his community with great humility, faith, courage and compassion.

As we have heard, he was born in Bordertown on 18 December 1944 during what was certainly a turbulent time of war, but from his earliest days he carried with him a spirit of optimism and determination that would certainly shape the course of his life. Even after a very serious accident that effectively ended his formal schooling in year 10, Stewart's passion for education and self-improvement never wavered. He completed his senior studies through night school and became a teacher. His teaching career spanned schools such as Pulteney Grammar, and Temple College, where he rose to become Vice Principal, and then later he became Principal at Southern Vales Christian College's Aldinga campus. He brought passion, humour and an unwavering commitment to his students, touching countless lives along the way.

Stewart's contribution to public life extended way beyond the classroom. In 1993, as we have heard, he was elected to the South Australian House of Assembly as the Liberal member for Hanson. His election marked a proud moment, a very proud moment, for his family and community, bringing to parliament a man of integrity, compassion and strong convictions. During his parliamentary service, from 1993 to 1997, Stewart distinguished himself through his work on the Social Development Committee where he focused on some of the most challenging and often overlooked issues of our time: supporting families, improving community welfare and pushing for reform in areas such as the prison system.

He spoke passionately about the need to eradicate drug use and sexual violence within our prisons, not because it was always politically expedient but because it was morally right. And that was the essence of Stewart Leggett from those who knew him best, that he was guided by his principles, not necessarily his popularity, all the time. His time in this place was also marked by very deep friendships from right across the political spectrum. That is why we have members like the former Speaker Mick Atkinson, Joe Scalzi, Joan Hall and others here today.

It is often said that he treated his competitors in politics like he treated his opponents in sport. He did not see them as political enemies, necessarily, but as equal contributors to our democratic system. These friendships extended way beyond the course of his political career. He treated those political opponents with respect. I know that they continued to visit him right until his final days. Stewart built strong bonds with various colleagues, who are here to pay their respects today. These relationships certainly endured far beyond the rigours of his parliamentary life.

Stewart also remained true to his Christian values throughout his career. Even when he offered a minority report on sensitive issues, he never compromised what he believed. His work reflected a deep commitment to what he said would be a fairer, more just society, a society where dignity and compassion prevailed. After leaving parliament at the 1997 election, as we have heard, Stewart continued a life of service. He worked as a senior adviser to the Premier and Deputy Premier of the state and then contributed to education once more as a principal. He also served on the Legal Practitioners Conduct Board, advocating for accountability and ethical leadership in public life.

Beyond his professional and political achievements, he was a man of many passions. As we have heard, he was a talented footballer and tennis player in his youth, and he then captained and coached North Adelaide Centrals to a premiership in 1967. That sporting spirit endured throughout his life, and he remained a loyal and passionate supporter of the Adelaide Crows.

He was also a gifted communicator and performer and, as we have heard, he acted in musical productions like *Oliver!* and *Noah's Flood* and appeared in South Australian Film Corporation movies such as *Wrong Side of the Road* and *The Sound of Love*. In later years, Stewart's love of radio shone through, as he became a beloved voice at local station 90.9 FM in Victor Harbor, where he shared some stories and interviewed local and international sport heroes alike.

Yet, perhaps Stewart's greatest pride and joy was his family. He was a proud father, a grandfather and a husband whose love and support of his family were unwavering. His eyes lit up when speaking about his grandchildren, Ellen and Sam. In his final years, even as illness took its toll, Stewart continued to live with grace, humour and a strong spirit. His life was a rich tapestry woven with service, family, faith and community. He was a teacher, a preacher, a politician, a performer, a sportsman, a husband, a father, a grandfather, above all a man of deep heart and unwavering spirit.

On behalf of the Liberal Party and the opposition, I extend our deepest sympathies to Stewart's wife, his daughter, Sarah, his grandchildren Ellen and Sam, and his close friends, including Mick, Joe and Joan. As an educator, a community leader and a member of parliament in this place, he will certainly long be remembered. His values, his humour and his humanity touched so many lives, and his legacy of service will live on. May he rest in peace.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the minister I would like to acknowledge Mick Atkinson, former long-serving member for Spence and Croydon, and former Speaker and Attorney-General of South Australia. It is wonderful to have you here today, Mick. Welcome to parliament.

Condolence

LEGGETT, MR S.R.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:14): I was Stewart Leggett's constituent, and I can profess that I never voted for him, sir, but I knew in 1993 that he was going to do something no other Liberal could, and that is win a seat that should have been Labor.

He was a gentleman. He was a lovely individual. He had the conviction of his Christian faith which he brought into the parliament which, in my opinion, was very admirable. He was someone I was preparing to contest against in the 1997 election. I was destined to run against Stewart as the Labor candidate, until my mentor and teacher, the honourable former member for Spence and Croydon, Mr Atkinson, decided to put me into the seat of Peake, which was alongside Hanson, and I am very grateful for it.

Stewart never forgot his Christian values throughout his entire life. He voted in the best interests of his Christian faith the entire time he was in this parliament, and it is something that gives me strength as a Christian in this parliament to know that there are people like him who, despite potentially being a more moderate being of the Liberal Party, have maintained their strong religious convictions.

He kept teaching throughout his entire life, which I thought was an exceptional trait of his. He also remained close to his former parliamentary colleagues, who are here today. I see the former

member for Hartley, the 'Lion of Hartley', Mr Joe Scalzi, Mr Ivan Venning, and Ms Joan Hall, a very good friend of mine who was here and, of course, Michael Atkinson.

Stewart had to make some tough decisions in this place. He had to decide in a leadership contest between a man who had won 37 seats at a state election, still the largest ever majority obtained by any individual leader in this state's history, who was removed from office within a short period of time—and Stewart had to make a decision, and he made a tough one. He voted for John Olsen rather than Dean Brown. Naturally, he would have been aligned with Dean. I suspect what Stewart did was vote with his conscience.

I do not know what was going on internally within the Liberal Party when he made that decision. It would have been very difficult for him, and I suspect he probably regretted it afterwards because it probably cost him his seat. However, he never compromised on who he was and what he stood for, and for that he deserves our thanks.

For those of us in the western suburbs who were served by him, he deserves our gratitude and thanks. He put his name forward to serve the people he lived amongst, and for that we are eternally grateful. I hope he finds comfort in the arms of our Lord and Saviour, and I hope finally he is at home at rest in peace.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:18): I also rise to remember Stewart. I did not have an awful lot to do with Stewart but certainly had the opportunity when he was working at Happy FM in his voluntary capacity to be interviewed by him a couple of times. Happy FM is a fantastic community radio station. Ken Burgess (Happy Ken Burgess as he was normally known) was very much the founder of that station, and to have Stewart there alongside Ken and the others—June Taylor and others who have been through that station—made it a fantastic community asset. Stewart certainly added that value in his delivery.

I very much remember being first elected to parliament back in about 2018, when my eldest daughter would have only been about 13 or 14, and she made a comment about Happy FM. I think it was actually just after I did an interview with Stewart that she said, 'Happy FM is ABC radio for old people.' She said that very affectionately just because it operates on a slightly slower motion than the ABC. But it has that dedication to the community, trying to find out those local issues that are confronting the local community. Stewart did a wonderful job in that role and I very much thank him for his involvement in the Victor Harbor community where he chose to retire. Vale to Stewart and we remember these important people in our lives.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (14:19): My engagement with Stewart was also slight, but I guess it was a sign of the passing of time as I joined the Young Liberals in early 1996 and Stewart finished his parliamentary service in late 1997, shortly after I had joined the Young Liberal executive. In the comments that came through from the Premier, the opposition leader, the member for West Torrens and the member for Finniss was this sense of Stewart as a gentleman, and I think that is to be lauded, encouraged and held up as a standard to which we should all seek to aspire.

We are joined by Joan Hall, Joe Scalzi, Ivan Venning, Mick Atkinson and Baden Teague. For a member of parliament who served in this house 30 years ago to have five former colleagues coming to the condolence motion is no small thing and a sign of the regard in which he was held. I think it was his character and the way he disposed himself and comported himself in this place that has contributed to that, even though there is no-one left here who served with him.

I was reflecting with Joan earlier on the interactions I had with him after that. I did some brief work with Joan during the time when Stewart Leggett was serving the Liberal government in another fashion and I interacted with him a couple of times. As a man of faith, education, community, sport, church and radio, that contribution to the whole of what life has to offer was very, very strong and is also to be lauded. I am sure that his daughter, Sarah, his grandchildren and, of course, Jackie, can be very proud of that continued service, and that continued character.

On the way in I asked Joan what were the key things that she thought were worthy of reflection and she highlighted the two things, in addition to a number of those that have been said already. First was his lifelong passion as an educator. As a former education minister I saw for myself, from the teachers and the school leaders that I engaged with, the passion that they feel to ensure that the next generation are supported to become all that they can be, and that was certainly

something that was evident in Stewart's life. Secondly, and I think very, very importantly—and not enough understood in this place—was the importance of the Adelaide Crows in the firmament of this state! He was a passionate supporter and they have lost a fan as well. Vale to Stewart Leggett and condolences to his family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:25 to 14:35.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: 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 Deputy Premier (Hon S.E. Close)—

Aboriginal Lands Trust—Annual Report 2023-24

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Summary Offences—Knives and Other Weapons

Rules made under the following Acts—

Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991,

Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993,

Youth Court Act 1993, Magistrates Court—

Joint Criminal—

No. 6

No. 7

Uniform Special Statutory—

No. 5

No. 6

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Motor Vehicles—Section 82A Demerit Points

Road Traffic—

Miscellaneous—Breakdown Services Vehicles

Road Rules—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions—School Days

By the Treasurer (Hon S.C. Mullighan)—

Forestry SA (South Australian Forestry Corporation)—Charter 2024-25

Government Response to Standing Committees—

Natural Resources Committee: Inquiry into Environmental, Social and Governance
in Primary Production Government Response April 2025

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon J.K. Szakacs)—

Local Council By-Laws—

City of Tea Tree Gully—No. 7—Cats 2025

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:37): I bring up the 132nd report of the committee, entitled Southwark Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms HOOD: I bring up the 133rd report of the committee, entitled Clare Hospital: Central Sterile Store Department Upgrade Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:38): I bring up the 49th report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Potential for a Human Rights Act for South Australia.

Report received.

The SPEAKER: Before we move on to questions without notice, we are having some difficulties with the microphones and the speakers. Hansard is aware of it and will, at close of business today, try to come up with a resolution rather than risk missing out on hearing everything during question time. We are aware of the problem and we are looking for a solution; hopefully we will have one by tomorrow. Thanks to everyone in Hansard for the work that you are doing.

Question Time

HEALTH SYSTEM

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): Just before budget time I note, sir. My question is to the Premier. Are ramping, long ED wait times and postponed surgeries the new normal? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: In response to the Australian Medical Association 2025 ambulance report card, the President of the AMA, Dr John Williams, was quoted in *The Advertiser* as saying the following:

It's no secret ramping has been getting worse. The AMA's Ambulance Ramping Report Card highlights just how bad things have become in a relatively short space of time...My concern is that ramping, long ED wait-times and postponed surgeries have almost become the 'new normal'.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:40): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. This government shares the concerns made by a number, including ourselves, in respect of the challenge we see in our public hospitals, particularly in our emergency departments. While, of course, the government is very keen to point out the substantial improvement we have had in ambulance response times, we absolutely accept that it shouldn't be a new normal in terms of the challenge we see within emergency departments.

I think, as is well documented—and I speak to my interstate colleagues of both political persuasions, premiers around the country, as I know the health minister does enjoy good relationships with his equivalent in other jurisdictions, again from both sides of the political aisle—the challenges that we are seeing in public hospitals, which are in effect uniform around the country, should not be allowed to become a new normal.

The principal question before governments writ large of all political colours and hues at the moment is: what more can we do to confront that challenge? Certainly, here as a state—and this is certainly a topic of discussion as we finalise this year's state budget—we remain steadfast in our resolve to invest additional resources that are required, not just because it is about throwing money at the problem but because the reality is we've got an ageing population and a growing population, and that is true around the country.

You can't have a smaller system and expect to do more. You do need to have a bigger system with more capacity to be able to confront the massive increase in demand. Of course, to that end, we couldn't be creating more supply of services no matter how much more money we put into it, because we are moving at flat strap to invest in that capacity. Let's talk about what that looks like in a bit of detail.

We are building more than 600 new beds. We committed to 300 new beds in the four-year term; we are going to be delivering 600 new beds into the system. The new beds—and there are a lot of new beds coming online this year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on his final warning. You have been doing nothing but interjecting in the three minutes that question time has been going on.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: New beds are coming online this calendar year at Hampstead, Flinders Medical Centre, Noarlunga, the Lyell Mac, Modbury, QEH and Mount Gambier, and then also with Drug and Alcohol Services at Elizabeth. That is happening this year. On top of that, we know that there is a lot more to come beyond this year, particularly at the Flinders Medical Centre or indeed at Mount Barker, which I know the member for Kavel is well familiar with and understands the desperate need for, which in effect triples the capacity at Mount Barker.

These are massive investments in the physical infrastructure to accommodate the ageing population that we have here in the state. Beyond that, of course, we've got other investments at hospitals in regional South Australia which are important to recognise as well: Gawler, KI, Keith, I mentioned Mount Barker, Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Port Augusta, Pirie, Victor, Clare, Leigh Creek, Bordertown, Wallaroo and Whyalla. They are all enjoying big investments. But on top of that there are the people. In the first two years of this government, we have recruited more than 1,400 extra health workers above attrition: 691 extra nurses, 329 extra doctors, 219 ambos and 198 allied health workers. We will keep investing to do what is required to make a difference.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. When will the Premier fix ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The AMA 2025 Ambulance Ramping Report Card revealed that the total hours ramped outside of South Australian hospitals has almost tripled under Labor, rising from 15,329 hours ramped in 2019-20 under the former Liberal government to 45,399 under the Malinauskas Labor government in 2023-24.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:45): I could speak at great length to the challenges that the system is experiencing, but our job in government isn't to sit around and observe the problem. Our challenge in government is to make sure we are actually investing the energy and effort, not just the money, in the policy that will make a material difference not just for the men and women who work with such dedicated enthusiasm and passion to look after their patients but for the sake of the patients themselves.

What we are doing as a government is methodically working through each and every level of our public hospital system to invest in growing its capacity. What we definitely know is that those opposite who seek to admire the problem are also contributors to exacerbating the problem—not just admiring it but exacerbating it—because during the course of a pandemic their solution was to make nurses redundant. Had that not occurred, maybe we would be in a stronger position than we are now.

This government is focusing on solutions, not just admiring the problem. Let's talk about what that looks like beyond the investments in the capacity and the people: innovative ideas that aren't just about relying on government but also partnering with those in the not-for-profit sector—those types of organisations that would seek to provide services in the community, whether it be addressing MND or epilepsy or mental health services that we know can make a difference on the frontline so as to prevent admission.

More than that, we are seeking to partner with the commonwealth in primary health care, which we know in the past has been underinvested in. Rather than freezing the amount that is paid to GPs, we are working with a federal government that is investing in the amount that it is making with GPs. Without a decade of not just inaction but active cuts to investments in primary health care, maybe the country would be in a stronger position today. We continue to make the investments, we continue to make the decisions, and we sit down with our clinicians and seek to work with them rather than against them to try to make sure that we are delivering better outcomes for people coming into care.

The people who appreciate and understand the government's policy, effort and endeavour better than anyone are the men and women working on the frontlines themselves. If you sit and

speaking to an ambulance officer, as I try to do on a semi-frequent basis, when I ask them what is going on, they don't sit down and say that everything's fantastic. They don't sit around and say that every problem is solved. But what they do know is that there are more ambulance officers in the system today than would otherwise be the case had this government not been elected, they know the difference that hundreds of extra people on the ground responding to 000 callouts makes, and they know that there are more people alive today than would otherwise be the case because there are now ambulances getting to 000 lights-and-sirens, life-or-death emergencies on time that would otherwise not be the case without the policies of this government.

So there are investments being made, there are decisions being enacted, and more people are alive today than would otherwise be the case. But we don't sit around and live in an alternative universe and suggest there aren't problems—of course there are, and that is exactly why we are making the decisions to make a difference for those people who deserve it most.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I remind members on both sides that interjections are in contravention to the standing orders. Member for Morialta, you are on your final warning. Member for Unley, member for Schubert, member for Hammond and member for Chaffey, you are close as well, as is the education minister.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome to parliament today law students from Flinders University—welcome to parliament—and also students from King's Baptist Grammar School, who are guests of the Minister for Education.

Question Time

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SALARIED MEDICAL OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier meet with SASMOA regarding its enterprise bargaining agreement and, if not, why not? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: SASMOA wrote to the Premier on 22 April 2025 regarding negotiations for a new salaried medical officers enterprise agreement. In SASMOA's bulletin to members on 28 April, it said in relation to the negotiations:

This unfortunately confirms an ongoing lack of respect for and valuing of the role of medical officers in the South Australian public health system and raises questions about whether or not the State Government is engaging in good faith bargaining.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:50): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question regarding a piece of correspondence that is very fresh indeed. Of course, I and my cabinet colleagues regularly meet with industrial organisations. You would expect nothing less of a Labor government. Of course, we can't always agree, because our responsibility isn't exclusively of an industrial nature, but we always take very seriously the role that any trade union plays in advocating for their members and their members' interests, and we meet with them on a frequent basis.

I will meet with SASMOA if and when it is appropriate to do so. Of course, when it comes to enterprise bargaining, there is a process. There is a well-established process for how those negotiations are conducted. I have every confidence that the Minister for Industrial Relations, the Hon. Kyam Maher, is making sure that the government adopts a position of good faith negotiations. That does not mean that there is automatic agreement; clearly not.

In terms of the work that SASMOA members undertake, of course this government values them, which is why we are investing in more of them—300 more of them. SASMOA's membership has gone berserk as a result of this government's policies because we are actively recruiting more doctors into our public hospital system than ever before. There hasn't been a recruitment boost quite like this one, so of course we value the work.

We are also very proud of the fact as a government—and I will look to my minister to correct me if I have this wrong, but I understand that SASMOA members in South Australia are some of the highest paid medical professionals in not just the state but indeed the country, which is a credit to SASMOA. That also speaks to the value that we have. The conditions contained within the salaried medical officers agreement we think reflect how much we appreciate the work our doctors do.

They have very unique conditions, rights and privileges that are not bestowed on any other workers in the state. No-fixed-hours clauses are unique, for instance; very high salaries; rights of private practice. These are conditions that are unique to salaried medical officers in South Australia. I have met with SASMOA on a number of occasions throughout my time in government, including prior to this government as a minister for health. I was able to have good negotiations with them but also more recently, and I am also familiar with—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I can say something with a high degree of confidence in response to those interjections. Under the former Liberal government, SASMOA I think were given genuine real wage decreases. You cut the wages of our doctors. Your agreement cut the wages. Your agreement cut the wages of doctors.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton can leave the chamber until the end of question time.

The honourable member for Colton having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The former government gave real wage decreases to our men and women in public hospitals, which I think is an appalling reflection on what you think of our serving doctors: the fact that you actively cut their wages in real terms. What we will do—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta can leave until the end of question time.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is sit down and negotiate with them in good faith as is appropriate and as those men and women deserve.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier reviewed SA Health's ambulance transport and handover policy and, if so, does he have any concerns with it? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Feedback from SASMOA to SA Health on the policy included concerns that 'patients will die and staff will leave,' and that 'there would be unattended patients in invisible spots in the ED getting no care or indeed no monitoring.'

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): It is accurate that there has been an update to the ambulance transport policy, and that followed expert review that we had undertaken by eminent clinicians professors Bill Griggs, former South Australian of the Year and very well known to the public, and Keith McNeil, who is the Commissioner for Excellence and Innovation in Health.

They made recommendations. They pointed out an area of what they regarded as some clinicians having legal questions about. They looked at the case law. They looked at what was in place particularly in the UK and what was in place in other states, and made the recommendation to us that we needed to update the policy to make clear what I think most people would understand, in that when a patient has been presented to an emergency department and when they have been triaged in the hospital system, the hospital and the local health network have some legal responsibility over that patient. I haven't actually heard people making an argument against that, including from the opposition.

I think it is telling that the Leader of the Opposition and not the member for Schubert asked this question because when the member for Schubert has previously made some statements about this matter, they have been absolutely rebuked by our ambulance officers. What happened was we had the member for Schubert coming out and saying that our ambos would 'dump and run' patients at emergency departments, which was an absolutely abhorrent suggestion from the member for Schubert and shows her absolute contempt for our ambulance officers across the state. What we had was the Ambulance Employees Association—

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order from the deputy leader.

Mr TEAGUE: Standing order 98(a): this is clearly debate from the minister. It was a question directed to the Premier about what the Premier has done, and the minister is choosing to go on ad hominem attacks against members of this place. The question should be answered.

The SPEAKER: Minister, if you come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: In relation to this policy, the Ambulance Employees Association had to put out a statement in which they said:

The AEA firmly rejects the offensive suggestion made by the shadow minister Ashton Hurn that paramedics and ambulance officers will dump patients at hospitals and run. Our members will always act in the best interests of their patients and will never put patients at risk of harm.

This is a government that backs our ambos. This is a government that backs our clinicians. This is a government that listened to the expert recommendation that was made and put in place sensible suggestions. If the opposition want to propose something different, they have the ability to promise that they will do so. The shadow minister was given that invitation on the radio the other day: 'Would you reverse this if you were elected? Would you reverse this?' What did she say? She said, 'I don't have all the information. I couldn't possibly know whether we should reverse it or not.' I thought we were on the cusp of their first policy. I thought we were so close.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat.

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order under standing order 98(a): I seek a ruling on the point of order. The minister has continued to debate the matter and has continued to take up attacks against a member of this place. It is a question directed to the Premier about the review of a policy.

The SPEAKER: As I said at the start of question time, interjections breach the standing orders. I have heard the member for Schubert continually interjecting and it is equally against the standing orders for the minister to respond to interjections. So maybe if the interjections stop on this side and the responses to interjections stop on the government side, we may be able to get clearer answers. The minister.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: So the idea that this is not going to be opposed, that this is not going to be reversed if they were to win at the next election, shows that this is just trying to pick up some dirt, raise this issue without actually any intention or any other proposition, and we are just getting on with the job of implementing what was made to us of some recommendations from eminent clinicians and making sure that we update our policy accordingly.

POWER OUTAGE COMPENSATION SCHEME

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Is the government progressing a compensation scheme with regard to power outages? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: In a letter dated 26 September 2023, addressed to Mr Philip Groves of Glynde, the minister wrote that he was determined to, quote, 'make the necessary reforms' via, potentially, a further quote, 'establishing a scheme which provides a fair outcome for households'. This would be welcome reform for my constituents who have suffered repeated outages, including a 20-hour outage last month.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:00): Yes, Liverpool has won the league title and

they have now 20 league titles, so we are back on our perch. But I think there was another part of your question about whether we will be introducing a new scheme to allow for compensation for surging, and the answer to that question is yes.

We put out a press release. I held a press conference with the member for Newland in her electorate. She championed this cause after her constituents were subjected to a surge which was no fault of their own. This had occurred under the previous government and under the previous Weatherill government. Through the privatisation of ETSA, SA Power Networks were immune from having to manage some of these surges, if they could prove to the regulator that they had done all that was reasonably responsible to maintain the system in an order where they did everything they possibly could to avoid a surge, but if a surge did occur, through some natural act, people were not covered.

What we are doing now is introducing an insurance scheme which has been publicised. We held a press conference. People will be getting compensated. There is a timeframe, obviously, in place, and I can get the member more information about that. If he would like to give me the information of his constituent, I can ascertain whether that individual constituent is eligible.

I do point out that this is about surges, not about schemes where people have lost power through no fault of the transmission or distribution networks. As frustrating as that sounds for me and the member, we have to operate under the contractual obligations signed by members of his former party who signed South Australians up to a 200-year lease under certain conditions, legislated in this parliament. They give certain benefits to try to maximise the sale price. I don't want to go into too much detail, given the gallery that's here, and I do not want to breach any friendships, but there are some people who gave away a lot to a small group of people for a very large sale price in the former assets.

I am doing all I possibly can to try to rectify some of this for constituents who experienced this through no fault of their own. I congratulate the member for Newland on the hard work she did to lobby the government to get this scheme operational. For the benefit of other members in the house on both sides of the parliament, that now means if there is a surge that's not covered by people's household insurance, that would not be normally covered by the regulator, now that insurance scheme will cover it and those surges can be protected. That does not include people who were subjected to a loss of outages. There are prescriptive policies in place, which I can point the member to so he can be fully aware of what is payable and what is not payable.

SKILLS TRAINING

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:03): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on how the Malinauskas government is delivering skills training for the next generation of workers?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:03): I thank the member for King for her question. The member for King, as a proud representative of her community with a particular interest in young people in the community, and as a mother herself, I know cares a lot about the future opportunities of young people in our state. I have to say, today was a really nice moment when I had the chance with the Minister for Defence and Space Industries and the Minister for Education to go down to Osborne to bear witness to an example of how a policy that has enjoyed bipartisan support with respect to the naval shipbuilding program is really coming to life. Seeing that first frigate really starting to take shape, the first of the Hunter Class frigates, down at Osborne—I mean, this is going to be a big ship; it's a big ship, to anyone who gets a chance to see it.

But even more exciting than that was that we got to see today, in effect, graduates of the Findon Technical College start work at BAE Systems. These are young South Australian men and women, who, as a result of the policy that this government has instituted to invest over \$200 million rebuilding technical colleges and high schools, are graduating, with their SACE certificate in one pocket and a trade qualification in another, starting work for a major, credible global company, where they will enjoy a well paid, secure not just job but career for the rest of their lives. It is a magnificent trifecta of policy coming together, the private sector and the government working together with a young person full of talent and hope about what their standard of living will look like in their home city and state now manifesting itself to a real-life opportunity.

Today, we were able to announce, on the back of the success that BAE themselves have seen through the Findon Technical College program, that they will be partnering with us at the Modbury Heights Technical College, which opens up just adjacent to where the member for King lives. The Modbury Heights Technical College will also partner with BAE to have the advanced manufacturing course provided for that institution. So, young men and women in the north-eastern suburbs will be able to say, 'You know what? I'm going to go work at Osborne too. I'm going to work in the defence industry as well, and I'm going to set myself up with a well paid, secure job for me and my family forevermore,' in their home city and state. It is magnificent to see, Mr Speaker.

This government is resolute in its belief that you don't have to go to university to get a good job. You absolutely can go to university and get a magnificent job, and we need more engineers, more young people doing engineering in every form in our universities to work on the naval shipbuilding program as well, but you do not have to go to uni to get a good job and earn a high income. If you are more inclined to work with your hands in a skilled and safe environment, then of course there is much opportunity in South Australia for you at the moment in a whole range of industries, and the naval shipbuilding is yet one example of that.

These technical colleges are a policy that we took to the election and are now very proud to be instituting in practice. The first one in Findon is up and running. The next one at Modbury opens up at the beginning of next year's school year. Findon, I should mention, is full to the brim with students, it's oversubscribed. We have much hope that the same will be true at Modbury. Then, of course, we have Mount Gambier, Port Augusta and Tonsley on the way as well, where we will have more important partnership announcements to make in the not too distant future. This is serious policy. It makes a difference to young people's lives, but it also sets our economy up for a prosperous future for many years and decades to come.

RAPID OFF-LOAD PROCEDURES

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Are rapid off-load procedures standard practice under this government? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: A SafeWork SA entry permit holder report submitted by SASMOA, dated 17 March, reported, and I quote:

Rapid off-load had been requested by the ramp on a number of occasions but there was no space in the ED. We told them we are drowning.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): Thank you very much for the question. What happens varies between different emergency departments based on their models of care but also their physical layout. But there are statewide policies in place, as there were under the previous government as well, in terms of the escalation of care, particularly where there are urgent cases in the community that need to be responded to, to make sure that overall patients can be responded to in the hospital but also in the community. That's a matter which is worked through between the hospitals and the Ambulance Service to make sure that we have got overall safe care for patients in the emergency departments but also in the community as well. I will particularly highlight what's happened at Lyell McEwin Hospital.

At Lyell McEwin Hospital there has been the ability, within the new emergency department there, to devise a model of care whereby we have particular off-load spaces for ambulance patients. That is one of the factors that has led to a reduction of ramping occurring at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, as well as of, of course, the additional beds that the government has built that have provided more capacity for that hospital as well. That means that there are staff and beds available for those ambulance patients to be off-loaded, meaning that the ambulance officers are able to be back out on the road responding to cases in the community. That is a model which is used in many hospitals interstate and it certainly is one of the factors that has led to improvements at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

CODE YELLOW

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Have any of our public hospitals declared Code Yellows this year and, if so, which hospitals, and

how many times have they been forced to call an internal emergency? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: It was reported by SASMOA that the Flinders Medical Centre ED had declared a Code Yellow on 17 March. A Code Yellow means that a hospital has declared an internal emergency and every ward is over capacity or under stress.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:10): I will just firstly set out the difference between what people will be familiar with—what occurred last year—and what the member is referring to. Last year we had a system-wide Code Yellow which was a declaration by the Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Robyn Lawrence, and that allowed a level of system coordination across the system between our hospitals, between our Ambulance Service, and between all elements of the system to deal with the significant demand that we were facing.

That has not been called. There has not been any declaration of any sort in that regard since that was lifted last year, and I am not anticipating that that will be the case in the future but, of course, that is always going to be part of the emergency response for any network across the country that would be considered in the future, but we are not anticipating that.

What the member is referring to is that an individual hospital or an individual unit may well have its own designations in terms of its demand escalation protocols. I am aware that Flinders Medical Centre for many, many years, including under our government, under the previous government, and under the previous Labor government have regularly called Code Yellows locally where demand has escalated in the emergency departments. I suspect that is what the SASMOA report that you are referring to refers to.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Have any children been sedated or anaesthetised and then awoken without having had their surgery at the Women's and Children's Hospital? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: It was reported in the media last month that compromised surgical equipment was used on dozens of patients in the Women's and Children's Hospital, resulting in cancelled surgeries.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:12): I don't have the details in front of me of every single surgery operation that has happened in the state and so I will—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It is serious. You have asked a serious question and I will undertake to seek that information if it is available.

NARACOORTE POLICE STATION

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:12): My question is to the Treasurer and Minister for Police. Can the Treasurer give a timeline for the build of the Naracoorte Police Station. With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: Last sitting week the Treasurer announced that a new \$18 million police station will be built at 31 Smith Street. Constituents would like to know when this building will start.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:13): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question. The member is right, I did advise the house that there is a new Naracoorte Police Station to be built, and I am pleased to advise the house that the expected timeframe for the completion of this new police facility in the member's electorate is late 2027.

Construction will commence shortly on the identified block of land which I advised the house of in the last sitting week. While that is under construction, of course, the existing facilities will continue to be used before they are decommissioned, towards the beginning of 2028, enabling a changeover of policing resources to occur from one facility to another.

The proposed total building area of the new facility will be substantially larger—I am advised at approximately 750 square metres—and that will include the police station, the police holding cell complex, as well as other facilities and amenities necessary for contemporary work accommodation arrangements for serving police. As we are able to get further particulars at hand, I look forward to keeping the house advised of progress.

ADELAIDE HILLS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister provide an update on mental health services in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15): I thank the member for her question in relation to mental health services in the Adelaide Hills. I was delighted in the past couple of weeks to be at the opening of the new Medicare Mental Health service, which is now open in Mount Barker and something I know the member for Kavel is very excited by. This is a new walk-in service which is available for the community as an alternative to emergency departments for people suffering mental health distress in the Adelaide Hills and broader region.

This is a joint effort between the Malinauskas Labor government and also the Albanese federal government and shows a very strong cooperation between those two levels of government to see this centre open. It is being operated by Summit Health, which is a longstanding provider of health services in the Adelaide Hills and it offers free walk-in confidential mental health support, with no waiting list or referrals needed, in a safe and welcoming space. Importantly, this is a space which is not like a hospital emergency department; it is a welcoming, relaxed, homelike environment for people to get the care that they need.

The team who have been employed in providing these services now include nursing staff, qualified mental health clinicians, and peer support workers with lived experience. There is a range of services provided, including immediate help for those in distress and ongoing care for people with complex mental health needs. The centre provides support for carers and families of people with mental health needs and referrals to other services, including further mental health services, housing and employment. It is open extended hours from 9:00am to 7:00pm Monday to Wednesday and 9:00am to 8:00pm on Thursday and Friday and will be opening on the weekends shortly.

This is now a part of a network of these services across the state and across the country. There are now five of these centres that have been opened between the South Australian and federal governments over the past few years. We have centres now in Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Elizabeth and in the city as well. This is not all; this is the beginning, because we have seen recently the Albanese federal Labor Party announcing their intentions—if delivered victory on the weekend—to open even more of these centres as well.

We will see an additional centre open in the eastern suburbs of Adelaide and an additional centre open in Marion and, excitingly for my constituents, an additional centre open in the Onkaparinga council area as well. There will now be a very strong network of these centres which shows the level of cooperation that we have had with the federal health minister, Mark Butler, to see that happen. That was part of a \$1 billion mental health investment that has been announced in recent days by the federal Labor Party.

Of course, that investment, in terms of Adelaide Hills mental health care, comes on top of the investment that we are already making for construction of the new Mount Barker Hospital as well. Very importantly, that hospital will have 12 new mental health beds within it, the first inpatient mental health services to be delivered in the Adelaide Hills. That really provides that whole gamut of mental health services for people in the Adelaide Hills. For lower complexity walk-in services, they are able to go to the Medicare Mental Health service. For the high complexity inpatient services we are building, as part of the new Mount Barker Hospital, the ability for people to get that care locally for the first time.

This is essentially very important and it comes on top of our investments in other community services as well: psychosocial services, services which previously faced a cut under the previous

government of 19 per cent, whereas we have now increased funding for those services to 24 per cent, so we are committed to improving our mental health services and will continue to do so.

PSYCHIATRY WORKFORCE PLAN SA

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What action, if any, has the government taken to address the EY report, Psychiatry Workforce Plan South Australia, released on 4 April? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: The report states that South Australia will not meet the demand for psychiatrists over the next 10 years, with the largest shortfall coming in 2027 and with supply projected to fall short of demand by 61 FTEs.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:19): I think I was considering doing a Dixer on this exact subject, so I am very delighted to have this question from the member for Frome.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: We don't do Dixers.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That's right. Oh no, sorry, we don't do Dixers—government questions. I am very delighted to have this question from the member for Frome because this is an initiative that the government undertook to commission EY to do this work. It was jointly commissioned between both ourselves and the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists because we know that there is a need. We know that there is a need for both public psychiatrists to work in our services and also for private psychiatrists, with people having difficulty accessing those psychiatrists in the community, and we know that there are particular bottlenecks in terms of the training of psychiatrists to get through that training program to become psychiatrists at the end. We also know that there is demand for doctors wanting to become psychiatrists.

Every time one of those training positions through the college opens, there is a ream of different applicants, of doctors wanting to be part of it. So we do have the potential if we work hard on this to unleash that bottleneck, to path forward and deliver an increase in terms of the number of psychiatrists into the future. I really want to pay credit to Dr Patrick Clarke, Chair of the College of Psychiatrists, who has worked very closely with us, and also with Chief Psychiatrist Dr John Brayley, as well as EY, in developing this plan. One of the key ways that we will be able to develop the implementation for this plan is the fact of the investments that we are making in terms of increasing mental health capacity, which are coming online within the next year.

Those additional beds that we are building at The QEH, at Modbury Hospital, at Noarlunga Hospital and at Flinders Medical Centre of course come with additional staffing that we are recruiting for at the moment. We are undertaking a big national and international recruitment campaign already for those positions. Those positions—particularly the first one of those centres is expected to be open at The QEH—are already out. I just had an update earlier today that we have had quite significant numbers of applications for those new jobs available there. So by having these additional centres opening, that allows us to have additional training capacity to make sure that we can get those additional trainees in, and then chart the course for more psychiatrists to be available into the future.

There's a raft of other recommendations as part of that, which we have accepted and are working to implement as well, including about how we utilise other mental health professionals to the best of their scope of practice as well. I was able to meet with the College of Psychiatrists at their annual conference that they had recently at Glenelg. I understand I was the first ever health minister to present to that college at their annual conference here in South Australia, and I have to say that the college is absolutely excited by the potential to work together on implementing this plan, to see that realised and to see a future pipeline of psychiatrists for people who need mental health care in this state.

PSYCHIATRY WORKFORCE PLAN SA

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:22): The minister expressed delight at the commissioning of this report, which is dated October 2023. It was handed down or completed last year in September. My question to the minister is then why did it take seven months for it to be released publicly?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:23): Because we have been working on it. This is a report that we commissioned; it was, in fact, one of our election commitments. It was something that we were very delighted to work on, and we have been working hand in glove with the college. One of the things that we have been working on over the past few months is the recruitment campaign, which has now gone live, and we coincided that with the release of the report. That has been now taking place nationally and internationally, coinciding with those positions opening up for those soon-to-be-opened mental health centres across the state.

So these things are all coming together, and there's no doubt that there are challenges in terms of the current availability of psychiatrists. It takes time to train psychiatrists, but if we don't start that work now, then we will be in a worse position into the future where we have got the potential to be in a better position in the future with this report, with this implementation of this plan that we have developed. That's why we thought ahead. We said from the get-go that we would be a government that didn't just think about the next four years but the next generation, thinking through about the future, and that's why we have done this plan. That's why we are implementing it, and that's why we will take the action necessary to make sure that we have got a stronger pipeline of psychiatrists in this state into the future.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. How many psychiatrists have been recruited to the state public system this financial year? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: The EY report, Psychiatry Workforce Plan South Australia, states that there are currently estimated to be 17 open but unfilled roles in South Australia, increasing to 23 later this year.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:24): I will take on notice the exact numbers.

VAILO COMPANY

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:25): My question is to the Premier. Has the government received all moneys owing in full from VAILO Pty Ltd and, if not, how much is outstanding? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: On 24 April, *The Advertiser* reported that VAILO founder, Aaron Hickmann, had been declared bankrupt after failing to repay a \$600,000 loan. In early March this year, VAILO was placed into receivership as a result of apparently defaulting on a repayment to a major bank.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:25): I think it has been previously reported in *The Advertiser* that there were some unpaid tax bills from Mr Hickmann or one of his companies for properties that were owned. That, as I understand it, related to a land tax liability. I think I gave a commitment the last sitting week that I would follow up the particulars about the status of that particular debt to RevenueSA.

While I have been advised that, due to the restrictions caused by the privacy provisions of the Taxation Administration Act in South Australia, I am somewhat limited in the advice I can provide, I will make sure that I come back to the house and provide as much detail as possible. Aside from the RevenueSA-related matter, it is my advice that not only do we have a new sponsor for the Adelaide 500 but of course the previous sponsorship arrangement has ended and there is nothing further that is required to occur between the two parties in that contractual relationship. But I will come back to the member for Flinders and provide as much detail as I can to him and to the house.

REGIONAL SERVICES

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:27): My question is to the Minister for Human Services, Seniors and Ageing Well. Can the minister explain the importance of investing in our regional and remote communities like Peterborough?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (15:27): Thank you to the member for Playford for the question. I think visiting regional and rural communities is essential, particularly to get the views and the stories from people obviously on the ground. This government have made it a really high priority to get out and visit as many of those communities as we can. I have really enjoyed speaking to people in local communities, often being accompanied by local members in those regions as well.

Areas like Peterborough often face unique challenges that really can't be addressed through remote assistance or centralised planning. Getting those stories is vital in order for us to get service delivery right, especially now given the significant and serious challenges being faced by local communities in our very, very dry conditions that we are experiencing.

There is the reality of limited access for regional areas. Rural people are more likely to experience barriers to health care, mental health supports, housing assistance and other social services. Whether this is due to distance, difficulties with transport or fewer local providers, the services that metro populations often take for granted can be much harder to come by when you are in the regions. By showing up physically, we can help in some small way to at least bridge that gap, with a face-to-face visit meaning the difference between someone slipping through cracks and someone finally getting the help they need, or indeed a community.

It is not just about access, it is also about understanding by walking the streets of the small towns and sitting at a street party, such as the Premier and the team hosted a couple weeks ago in Peterborough, sitting around having a barbecue and a chat. It is great to be able to get those stories and hear things from the town's perspective. You can hear firsthand what is actually working and what is not; what is desperately needed and what isn't there on the ground. That kind of insight can be captured face to face, but not in a survey or a phone call. It takes presence and real connection.

The visits also help to build trust. In close-knit communities, we know that those relationships are vital, so to insert yourself into those conversations I think matters. While we were in Peterborough, I felt like we were able to sit with people in the town and really hear some of their personal stories and help to engage and try to work towards some long-term solutions.

I want to also make sure, as rural and regional representatives of course know, that we don't forget the incredible resilience and innovation that is already happening in those areas. Communities often have really creative grassroots solutions to local issues, and by visiting we can learn from them, collaborate and strengthen those efforts. When our cabinet recently visited Peterborough, we connected with many of the local organisations such as Rotary, the Lions Club and Uniting Country SA. The Breakthrough Mental Health Research Foundation was up there providing support and services.

I know that nearly two-fifths of our community centres in rural and remote regions receive funding under our Community and Neighbourhood Development program. For years, areas have not been serviced, and our department is now working hard to get some local community centre funding procured and get that on the ground and get that coverage. Also, at Grants SA we have been working really hard to tailor those more effectively in regions. Nearly half of all of our grants go to regional and remote communities. Thank you to the country areas for advocating so strongly, especially through country cabinet.

COMMSEC STATE OF THE STATES REPORT

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:31): My question is to the Premier. What is the Premier's response to the latest CommSec State of the States report, which sees South Australia slipping from second to fourth in their ranking?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:31): I thank the shadow treasurer for his question. There is no doubt about the fact that the government was very keen to celebrate, and remains keen to celebrate, the fact that it is under the life of this government that for the first time ever South Australia was able to attain the position of the number one state in the country in the CommSec State of the States report, and then we didn't just hold that position once or twice but then three consecutive months. We concluded the calendar year 2024 as number one in the country, then in January we were ranked number two and now we are ranked number four.

I have had an opportunity to traverse some of the detail within the State of the States report. While of course we would prefer to be number one and retain that position, it does contain within it a

number of statistics that continue to provide much hope—in fact, more than hope: a sense of confidence that the government's policies in the areas that we are most focused on are making a difference. None is more important than what the government has been able to achieve in housing.

Dwellings starts in the December quarter to 2024 are up 8.2 per cent on the decade average, and housing finance commitments in the same corresponding quarter are up 28 per cent on the decade average, which means that in South Australia both in terms of dwellings starts and in terms of construction work that is completed we are second in the country. In housing finance commitments, as I said, we are up by 28 per cent.

Of course, the other area where the state is performing exceedingly well on any objective assessment is what is happening in terms of employment. We continue to retain our number two position in the country in terms of relative performance on where we are at in terms of unemployment. What I am particularly pleased about in regard to employment is that we haven't just seen more people in work; we have actually seen more people participating within the labour market.

For the first time ever, we are now in a position where, as at the beginning of this year, we ticked over one million people participating in the labour market in the state of South Australia. To see more people participating means there are more people who are choosing to put their hand up for work than what we have seen in the past, yet despite that we have continued to retain a very low unemployment rate.

As I think has been referenced previously but in my view is worthy of reiterating, there have been 16 occasions in the history of monthly records being kept regarding unemployment in the state of South Australia—of course, it is the Australian Bureau of Statistics that keeps these records. It has been doing it monthly for 47 years, and only on 16 occasions has the unemployment rate had a three in front of it in this state. Each of those 16 times has happened during the course of the life of this government. Never once before has the unemployment rate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders, you are on your final warning.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We continue to devote our energies to the areas of the economy we think are of most need. Housing is a pre-eminent priority of the state. We continue to dedicate efforts. We are seeing results, but we want those to continue.

MARION ROAD-STURT ROAD INTERSECTION

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (15:35): My question is to the Premier. Will the Malinauskas government commit to funding upgrades to the intersection of Marion and Sturt roads? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The recent release of the RAA's 2024 Risky Roads survey shows that the Marion Road-Sturt Road intersection has been classed as Adelaide's most dangerous for the past three years running. An elected Coalition federal government has committed to provide \$40 million for the upgrade.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:36): I heard the announcement of Ms Flint and Mr Pasin for their very generous \$40 million contribution to a \$200 million project. I am just not sure that they thought this through. There are a couple of reasons why I think they have not thought this through. The works that we are doing on the north-south corridor will do a great deal to alleviate a lot of the congestion on that road. There is no doubt that intersection needs upgrading; the government accepts that.

If we did that work now, before the north-south corridor was completed, it would be very hard for us to model exactly what traffic conditions we need to be building for given the change in patterns of behaviour that will be occurring as a result of the north-south corridor being completed. We are undertaking a study of that road as we speak. It seems to me what is actually happening is that Ms Flint and Mr Pasin have read the room, are becoming increasingly desperate about her predicament in the seat of Boothby and are making pronouncements and announcements that are not based on what is actually in accordance with good governance.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Point of order, sir: the minister is entering debate.

The SPEAKER: I will continue to listen to the minister, if he continues.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am very keen, because I have been lobbied very hard by the member for Gibson and others about this intersection. For this intersection, the \$40 million contribution, quite frankly, is a bit of a joke and relatively insulting to the people of the local community. What Ms Flint has not considered, of course, are the 20 to 40 homes and businesses we might need to compulsorily acquire in and around that area.

I know that Ms Louise Miller-Frost is speaking to those households about the Liberal Party's plans to compulsorily acquire their homes to upgrade this intersection for the very benefit of Ms Flint's election announcement rather than actually improving the intersection. What Nicolle does is she turns up, does a video, talks to no-one and announces that they are going to be undercontributing to an intersection. When you point out that we have actually—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order: standing order 98(a). The minister is clearly doing something other than answering the question. It looks a bit like he is attempting debate. He needs to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The question was whether the government supports a Liberal proposition from the federal Coalition, and the minister is answering it. The minister will continue his answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am very concerned. On that intersection, there is a business that is investing millions and millions of dollars in building a new structure to create a business. Ms Flint would have us demolish that. I have to say that I would rather do the detailed planning. We are spending \$15 billion to upgrade the north-south corridor to alleviate a lot of the traffic on Marion Road, on Sturt Road, on South Road, on Goodwood Road and on Unley Road because of what is occurring on the grid network. So I don't think members have thought this through. Is the intersection in need of an upgrade? Yes, it is. Is \$40 million enough? No, it's not. Has Nicolle Flint thought this through? No, she hasn't. Does Tony Pasin add value?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is where I disagree with my friends: he does add value, but to us.

Grievance Debate

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:40): I have a bit of an odd confession to make, and that is that on a few occasions I have felt extraordinarily sorry for the member for Kaurna, who is the health minister here in South Australia, because we know that he has a really big job. It is an important job. It is one of the most demanding jobs in the state cabinet. It is an important one because it genuinely impacts the lives of all South Australians in so many ways. I hate to say it, though, but he has presided over the worst ramping results in the history of South Australia.

It is always the member for Kaurna who is sent out to defend the indefensible, and it is not just on record ramping. There is a litany of failures that we are seeing constantly under the Malinauskas Labor government when it comes to health. While the member for Kaurna is out defending the indefensible, what do we have the Premier doing? He is taking a bow and he is doing all the curtain calls, which is fantastic for the Premier.

So I have felt sorry for the member for Kaurna on a number of occasions. That is until I remember one thing: the state election campaign, when it was the member for Kaurna and all those opposite—the Premier and all the backbench—who went out there and looked South Australians in the eye on many occasions and promised South Australians that they would fix ramping.

In fact, they said it was so bad that they made an idle threat to South Australians that they had to use their vote like their life depended on it because things were so bad that people might die if the government did not change. In fact, the day before the state election, what did we have the Minister for Health, the member for Kaurna, out there saying? He said that there was only one thing required to fix ramping in South Australia. Can you guess what it was? 'Vote Labor. We will fix ramping. That is the only thing that is required to fix ramping.'

After I remember that, after we on this side of the house remember that, every single drop of sympathy that I might have had for the member for Kaurana completely evaporates, because what have we had since the election? Has ramping improved? Are our emergency departments less clogged? Are people getting their elective surgeries quicker? Do we have workers who are feeling at ease now that they finally have a Labor government? Not by a country mile, because this government has delivered the worst ramping in our state's history and it is workers and patients who are worse off under this Premier.

What do we get? We have seen it on display today in question time. All we get are these mealy-mouthed excuses from the government. They are constantly clutching at excuses: 'It's the federal government's fault. We have an ageing population. This is a national problem. We can't possibly fix it overnight.' The Premier had all of that on display today. Unfortunately, that is not what they said during the state election campaign; they said they would fix ramping and it was so bad that people had to vote like their life depended on it.

The clock is ticking for the government to deliver. They can try to spin all they like about the different metrics that they promised, but we expect that in being so desperate to change things around and deliver on their election promise they will look for any trick to possibly do it between now and the election.

That brings me to the motivation behind the latest policy change to the ambulance transport and handover policy, which has been in draft form for some time. The government is desperately trying to say, 'Nothing to see here. It is a minor change about who is legally responsible—nothing big.' But here is the thing: when you have bureaucrats, and who knows where else the pressure is coming from, to clear the ambulance ramp, who is legally responsible for the patient fundamentally matters.

So what is some of the feedback that we have been hearing from clinicians, because the minister said today that apparently the opposition is just kicking up dust—apparently we are just kicking up dust. Well, this is what some people in the ED say: it would lead to unattended patients in invisible spots in the ED getting no care, no monitoring. Here is the real one: patients will die and staff will leave.

If that is not enough to send a shiver down the spine of a health minister, I do not know what is, and the minister is wilfully ignoring this. I think that it is time for the mealy-mouthed excuses from those opposite to end. It is time for them to start delivering and actually put the patient first because that is the difference between us and them. We are focused on the patient and we are not going to be taking shortcuts to deliver better outcomes for them, whereas this government is desperate to save their own political skin by making changes like this.

NORWOOD FOOD AND WINE FESTIVAL

Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (15:45): The Norwood Food and Wine Festival—what an absolutely magnificent day it was on The Parade for the 2025 Norwood Food and Wine Festival. There were already so many superlatives needed after last year's festival and now this year's has surpassed that which I thought could not be surpassed. Over 90,000 people came together to celebrate the best of what South Australia has to offer, turning The Parade, our Parade, into a vibrant tapestry of food, wine, music and community spirit.

It was truly a sight to behold, with more than 50 local traders, from Parade stalwarts Danny's Thai and the Bath Hotel to more recent Parade institutions Africola Canteen and 30 Acres offering a diverse array of delicious food and so many of our leading South Australian wineries, breweries and distilleries putting their passion and creativity on full display.

From the South Australian Wine Producers Bar, which showcased a diverse selection of wines from across our state's renowned wine regions, to Pirate Life Brewing and 23rd Street Distillery, there was quite literally something to entice every person there, because everywhere you turned there was something wonderful: delicious food, world-class wines, the buzz of laughter and conversation, people dancing in the street, and that unmistakable feeling that you are part of something very special.

The pop-up bars brought their own style and flair, and the excellent line-up of DJs kept the energy alive all day and into the evening—and how fantastic was it to have Birds of Tokyo headlining, an ARIA Award winning band right here in Norwood? The atmosphere of the Food and Wine Festival

was even more electric thanks to the perfect location of Norwood Oval. We are so fortunate to have an oval of this standing situated right on The Parade. After the Gather Round game played there, people left the footy already in a fantastic mood, full of energy from the excitement on the field, and practically stepped straight into the festival. It created this seamless, joyful celebration that just kept building all afternoon and evening. You could feel the sense of happiness and pride radiating through the crowd.

One of the great things about this year's festival was how it catered for everyone. Even the footy fans not at the Gather Round match were looked after, with AFL games broadcast live on big screens throughout the precinct. It meant no-one had to miss a moment; they could cheer on their team while soaking up the incredible festival atmosphere at the same time.

After the festival, I spoke with a number of our local traders and their feedback was overwhelming. Outstanding local bar and restaurant Arkhe told me that it was one of the best days of trading they had, and they certainly did not run out of wagyu burgers this time. Rimu from local cafe Pavé said the same. Other traders told me just how much this event means to them, not just in terms of a boost in business but also in terms of the pride they feel in showing off their craft to locals and visitors alike.

Many said it was one of the best days of trading they had ever had—each and every one. The success of this year's festival is more than just the incredible turn out; it is a testament to the power of major events to drive jobs, investment and pride in our community and across South Australia. When we come together to celebrate what makes our state so special—our food, our wine, our talent, our people—we create something that is bigger than the sum of its parts. The truth is that it is no surprise that the energy on The Parade was so infectious after The Parade recently garnered international acclaim, being featured in *Time Out* magazine's list of the 38 coolest neighbourhoods in the world, the sole South Australian suburb on this prestigious list.

The success of the Norwood Food and Wine Festival was an incredible reminder of the renowned South Australian hospitality and our very own brand of coolness. I have no doubt it left a lasting impression on everyone who was there. It is events like these that show the heart and soul of our community and the extraordinary passion of our producers, chefs and small businesses.

For me personally, I just felt an overwhelming sense of joy. I am so proud to have been part of it. I know I am not alone in feeling an enormous sense of gratitude for everyone who made the Norwood Food and Wine Festival 2025 such a massive success, from the traders, the entertainers, the organisers and, of course, everyone who came along and made it a day to remember. To all of you, I say thank you. I already cannot wait for next year.

FEDERAL ELECTION

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (15:50): This Saturday, I am looking forward to voting for James Stevens as the ongoing member for Sturt, and I do so for a number of reasons. James is somebody who is a passionate advocate for his electorate. He is somebody whose mind is well regarded across the nation. He contributes to making the federal Liberal Party a stronger team and he contributes to making the federal parliament a stronger team. Despite that, he puts his community first, and I thought this was on very strong display when the Magill Matters community group recently put forward the opportunity for the key candidates for the federal election this Saturday to state their case in relation to the future of the Magill site currently occupied by the University of South Australia.

Members would recall that as part—certainly at the same time—of the university merger proposal, one of the aspects was that this state government has purchased for approximately \$65 million the land at the Magill UniSA site. The Labor government's proposal going forward is to sell that land, or a substantial component thereof, to developers who are able to deliver housing. The stated ambition of Renewal SA and the Treasury, when the university's committee was exploring this, was that the government wants to recoup that \$65 million or, as the then under treasurer Rick Persse said, they want to recoup at least \$65 million from the sale.

Since then, a number of things have happened, led by the Liberal Party, by Vincent Tarzia as Liberal leader, with my support, with the support of people like Scott Kennedy, the Liberal candidate for Morialta, and James Stevens, the Liberal member for Sturt. The Labor Party has started talking about other things too. They started talking about the heritage value of Murray House. They

have started talking about and acknowledging the importance of the area around the creek line that is valued by so many walkers and, as James Stevens has highlighted on so many occasions, amongst others, the opportunity and the need for more recreational facilities.

The community has also played an enormous role in this matter. The Magill Matters Facebook group, led by Charlotte Reimer, but with the support of an active committee, has indeed been advocating hard for continued community use of that space. Going forward, I think the Magill Matters community group, as they did during the Renewal SA public consultation, will continue to play an important role. I want to commend everyone in the group, Charlotte and all of her team, for what they have done in this role. A couple of days ago, they put up statements from the four main candidates in the federal election as to what they are doing there. I note a quote from Dr Verity Cooper, the independent candidate:

The State Government has acquired the site, primarily for building urgently needed housing

But it is vitally important for all parties to discuss, be able to discuss and negotiate together, and aim for a shared vision for the Magill campus. There are 14.62 hectares to use for multiple purposes.

We need to work together for everyone to be heard and to listen. I look forward to supporting and participating in this purpose.

I am not entirely sure where that is going, but that is her view. Katie McCusker, the Greens SA candidate for Sturt, said:

The State Greens have a vision for high quality social and affordable housing on the site, which is contained to the existing building footprint and planned in consultation with the community. Any such development would include retention of the existing green space along with important recreational and other facilities so well used and loved by local residents.

So, social affordable housing with retention of some green space. James Stevens and Claire Clutterham are probably the two main candidates. Claire Clutterham, the Labor candidate, uses the word 'future' three times in the first sentence, but I am not sure what it means. She says:

I am...looking forward for the report reviewing the results of the public consultation, which will provide further insight into the wishes of the community and which should be carefully considered at an early stage in the process of determining the pathway forward.

I will tell you what the Labor Party's pathway forward is: they are going to sell this land for \$65 million or more. They have said that is what their pathway is. Renewal SA is consulting on a master plan and that is good, and hundreds of members of the local community have considered it and contributed to it, but I have no faith in the Labor Party to take those considerations seriously, absent action taken or a clear election commitment by the Labor Party to protect and preserve this land for the community.

James Stevens by comparison is very clear. He says, 'I am strongly opposed to any proposals for dense housing on the UniSA land on either side of St Bernards Road.' He talks about the importance of opportunities for multicode recreational precincts and says:

Developments of this nature that protect existing open space and provide enhanced community use have my strong support.

They have my support, too. They have the support of the local community. James Stevens is the only candidate very clearly and unambiguously making support for recreational facilities, opposing Labor's high-density sell-off of the land, and supporting the environmental and recreational opportunities on this site, and James Stevens will continue to have my support.

ANZAC DAY

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (15:55): ANZAC Day is a moment to reflect on the immense sacrifice of generations of Australian service men and women. At dawn services throughout my electorate on 25 April, those sacrifices were recognised as they always are in this customary way.

I want to acknowledge and place on record my gratitude to the RSL members at Lobethal, Nairne and Mount Barker, and elsewhere in the Hills, who ensure that dawn services operate. They also put on traditional gunfire breakfasts, including for example at Nairne and Mount Barker. This year I was present at the Nairne service. An ANZAC Day football match is always held between

Hahndorf and Mount Barker to commemorate the day. It is widely attended and is also an opportunity for our community to come together.

Separately, I want to acknowledge the work of the Independent candidate for Kavel, Matt Schultz, who is also the President of the Mount Barker Football Club. Matt is a diligent, thoughtful and hardworking candidate and together with his community ensured that the game (hosted this year at Mount Barker) was a success.

Matt lives in Mount Barker with his wife, Kylie, a nurse at the Mount Barker hospital, and their children. He is committed to being a strong, independent voice for my community, and engaging in grassroots activism to deliver the projects we need for a growing community. His priorities include a new public high school for the Hills, the upgrade of the Woodside intersection, the resurfacing of roads into Lobethal, more paediatric services at the Mount Barker hospital, the ultimate prize of restoring passenger rail services to the Hills, and more equipment and facilities for local emergency services.

Matt is known and respected in the Hills through his work with families and their children in the Mount Barker Football Club development programs, and his work as a talent scout for TAFE and Flinders in the Hills. Matt has a passion for helping people. I sincerely believe he is the best person to fight for our interests in the state parliament as we face growth challenges in the Hills. He has the right priorities, values and sense of quiet determination.

I note our federal member, Rebekha Sharkie, said she was confident that Mr Schultz has the right values and perspective to be an effective local member. She said:

Matt is well known in the Hills for his passion for grass-roots sports and community clubs. He genuinely cares about people and has welcomed many families in our community into the Hills sporting and community life.

I wish to add that the region's growth challenges mean that it is, in my view, best to vote for an Independent. I know you expect me to give an honest answer as to who is best to replace me. The alternative to Matt is a new Liberal or Labor member. In my frank assessment a new major party member would have no influence at all especially within the poorly performing state opposition. We would be setting our community back at a time when we need determined, careful and effective independent representation, and a member who is capable of working with all sides to get things done.

DAY IN THE DIRT EVENT

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:58): Women hold up half the sky, and on Sunday just past we were dancing as hard as we could to make that sky deliver a lot of rain to the communities of Owen, Balaklava, Mallala, and pretty much anywhere across regional South Australia. I took great delight in having the honour of addressing over 100 women who had convened on the dusty Owen football oval—that has not been in circulation since about the eighties—and it was the perfect place for a day in the dirt. For over four hours we had nonstop music. We had DJ Sparks, otherwise known as Tony Clarke, who for people born in the seventies and eighties would have had him as their DJ for their twenty-firsts. I am sure he is doing fiftieth birthdays now. But there was not anyone dancing harder or playing harder than DJ Sparks, Tony Clarke.

This was an initiative that really went to the heart of what our country communities are battling at the moment and that is the drought. This opportunity that I take now is to recognise those people in the community who understand that, when an initiative is community led, then it is trusted by locals, and they come along understanding that they are going to be in a safe space to let their hair down and to shake off some of the woes and worries that we certainly carry with us as we step our way through this year's season hoping for the rain to break. As I said, women hold up half the sky and we were hoping that that sky would send down a bucket of rain, and we still anticipate that that will happen.

An event like Sunday's Day in the Dirt does not happen without coordinators, and two very special women Abbie Tiller and Melissa Smith of Greater SA, took about 16 days, no more, to pull together an event that brought women from all over the Mid North, from Jamestown, from Owen, from Balloch, from Orreroo and districts to roll up in their caravans, their camper trailers, their tents, to have a designated driver, to pack an esky of soft drink or other, to enjoy a barbecue, to grab a honey-flavoured Golden North Giant Twin ice cream and soak up the ambience and to come together.

I know that some of the sponsors included NTS Rural. Certainly there was a contribution from our Primary Industries on the ground, serving drinks, serving water. Applying some sparkles to the skin to give us a bit of joie de vivre was the Mallala and District Lions group, and it is a community that is well served by them as well. So not only did Abbie and Melissa pull this together in just 16 days but I think they captured the essence of what we were trying to achieve by this one line: 'We weren't just dancing, we were planting joy on dry land,' and we did that for four hours, dancing to the beat of any song that DJ Sparks wanted to play for us. It could have been *We Want to Party* by Vengaboys, we had *Footloose* going, we had *Grease the Musical*, we were linedancing and bootscooting and the atmosphere was electric.

I want to thank Marie Tapscott for her photography and drone work, as well as recognise a group that was being beautifully branded with the pink baseball caps and that was the Adelaide Plains FarmHers. So my gesture back to Abbie, Melissa, Greater SA, and everyone who was involved in coming along from Worlds End, to Burra, to Balloch is: what a fantastic day it was and this speech and my recognition goes out to all the FarmHers that were there.

One of those FarmHers included a lovely friend of mine called Alex Thomas. She has established a business called Plant a Seed for Safety. She donated a voucher which was won by Tracey Angel, but Alex and her family are grieving at the moment having lost a lovely member of their family, Dr Ashleigh Thomas AM, an RFDS doctor, who for over 30 years serviced our regions and our remote areas based out of the Port Augusta base. Our RFDS doctors are extraordinary, but Ashleigh was one in a million; long hair flowing, fast car driving, a lovable man who as a doctor looked after Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike. He will be sorely missed. We farewell him on Friday. Vale.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION SERVICES

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (16:03): I would like to rise to talk a little bit about the ANZAC services that were on in our community over the weekend. The Upper Sturt Soldiers Memorial Hall, which was opened in 1935 and which had a fine gathering of present and old residents and visitors, which has served our community for a very long time, was the place to be on ANZAC eve.

The local residents at the time of the hall being opened, many of whom were orchardists, market gardeners and quarrymen, were practical hands-on people, and the hall was designed not only as a living memorial to World War I soldiers but also for practical use by the community. Many ANZAC and Remembrance Day commemorations, along with dances, fetes, strawberry fairs, school concerts and presentations have occurred there over the last 90 years. On Thursday night last week, the ANZAC service was very touching and it was lovely to be a part of that.

As a member of the committee now for just short of 10 years, I was tasked with finding a poem to read at the service, and I wanted to find one that was about women: about the sacrifices that women made, those who went to war, those who stayed home and those who were left behind, and I wanted it to be special. There are lots of poems out there, but I was able to find a couple of our local residents, Tilly and Alice Schammer—girls I have known for quite a long time—and I tasked them with writing me a poem.

Tilly—who had already been awarded the Premier's Anzac Spirit award—and her sister came up with the most beautiful poem. Whilst Tilly could not be there on Thursday night, Alice (who is 12) stood tall and read her poem, and I would like to read it now. *ANZAC Women*, written by Tilly and Alice Schammer:

We remember the women who struggled their greatest
Ones who fought and others who waited.
Day to day life, it must have been hard
On the inside and out, to arrive home with scars.
We thank them for the service, their commitment and time,
The women who fought out on the front line.
Courage was shown, an ANZAC spirit
Girls put at risk, no need to fear it.
We won't forget what they gave

All the strong and all the brave
They are heroes, together with all
Today we remember those who did fall
We say thank you, loud and clear
For these women, from both far and near
Lest we forget their sacrifices and toil
Thanks for their help and always being loyal.
These women were nurses, soldiers and friends
Standing tall and brave until the end
Together they fought proud and strong
Working together on days hard and long
Proving their mateship, they worked together
And so, looking back, we treasure
The work they have done, in the future and past
Thanks to these women, the ANZAC spirit will last.

It was a very special evening. They also had a presentation of some incredible World War I badges that had been presented to the hall 90 years ago. They were the most beautiful World War I pins and badges. Whilst we had them on the wall there at the hall for quite a while, they are that precious that they are now in the State Library, but it was lovely to have them there for the event.

After the Upper Sturt service, I made quick time down to the youth vigil at Blackwood where the cadets, the Scouts, the Rovers and the Guides were all waiting to hold ground to protect the shrine, and it was lovely to join them as they had their service. Literally straight after the service, the CFS pagers around the area rang out with a big shed fire in our area up in Coromandel Valley, and I am proud to say my own son actually crewed one of our trucks that went out there. He suggested that it was the hottest fire that he had ever been to as they did their best to protect some solar batteries that would have been in trouble if they had lit up. So well done to all of our CFS crews that were involved.

Back at the vigil, the young people from the Scouts, the Rovers and Guides all stood around holding ground, and it is always lovely to spend time with these young people while they are spending the night considering the sacrifices that many have made to keep them safe. I was happy to arrive with leftover soup, fresh rolls, some personally baked ANZAC biscuits and also, later on in the evening, 26 pizzas. Needless to say they were very, very happy and very, very full. The next morning, at 6.30am, the Blackwood RSL dawn service began with easily 3,000 to 4,000 locals gathered to show their respects. It was a moving service.

After the Blackwood service, it was off to the RSL for a gunfire breakfast and then off to the Coromandel Valley War Memorial where another service took place at 9 o'clock with around 400 to 500 locals all standing silently as they listened to the service and the *Last Post*. It was a beautiful afternoon that we had after that with afternoon tea, and I was lucky to meet Mavis Brownlow who turned 104 on Sunday, and I wish her a very happy birthday.

Private Members' Statements

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (16:09): I want to acknowledge and put on record in the house today our community's appreciation for the efforts of four young adults at West Beach early last month. I will read the words put together by Henley High School as I think they perfectly capture the sentiment:

Henley High School are immensely proud to celebrate the heroic actions of two brave students. Kai [Nixon] and Cruz [Campbell] have demonstrated exceptional courage and quick thinking during a recent rescue at West Beach with two other friends [Louis Kempster and Riley Kellock].

On March 5, while enjoying a surf after school, they noticed a woman signalling for help, her grandson had fallen from rocks into dangerous water [at the breakwater around the boat ramp].

Without hesitation, the four boys jumped into action to assist. Despite challenging conditions near the rocks, they managed to reach the boy. In a selfless act, the grandmother also entered the water to help, only to become trapped herself. The boys continued to assist until emergency services arrived. Thanks to their bravery, both the boy and his grandmother were safely rescued unharmed.

This remarkable act of heroism reflects the values these students hold. Kai and Cruz exemplify the best of our school, and we are incredibly proud to have them as part of our community.

I know that at least one of the boys is a member of the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club, and they are not the first to rescue others in need over the last couple of years. I know Kai in particular has been dealing with his own health issues in recent times and, in light of that, his efforts are all the more impressive. Boys, you should be proud, your parents should be proud and we are all certainly proud of you. Great job, and we are only too happy to recognise your efforts in the South Australian parliament today.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:11): It was an honour to welcome the Hon. Frances Adamson AC, Governor of South Australia, and her husband, Mr Rod Bunten, to Freeling during their official visit to the Lower and Mid North regions yesterday. Meeting them in our local area was a special moment for the local communities to showcase the vibrant spirit and rich heritage of the region. I extend my heartfelt thanks to the Light Regional Council for the invitation and for hosting such a meaningful day of engagement.

At Kapunda High School, students were thrilled to have the unique opportunity to discuss leadership and community engagement with the Governor, a moment that will undoubtedly inspire them in future years. At the Kapunda Town Square, the community's creativity and resilience shone through as Kapunda kindergarten students performed an acknowledgement on Ngadjuri country in song before the Governor explored the mural walk and visited the Kapunda Community Gallery, all celebrating our region's heritage and artistic talent.

Joining the Governor for lunch at the Barns of Freeling was a privilege. What a wonderful place the Barns of Freeling is, a tourism business and accommodation mecca in natural surroundings. Discussions on community resilience with local business leaders highlighted the strength and determination of the people in the local area.

The Governor's two-day tour exemplifies a commitment to understanding and supporting regional South Australia. This visit reminded us of the power of connection and the collaboration in building a brighter future for our regional communities.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:12): I want to talk about the importance of being a volunteer and what it means to a community, particularly a regional community. As regional MPs, we all know how hard it is to draw volunteers into any organisation, but I have made a commitment to reignite my volunteering to Meals on Wheels, who deliver freshly cooked meals to the elderly five days a week and frozen meals on the weekends.

Meals on Wheels have been operating in South Australia for over 70 years. They have delivered over 50 million meals to South Australians and the organisation relies solely on volunteers. In the Riverland, the four branches that we have are at Waikerie, led by Shirley Mudge; in Morgan, Jakob Gamertsfelder leads the unit there; in Berri, it is driven by the hospital; and in Renmark Rozz Dyer is doing an outstanding job. She gave me the induction only a couple of weeks ago before I went out onto the hustings to deliver a three-course meal. There was a nice soup, a nice chicken schnitzel with vegetables and an apple crumble with ice cream, just to get the taste buds rolling. What I must say to all of those 168 clients in the Riverland is: you are on notice. I will be calling soon to deliver the food and will be looking for some conversation.

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (16:14): Minister Koutsantonis spoke earlier today in question time about the small claims compensation scheme. I thought I would just take a moment to acknowledge what has gone into the introduction of that scheme here in South Australia. In October 2022 there was a power surge on Whiting Road in my electorate, where through no fault of residents there was a surge at the power box that meant that a number of residents on and around that road actually saw a significant amount of damage to electrical goods in their houses.

In the weeks and months that followed, I was contacted by a large number of residents asking if there was a vehicle for compensation. Some had lost air conditioning, some had lost fridges, and many had lost kettles and toasters and that sort of thing. They were very frustrated—rightly so—that

at the time there was not a vehicle to be compensated for their losses despite the failure of SAPN infrastructure that, of course, was not their own fault.

Those residents came to me and as a group we advocated to Minister Koutsantonis and his office for a bit of change in that area. We were incredibly pleased to announce late last year, I believe it was, that the South Australian government would be introducing for the first time a small claims compensation scheme for individuals and households affected by power surges such as this one. Residents can claim up to \$15,000 for losses incurred as a result of that scheme. I just want to thank the residents of Whiting Road for advocating on behalf of South Australians.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2025

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (16:16): Thank you for the opportunity to continue my remarks on the Supply Bill 2025. For those who were tuned in before the break, I was reflecting on the narrative that has been coming out of the government, and how unfortunately the reports that they have been relying on for a number of months now to try to talk up what they are doing in the business space have been sadly superseded by an overwhelming number of reports from agencies such as NAB, the CommSec report and Deloitte that are highlighting the challenges that businesses in particular, and South Australians in general, are facing at the moment under this Malinauskas Labor government and their mate Anthony Albanese's federal Labor government.

The concerns that are being articulated from this side of the chamber, specifically around some of the business confidence numbers, have been magnified by some of these latest results. It was interesting to hear the answer to a question in question time where the Premier, when asked about South Australia slipping down the ranking of the CommSec State of the States report, tried to lean into any aspect of positivity from that report. But the reality of what that report now says is that South Australia is well and truly back in the pack, or even at the back of the pack, when it comes to comparisons with our interstate cousins.

The significant drop in business confidence that is being faced at the moment is starting to really impact across the community. This challenge that we are facing at the moment in South Australia in particular, with the lowest number across the country of investment back into business capital, should be ringing alarm bells for this government. It means that businesses around South Australia do not have the confidence to be putting money back into their businesses.

I spoke of a quote specifically from a business owner involved with the South Australian Business Council survey, where they pointed specifically at some of the red tape and regulations that they are having to face and saying that, indeed, it is not worth running a business in South Australia with the amount of red tape that they are having to face. As I said, this should be ringing an alarm bell for this government, because South Australia is a small business state. We have businesses at the moment that are feeling the pinch, and unfortunately the number of business closures that we have seen in South Australia is at the highest point since COVID.

These sorts of challenges and the reports that have been presented on business confidence and the like should be a wake-up call to this government that they need to be doing more. They need to be listening to the business community in particular, because it is hard to see business confidence numbers falling much further given that the South Australian Business Chamber has had business confidence in negative territory for 12 consecutive quarters; this is not a new thing. While the Premier is on his fiddle trying to create a song that might distract people away from these challenges, unfortunately, Rome is burning.

No wonder business confidence has tanked. The South Australian Business Chamber found that general business conditions in South Australia declined for the fourth consecutive quarter and have declined in five of the last six quarters. At 81.9 points, conditions are at their lowest point since the June quarter of 2020 at the height of the pandemic. General business conditions have declined rapidly: 13.8 points in the last year and 20.8 points in the last two years. This is from a Premier who likes to talk about his business credentials. He likes to put himself forward as a friend to the business

community. Maybe that promise is as hollow as his promise that we were reminded of during question time about fixing ramping: all talk and no delivery.

It is not just that: it is also the escalating levels of debt that we are facing as a state. Not very often do you go around South Australia and people bring up state debt with you. Often the discussion is around concerns with the debt that has been racked up by our federal government, but more and more, people are starting to realise that the level of state debt that we are getting to is out of control. If you compare it with previous state debts, with the State Bank debt that was being faced by us as a state, in today's dollars it is exponentially worse now than it was then.

We did learn from the Mid-Year Budget Review that there was an extra \$3 billion of additional revenue from taxation, but that only amounted to a small surplus to go with record debt levels. State debt in that Mid-Year Budget Review had increased by \$1.8 billion and will total \$46 billion by 30 June 2028. I am sure, as we start to consider what the next budget is going to look like, that number will be over \$50 billion. The Premier today spoke about how great it is to have a million people in the workforce. If we have a state debt of \$50 billion, that is a lot of money for each and every one of those workers to be responsible for paying back at some stage.

At the moment, despite boasting of record revenue, this government has no debt management plan. When they were in opposition, the now Premier made a lot of noise about the need for government to have a debt management plan in place. He made it their point of difference. That was at a time when state debt was significantly less than it is now. What do we hear from the Premier? Nothing at all. This government continually has failed to appropriately address many of the major challenges that have been faced by our state, especially some of the challenges, opportunities and concerns confronted by regional South Australia.

The Premier, when he was in opposition, made a point of the need for there to be a debt management plan in place. As I said, it was at a time when debt was significantly lower than it is now. The debt that has been racked up in just a few short years by this Labor government is significantly more than that, yet still they have not brought in place any sort of debt management plan. Where are the savings targets across non-vital government agencies? Where is the plan to be able to pay back the debt that has been accumulated?

We see that government spending is out of control. Government departments are out of control. We have seen that with the significant budget blowouts across portfolio areas; it is not just isolated to one or two. Right across portfolio areas, right across departments, we have seen budget blowouts, budget escalation. There seems to be no respect from this government and its departments for the taxpayers of South Australia. It is spend, spend, spend, not just for taxpayers now but for taxpayers in the future. How long into the future? We do not know because there is no plan to actually ever pay back this debt, and that attitude towards departmental overspend and government inefficiencies is only costing South Australians more and putting upward pressure on inflation.

It was fascinating to hear the commentary from those who are charged with trying to make decisions with the Reserve Bank to put constriction, downward pressure, on inflation. They highlighted that government spending at both federal and state levels is only pushing the inflation rate up. During a cost-of-living crisis, we need to be fully aware of the impacts of these decisions that are made by ministers, by department heads and by department staff down the line, and what impact that is actually having on South Australian families who are doing it tough during a cost-of-living crisis.

We have seen some examples of department budget overspends but there is none greater than the blowout of the health budget. In the Mid-Year Budget Review we saw that there was a blowout of \$627 million. That is \$627 million more than when the budget was handed down, and it is not just that. There continues to be massive growing concern about the cost and delivery of the new Women's and Children's Hospital. This is only going to put more pressure on South Australia's rapidly escalating debt levels.

Yet what have the outcomes been? What have the health outcomes been? We have seen ambulance ramping numbers balloon even more. They are now at almost inconceivable levels: more than double what they were, near on triple what they were, when this government came in with the promise that they would fix the ramping crisis. Remember those words? We are here to remind the government that they made that promise that they would fix the ramping crisis, yet those numbers

are significantly higher, and South Australians are rightly asking, 'When are you going to come through? When are you going to keep your promise?'

This government has made promises to get power, yet they cannot use that power effectively to drive the necessary change which actually matches these promises. Not only that, but we are seeing significant challenges, like I said, with some of the health delivery in regional South Australia. We have been calling on this side of the chamber for there to be a boost to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, the scheme that is relied on by 6,000 claimants—that was the last number—for regional people to get the level of service that their city cousins have in order to travel significant distances. From my electorate, for instance, it can be 500, 600, 700 or 800 kilometres and multiple plane flights. These are the challenges that they are facing because the health system is not delivering the equivalent level of service.

People in regional South Australia do not expect there to be the same standard, but there needs to be a standard and it needs to be something that we strive for as decision-makers. When that standard is not reached within regional centres, we need to have a scheme that appropriately and adequately reflects the true cost that is borne by people in regional South Australia to get that level of health care when they visit major centres, especially Adelaide.

On this side we are calling for that scheme to be ramped up, not just the fuel costs but also the overnight stay. When you have a compensation scheme that only gives back \$40 for an overnight stay in Adelaide, \$40 does not get you too many places where you can stay in Adelaide. This is why regional people are significantly out of pocket. When they put their claim in and they have stayed a night in a hotel or a motor inn or even a share house—whatever it might be—you can guarantee that the cost borne by them would be more than \$40, sometimes exponentially more, and that is how much they get back from the PAT Scheme.

So this is something that I urge the health minister to consider. These are the sorts of measures that need to be in place to appropriately recognise and reflect the needs of the community and to be listening to the people of regional South Australia. The PAT Scheme needs to be something that is a priority for this government.

We have also seen the burdening of GPs with significant payroll tax obligations, which also has flow-on effects—significant flow-on effects, indeed—to South Australians. The government spin is that they are listening to GPs. If that was true, they would have been hearing the same thing that we have been hearing for the last 12 to 18 months: that this decision from the Labor government to enforce this payroll tax ruling on GP clinics is going to mean that people are going to be paying more to go to their GPs.

It is going to make health care less affordable for the average South Australian and because of this there will be more pressure on the emergency departments of hospitals all around our state. During a cost-of-living crisis, this is the reaction of this government. It is not in the too-hard basket because we have seen examples interstate of governments making the right decision to properly reflect what the expectations of the community are. But this government seems to be hard of hearing. They seem to have no care or concern when it comes to South Australian families doing it tough.

Not just that, we have also been calling for a long time for the Premier to put in place appropriate incentives to attract and retain healthcare workers like what is on offer interstate. It does not matter at the moment how much cash is thrown out there about health announcements if we cannot actually have the health professionals in those service areas to actually staff the workforce needs that the health system has at the moment.

If we are competing with our cousins interstate, with governments that are putting incentives in place for healthcare workers, what chance do we have in South Australia to attract those sorts of healthcare workers if we do not have similar incentives in place? The health system—absolutely, it is a massive challenge and it is one which the government put front and centre in their last election campaign, one in which they said to people, 'Vote for us like your life depends on it.' Well, lives are depending on there being an appropriately resourced but also delivered health system and unfortunately, at every step along the way, this Labor government has not kept its promises.

A challenge is also being faced at the moment when it comes to housing, and some of the numbers that we are seeing coming through in a lot of the reports looking at the housing system are really concerning. It takes 11.8 years in Adelaide to save a 20 per cent deposit. It is the second

longest in the nation. When South Australia, which normally had its competitive advantage of affordability when compared to the Eastern States, is as bad or worse than our cousins interstate, that is when we have a significant issue.

So we are the second longest in the nation to actually be able to afford to save for a deposit, only behind New South Wales. We are the most expensive place when it comes to comparative numbers to actually rent in the whole country. When we are worse than Sydney, Melbourne or even Brisbane, or Perth, or a regional centre, when we are worse here in South Australia, there should be alarm bells ringing well and truly for this government.

We have the highest percentage of household income required to service rental payments; that is, the amount of money that we need out of the average salary that we get is the highest in the nation. We have the second highest percentage of household income required to service a mortgage. If you are lucky enough to be able to get yourself in a position to buy a house and have a mortgage, well, we are now the second highest percentage of household income required to service that mortgage, only behind New South Wales.

When it comes to dwelling value to income ratio, once again, we are the second highest in the nation. There was a time when this was the competitive advantage South Australia had—those times are no more. It is nine times the median income to buy a median-value house. These should be areas where the government is putting in place proactive policies. It is not just about supply; it is about trying to work out what are the mechanisms that are within the capacity of a government to be able to put in place.

The Treasurer has publicly acknowledged at the Mid-Year Budget Review a \$113 million increase in stamp duty revenue in the current financial year. That corresponds to massive increases in residential housing prices during a housing affordability crisis. The government is being advantaged by the challenges that have been faced by South Australians.

This significant surplus in revenue is at the cost of new home owners and businesses. It is a slap in the face, really, for those who have recently bought houses, many for the first time, and the Treasurer delights in the stamp duty pain. He is raking in that extra money. The government collects \$37,830 in stamp duty from the average house in metropolitan Adelaide. That is more than \$8,000 higher than when this government took power. In three short years, it is more than \$8,000 more on the average house in the pockets of this government.

The state Liberal opposition have significant concerns about the lack of cost-of-living relief for both households and businesses. Adelaide is in a housing affordability crisis and is the least affordable capital in which to rent and the second least affordable to buy. Those numbers, once again, are really confronting. It is fascinating to have some of the debate, which has been had in this place, where decisions are made, to actually have less housing, when the Opposition are putting forward proposals which would open up more land.

We have a massive housing supply shortage here in South Australia, missing housing targets by 26 per cent, with an expected 34 per cent undersupply by 2029. South Australians are paying \$237,000, which is 37 per cent of the total value of new house and land packages, on taxes, on regulatory costs and infrastructure charges—37 per cent of the cost of a new house and land package going to taxes, going to the cost of regulation, going to infrastructure charges. That is a significant acceleration, an acceleration of 90 per cent since 2019. Where is the relief from this government?

Aspiring home owners will need to fork out over \$40,000 in stamp duty alone on the median house price in Adelaide. It is an increase of \$11,000 since this government has come into power. Some of these numbers might seem dry, but if you are that person who is now having to find an extra \$11,000 just to cover tax, to go into the pockets of the government, you can see why people are frustrated, you can see why community confidence is rattled and thus the flow-on effect for business confidence as well. There is some \$65.9 million for public housing build commitments and \$135.8 million for maintenance and building of 442 social housing units, but that \$135 million is federal money. There is not the state investment into this as well, and it is pretty vague in social housing information.

Right across the chamber we hear from our constituents about the challenges of maintenance backlogs within housing across the state. It is often at the door of a local MP that people

turn to when they have been so frustrated by the system. The system has let them down. Where do they turn to? They turn to the local MP. Some of the stories that I hear from my constituents—and, as I said, I am sure people right around this chamber hear similar stories—about the standards that people are having to put up with because of that maintenance backlog are significant.

There continues to be unanswered questions on water infrastructure to support not just the future housing development but even the existing water needs of South Australia. Over the last several months we saw what Labor are rolling out when they use the shadow of the ESCOSA process and the SA Water pricing mechanism to significantly raise the water bills of South Australians, right across our state, because of mismanagement and lack of planning for our current and future needs. The average South Australian household water bill this year increased by \$80. People are having to find more money to go into the pockets of government during a cost-of-living crisis, when South Australians are feeling the pinch most.

The government seems to not care or ignores those concerns from South Australian families doing it tough. The government have said the increase is needed to help pay for their \$1.5 billion worth of new mains water and sewerage connections for rapidly growing Adelaide suburbs. That is really code for the government has had its head in the sand, unfortunately, for many years when it comes to our infrastructure needs, because we have seen billions of dollars swathed out of SA Water throughout the years, propping up general revenue. South Australian governments have used SA Water as a cash cow rather than investing into the water needs of South Australians and now, unfortunately, our current communities, our current water bill payers, are paying the cost for it.

During a cost-of-living crisis we see some of the most basic essentials, like water, being jacked up by this Labor government. It seems like there is no concern from this government about those concerns from South Australian families that are really doing it tough. It is often asked, 'What would you do differently?' I have been proud of the way that the opposition has been putting forward alternatives or what we would do if we were in government to try to ease some of the pressures, to ease the burden on business, as I was saying before, the red tape, regulation and costs that businesses are having to face in South Australia.

What would we do? We would put forward a proposal to lift the payroll tax threshold and to have no payroll tax for apprentices and trainees. This is a proactive move because we know that with the raising of wages the equivalent payroll tax amount has not changed at all. The amount that businesses are paying their workers has gone up, but that threshold—that more and more small businesses are hitting—has not changed. It is bracket creep, just as we talked about with other taxation. That is exactly what is happening here with payroll tax. More and more businesses that never have considered themselves to be big enough to have to pay payroll tax are now hitting that threshold.

It is even amongst some of the hospitality businesses that are working under pretty thin margins: they reach a threshold and have to pay payroll tax, and not just from \$1.5 million level onwards, but then that is wound back to a number which astounds people really. The amount of payroll tax that they are having to pay when they hit that threshold is significant. It really is an insidious tax. It is a tax which actually disincentivises businesses to expand. It disincentivises businesses to employ more people, because if you reach that threshold suddenly you are going to have to be putting significant dollars into the pockets of government.

For us, it is pretty clear: that threshold should be lifted. It should appropriately reflect the changes that businesses are facing. As well as that, there should not be payroll tax for apprentices and trainees; there should be a system in place that actually helps businesses when they are considering putting trainees and apprentices on, rather than one which only adds to that concern about the payroll tax burden. It is only the Liberal opposition that are putting forward a proposal to lift that payroll tax threshold in response to concerns of business right across South Australia. We are listening, the government is not.

As well as that, there needs to be more consideration of the stamp duty relief when it comes to first-home owners in particular. The concession on home builds the government has put in place but we are the only state without a concession for first-home buyers on existing homes. The challenge, as I said earlier when I was giving you some of those facts and figures when it comes to stamp duty, is that over one-third of the cost of what it takes to buy and build a new home goes into

government taxes, regulation and infrastructure costs. These are the sorts of things that are within the control of the government.

You may talk about the impact that market changes and rising prices have—and absolutely that can be out of control—but over a third of the cost for a new home being government-led absolutely is the lever. We, on this side, think there needs to be more done when it comes to stamp duty relief for South Australians, especially those South Australians trying to get into their first home.

We, on this side, have been strong advocates for reversing the decision to enforce payroll tax on GPs. As I said, this has had a direct flow-on effect to the affordability of health care for South Australians. It is adding extra pressure on our emergency departments, which are obviously significantly strained, significantly more under this government. To reverse that decision to enforce a payroll tax on GPs would be saying to doctors and their patients all around South Australia that we are listening.

Why has this government not considered putting this in place permanently? Once again, as I say, it is not something which is in the too-hard basket because other jurisdictions are doing just that. These GPs are partners and contractors. They should not be included with the payroll tax grouping. We on this side would make that change.

As well as that, the amount of money that South Australians are now having to fork out for their SA Water bill is having a direct impact on what people can afford in life in general. That is why we are saying we need to ease the pressure on water bills. It should not be those existing customers that are having to bear the brunt of poor decisions made by previous governments about the lack of investment into water infrastructure. To force South Australians to pay an extra 3½ per cent above inflation—3½ per cent plus inflation—on their last SA Water bills is a pretty bitter pill to swallow for South Australian water bill payers: families and businesses all around South Australia. This is why we on this side say that pressure needs to be eased.

This is why we are putting forward these credible, proactive steps and policies that we say are reflective of what we are hearing from our communities right around the state. We are listening. We know that the challenges of the cost-of-living crisis at the moment are really starting to bite. We know the challenges for businesses trying to deal with government regulation and costs are really starting to hurt. This is why business confidence is so low. This is why people are coming to us and saying, 'We don't know how we're going to afford the next increase in our SA Water bill.' This is why businesses are saying, 'We don't want to employ an extra person, because we are going to reach that payroll tax threshold and it means we are going to be having to find tens of thousands of dollars to pay payroll tax over and above what we are already doing at the moment.'

This is real life for people having to experience it right across South Australia. These are mums and dads, these are individuals trying to work hard to get ahead who are consistently hearing a message from this government that, 'We are not listening. We are happy to take your extra stamp duty and we are happy to take your extra payroll tax without making any sorts of changes to the system that's in place.' On this side we say those changes need to be made.

As we consider this Supply Bill, we look at all the different aspects of what is necessary to fund government operations right around the state and some of the projects, which are nuanced, in particular, to regional South Australia. In my electorate I have been concerned—frustrated even—with the lack of vision for regional South Australia in particular. When the last Liberal government was in place here in South Australia a few years ago, we saw significant expenditure and investment into my region, into some of the infrastructure and roads in particular, which helped the businesses that are specifically export businesses, to be able to effectively get their product to market. It put in place measures which made travelling those long distances on our roads even safer.

The shoulder sealing that we saw on the Eyre Highway has dramatically changed the way that people can travel right across the western third of our state. If you have actually taken the time to drive the Eyre Highway now from Port Augusta all the way to the border, you can see the amount of money that the previous Liberal federal and state governments, in partnership, put into that road, that national highway, in particular the section from Kyancutta west, which is now a joy to drive.

I drive tens of thousands of kilometres a year and to do so on a road which is safer, wider and less confronting for caravans and heavy vehicles to have to traverse, saves lives. It saves some of the challenge and distress that is caused on some of these roads. The shoulder sealing on the

Eyre Highway and the shoulder sealing on the Tod Highway, from Kyancutta down to Cummins, was a significant investment from the last Liberal government and it really has paid dividends. The overtaking lanes and the intersection upgrades on the Lincoln and the Tod highways have been a significant upgrade for my region.

When it comes to roadworks, one change that this government put in place in my electorate was one about which I do not think anyone within my electorate came to me and said, 'It is a good idea to do intersection upgrades on Liverpool Street in Port Lincoln.' Those upgrades were to take out a left-turn lane on significant roundabouts through the centre of Port Lincoln, and it was something which was roundly opposed right across the community.

The government heard that and the department heard that through their consultation. They heard that from me. I was on my feet several times in this place. I wrote to the minister and said, 'This is something which needs to be reversed. This change is actually going to make traffic movement in Port Lincoln worse.' Those concerns were not listened to. Sadly, we have actually seen exactly what my community and I as the local member predicted, and that is lesser outcomes for traffic movement, for freight movement, and—in some sort of perverted way—more dangerous situations for pedestrians.

It was under the guise of pedestrian safety that these changes were brought in place in Port Lincoln, but everything that I hear is that it has actually clogged up traffic, it has meant that there are more cars going through these intersections and it is actually a more dangerous situation. As the local member, I say to my community I am sorry: I am sorry that government has let you down with that decision, I am sorry that you have a poorer outcome because a department and a minister did not listen to that community concern. It is not good enough, and sadly this is the sort of thing that undermines people's confidence in bureaucracy and decision-making.

So, for me, I continue to urge the minister to look at potential investment into the road network right across regional South Australia, particularly in my own electorate. The shoulder sealing work that was done on the Tod Highway and the Eyre Highway which I spoke about is the sort of thing that needs to be rolled out more on the Flinders Highway. It has been encouraging to see some work done there on some of the more dangerous sweeping bends, but there is more work to be done on this section.

If you get the privilege of driving as much as I do up there between Streaky Bay and Ceduna, some of the drop-offs on those shoulders are really frightening. On a section south of Elliston, you can see a near-on foot (12-inch) drop—30 centimetres for those in the metric system—off the edge of the road. You can see why unfortunately people with caravans, people with heavy vehicles, are right on the edge of that road and have real concerns.

I sadly get to see some of the dash cam footage of some of the incidents and accidents that happen within my electorate, and too many are caused by not enough investment into the road network, especially with caravanners who are not used to having to traverse these roads and are having to deal with a wider footprint with their vehicle.

We also in regional South Australia need to see more investment into our health system. As I spoke about earlier with the PAT Scheme, the expectation for regional communities is not that the same level of service is delivered right across South Australia that is delivered here in Adelaide. We do not expect that. We do expect a standard to properly reflect the amount of money which regional South Australia put into the state and federal economy.

If we do not support the communities that are the economic powerhouse of our state, those communities are not going to be sustainable. We are not going to be in a position where those communities are still there in five, 10, 20 years to be able to provide that same economic uplift for the state if we do not invest into the basics to make sure that those communities are sustainable, and the health system in particular.

We have seen some of the struggles across my electorate of trying to get GPs and health professionals into our regional areas. There are the concerns of the local community when decisions are made from outside that community which directly impact health delivery, and I have real concerns when it comes to any steps that actually lessen health care within our regional communities.

My continual urge to the state government is, 'Don't turn your back on providing adequate health care within our regional communities, some of our more far-flung regional communities, which

put so much into our economy.' We need to be investing into the foundations of those communities to ensure the quality and the sustainability of them.

Any opportunity that I get on my feet here in this place, I urge the minister and the government to be considering the short, medium and long-term future of jetties right across the coastline of South Australia. I am very privileged to be the member for Flinders and to have over 2,000 kilometres of coastline. I am also very privileged to have 19 different jetties around that 2,000 kilometres of coastline, and each one of them is a central point for that community.

If you ever have the opportunity to go all the way out west to Point Sinclair, that is a focal point for that community, as is Fowlers Bay out in the far west and all the way around the west coast and down into the gulf waters. Obviously, those 20 jetties across the electorate of Flinders are priorities of mine, but there are over 70 jetties and marine infrastructure right around South Australia that are priorities for each and every one of those communities, and there needs to be strategic decision-making made. Not political games played, there needs to be strategic decision-making.

Obviously, the one that is front of mind for me and my community at the moment is the Tumby Bay jetty. It is a community that has continually called for action and, as I said, not just the political games. It needs real short, medium and long-term investment, but that is not the only one. The jetties where concerns are raised to me include Louth Bay, Denial Bay and Ceduna.

It has been encouraging to see some investment into the Streaky Bay jetty, which is one that does actually sustain a significant commercial fishing operation. For the last several years, they have not been able to use that jetty and they have had to have alternative arrangements in place. As I said, if we have not got the capacity to invest into the regional communities that put so much into our economy, then what are we doing as a state?

The Tumby Bay jetty, for instance, like many of the jetties around my coastline, is owned by the state government and it is leased to the council, and this lease is expiring soon. Whether it is the Tumby Bay jetty, the Port Neill jetty or one of the other several council-leased jetties around the coast of South Australia, they need works but they also need to have strategic decision-making put in place.

We need to have a full assessment of where that asset is at and then make clear non-political decisions about investment in the future. It is encouraging absolutely to see \$5 million a year put into jetties by this government. Unfortunately, it is a drop in the ocean and there needs to be more funding made available to communities to put this in place and to take away the games.

This has been the issue where I have been frustrated. The member for West Torrens, the minister, and I butt heads on this one and he often tries to pop me in parliament, but I am reflecting what the community concerns are within my community; that is, if these vital pieces of marine infrastructure are lost now then they are lost for generations. They will not come back. They will not provide the opportunity for not just members of regional communities but our city cousins who often come to visit to go fishing, to go swimming, to go diving or to simply walk along and experience that marine environment.

This is not just about the small communities that these jetties are in, it is about the long-term future of South Australia and the coastal culture, which is such a significant part of who we are as a people. Councils and local communities have a role to play, absolutely, to partner with the state government, but it is time for the state government to step up and provide long-term solutions.

If you are asking communities of a couple of thousand people to put in several million dollars, the maths is just not working. They can't afford that. You cannot expect ratepayers of small communities—the District Council of Tumby Bay, the District Council of Ceduna, the District Council of Cleve—to be putting that significant money in without appropriate higher levels from the state government.

As the local member, I will keep making noise about this. I do not mind if there are personal pot shots at me in parliament; that happens all the time. We need to have a suitable solution for the jetties—and not just at Tumby Bay, which is front of mind because we have seen that play out publicly. We need to have this in place for regional communities, in particular all around our coastal communities, because we cannot afford to lose these vital pieces of community coastal infrastructure.

There is also a significant challenge being faced at the moment in my community and around South Australia when it comes to community safety. Every one of us as South Australians deserves to feel safe in our homes, on our streets, in our businesses and in our towns. Some of the alarming increases we have seen in offending—and those stats are really confronting—are in areas such as assaults, thefts, break-ins and other antisocial behaviours. They occur both here in the CBD in Adelaide, absolutely, but also in some of our regional centres, as we have seen recently in Port Augusta, Whyalla, Port Lincoln and Ceduna.

I have really deep concerns for the long-term resourcing of the police force in our state. I speak to so many not just around my electorate but around the state, and hear some of the stories about the struggles of the officers who are leaving the force. Recruits come in, but experienced officers are leaving at the back end. They are burnt out, they are frustrated with the system, and indeed the issue of recruitment and retention of police within our state is only exacerbated within regional parts, where I am hearing over and over that there is an ever-increasing need.

The stories that I am hearing from communities right around the state are frightening. As well as that, some of the anecdotes that I am hearing from police on the beat in these types of communities are equally as concerning, confronting and frightening. Our police are getting worn out, they are getting worn down, they are getting overburdened with work and they are actually starting to question their long-term career. If we are in a position where experienced police officers who have been in the force for a long time are questioning their long-term career, that is not a sustainable position at all.

Sadly, I have seen that within my region. I was speaking to an officer who has been in the force for decades who just got so sick of the system that he has moved. He has moved out of the state, that is how sick of it he was. At the same time as we are facing these challenges, we see that there are incentives in place interstate. Queensland, for instance, are offering significant incentives and financial supports to recruit police officers from both interstate and overseas.

We on this side have been calling for the government to release the findings from the Premier's Taskforce—once again, a big promise that was made in the lead-up to the last election. It is something which they said was necessary: a report that has been completed and a taskforce which finished its work months if not years ago, yet there is no sort of transparency when it comes to any report from that taskforce, and not just for us as decision-makers but for the police on the beat. To keep that Premier's Taskforce report secret is saying to police officers right around the state, 'You don't need to know this. We'll just keep this within our little circle, you don't need to know.' I think we are starting to see the police officers who are getting sick of that burden being carried solely by them.

The communities of South Australia, the communities within my electorate, are crying out for action from the government. They need to feel safe. We all deserve to feel safe within our own homes, and not just that but we need to have a system that actually holds offenders to account when they do the wrong thing.

I hear from so many police officers around the state and in my electorate who get frustrated with a system where they find an offender, catch an offender and hold them to account, but before you know it that offender is out on bail and offending again. We are starting to see these repeat offenders, and some of the extreme cases that the shadow police minister continues to highlight are truly worrying. It is affecting local communities.

Where is the strategy behind this? Where is the transparency? Where is the appropriate resourcing for police within our regional areas? Where is the strategy to help support police to stop them from leaving the force? We have seen just in recent days the recognition, the acknowledgement, from the police commissioner that perhaps the model that has been put in place is not working. He did say that, whatever model is in place, the resourcing to back that model up needs to be appropriate.

We on this side would welcome any transparency from the government when it comes to the Premier's Taskforce on police. We certainly welcome the review of the district policing model because this is something that we have been hearing from police officers right around Adelaide. They have concerns about that model with the current resourcing level. We need to have a minister—and I hope the Treasurer has time to be able to do so—who appropriately recognises those concerns and puts the resourcing in place to make sure we are backing up those who are tasked with keeping us safe.

It is some of the basics that we need to get right in our community that the government is responsible for. One that is obviously front of mind at the moment within regional communities in particular is the drought conditions that are being faced right across the state. This is one that is pretty close to home, because I am hearing every day from farmers who are on the edge of something catastrophic, who are frustrated with promises made but not delivered. There seems to be a theme here, a recurring theme.

Although noise gets made about a great party in Peterborough—'Peter goes to Peterborough, happy days, let's put on another party'—what we have actually seen delivered from the latest announcement about support for people experiencing drought conditions is that the help is not getting where it needs to get to. People right across my community in particular but also across the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula have been frustrated because the rhetoric does not reflect the reality. What we are hearing from government is not being delivered on the ground.

I hope that the meetings that have been had in recent days, whether it is today, yesterday—I am hearing about the system that is in place, for instance, to get donated hay into the paddocks of those farmers who are trying just to sustain their livestock. They are not trying to do anything exorbitant: they are just trying to keep their sheep and cattle alive until they get the feed in their paddocks that they need. This is a pretty significant extended period of dry. Last season was dry, absolutely. It shut off pretty early. There has not been any summer rain. The paddocks are bare.

The people are calling out for support from the government when they need it most, but what I am hearing from the services delivering that hay and from the farmers who are needing it is that there is no more hay. The procrastination from the government, the delaying of a decision to help pay for some of the transport costs, has actually meant that the hay that was available to be delivered to South Australian farmers has now gone. It has gone up to Queensland to flood-affected farmers. Farmers across South Australia cannot get the feed source that is needed to sustain their livestock.

In the media in just the last 24 hours we have seen the significant burden that is being carried by those regional communities, by those livestock owners, and the amount of livestock that has been sold in the last few months—and this is not just the regular sale of livestock when things get a bit tight. What I am hearing from farmers across my electorate and across South Australia is that they are selling the breeders. They are selling the years of genetics that they have invested in to have an ever-increasing capacity within their flock. Those breeders are being sold because the support has not been in place.

Looking forward, what we are hearing from those who are tasked with supplying that donated hay, firstly, is that a whole bunch of it is not available now because of the procrastination of government decision-making and, secondly, it is not going to be available for another month. Grass does not grow in a hurry, it only grows after a rain, and there is a significant delay. We have not had the rain. We have not even got to the point of germination of any sort of feed source.

When we have people who are making decisions about the long-term future of their livestock operation being told, 'No, it's over a month until you actually have the ability to access any of this feed,' you can see why some of them are getting pretty desperate. They are getting pretty desperate and that desperation, I fear, is leading to poor decisions and desperate acts.

I have spoken previously about my frustrations with the lack of understanding about how dire things are. It is all good for a bit of spin, all good for a Peter party, but when it is actually significantly hurting our regional communities they feel like they have been ignored. We have had announcements, whether it is an ESL refund or a registration refund, but when you dig into the detail of what it actually means and realise that very few farmers can actually access it, people see through that. People are sick of these sorts of platitudes that miss the reality of the situation. Our regional communities are really hurting, and what has been delivered by government has missed the mark by so far.

This Supply Bill is really about the continued operation of government for a period of time, and we reflect not just on the current financial year budget but also on what the budget might look like in the future. What a significant capital investment in my community looks like at the moment is what is being proposed for what is the most wicked problem on Eyre Peninsula and has been since settlement, and I am sure even before, and that is water on Eyre Peninsula.

The story often gets told that when Flinders came through and looked at the beautiful harbour—and if you have the opportunity to be on the water in the harbour at Boston Bay, you realise what a beautiful location it is and what potential is there, but the constraint has always been a water source and water supply. This is why, as the story goes, the capital of South Australia was not built at Port Lincoln: it was built over here in Adelaide.

My people on Eyre Peninsula have been frustrated because once again they feel like they have not been listened to by decision-makers, and this is especially pertinent when it comes to the proposal for a desalination plant at Billy Lights Point at Port Lincoln. For those who have not had the privilege of being on the water in Boston Bay, you may not know the intricate layout of the interaction between Proper Bay, Boston Bay and the gulf waters and the way they move around.

The proposal for a desalination plant within that bay area of Port Lincoln, from the very beginning when it was proposed, really was alarming not just for the aquaculture and fishing industries that rely on those waters but for the community as a whole who see the challenges that already exist within the environment there and the fine balance that there already is. They have a government that is continuing to push along with their proposal because it is the cheapest, because it is the easiest, but the concerns remain nonetheless. These are concerns, like I said, right across the community, right across the fishing and aquaculture industry, right across the Indigenous community, who have real concerns with that as a location.

What is the response from this government? Successive ministers, whether it was the minister for environment before or now the super minister, have said, 'Well, we don't think that you know what you are talking about, people of Eyre Peninsula. We are just going to do it anyway because it is the cheapest, because it is the easiest.'

As the detail of this proposal has worked its way through, I have spoken in this place a few times about my concerns with it. If this is going to be the location, at least try to get arrangements in place that minimise that concern and minimise that risk. It was only just a few weeks ago in a committee where we found out that where the wastewater treatment plant for Port Lincoln is, right nearby where the proposed location for a desal plant at Billy Lights Point is, there is only going to be several hundred metres between the outlet of the wastewater treatment plant and the intake of the desalination plant—something which my community did not know about until it was brought up through questioning in a committee.

It was the same with the outfall of the desal plant and the outfall of the wastewater plant. It is a concentrated area with slow or little movement of water in the bay area of Port Lincoln, which continues to be the concern for my community. At least, if you are going to put that desal plant in that location, consider an extension of the pipeline to get it out into some of that more swiftly moving water in the gulf. It does not move around much, but at least consider making that pipeline a few kilometres out. But, no, SA Water, in their wisdom, have continued to bore on straight ahead despite community concerns.

This is going to be the most significant capital infrastructure investment into Eyre Peninsula in history, comparative to some of the major works when it came to whether it was putting the Tod Reservoir or putting in place the rail line which went through the middle of Eyre Peninsula. This is going to be a significant capital investment—\$330 million plus—and still the community's concerns about the arrangements have just been ignored. I will continue to bring up those concerns in this place in particular with the people who are tasked with making the decisions and getting those arrangements right; I will continue to be the advocate for my community.

The other aspect that is fascinating to watch at the moment, and frustrating for me, and the politics that have been inserted into that, is the Northern Water proposal. This is a significant potential project for the state—significant financially, absolutely—and what the effective project delivery would mean for the economic future of the whole of the state is significant.

The body of work that was put in to look at the preferred location at the time of Cape Hardy for the Northern Water project really did mean that the proposal had pretty widespread community support. It was in a location where there is deep water. It is reasonably active water for gulf waters, and there is not the same environmental concern. There is an existing Indigenous land use agreement in place and all the arrangements that had the support of the community, and it had a project team which was enthused about that.

Over the last six months, we have seen that obviously change. To have the responsibility for that now given to the Minister for Energy and Mining and for that project to now be considering an alternative location up at Mullaquana has meant that I have serious concerns about whether that project is actually going to be delivered and serious concerns about what the actual project cost is going to be. I think that whenever politics gets put into the decision-making for significant infrastructure projects like this, there is a risk of poorer outcomes for our community. This is exactly what I see happening at the moment.

Once again, politics gets paid, personal attacks happen—absolutely. You can see some of the back and forth that happens and the accusation that it is just me as a selfish local member wanting that project. No, I actually want the best outcome for the people of South Australia. I want there to be appropriate investment into infrastructure which enables economic activity for our state into the future and not just one which is made because of a political whim at the time because that is when lesser outcomes happen.

Within regional communities in particular, the challenge of housing is nuanced. There is a lot of discussion in this place and debate around the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan and where different locations are within that urban and peri-urban area, but there needs to be strategic decision-making when it comes to regional communities in particular. South Australia really is left behind when it comes to our cousins in the Eastern States, where we see that they have invested in regional communities, invested in regional cities that are now economically sustaining themselves, communities which have 50,000, 60,000, 100,000 people.

We talk about our regional centres. When our second biggest town is a 25,000-person one, this is why interstate the population centres of that size are called towns because they have real regional cities. We need strategic decision-making because regional South Australia has the potential to be the economic driver even more so than it is now, but that investment needs to happen strategically, and it starts with some of the strategic decision-making around regional housing in particular.

One aspect which I do not think is fully understood, fully grasped, by decision-makers, especially those from metropolitan areas, is the impact that the native vegetation laws are having on constricting and restricting the potential residential and industrial growth for our regional centres. The Native Vegetation Act is in place, but it does not pertain to metropolitan Adelaide; it is for areas outside. We hear about the obligation and the cost burden that is borne by regional communities, regional councils, regional investors and developers, because of this piece of legislation, even within the confines of a township boundary.

With strategic decision-making, if we are actually being proactive about the future of our state, these are the sorts of levers that should be considered by decision-makers when it comes to enabling communities, putting real incentives in place and reflecting not just the economic activity that is already put into the state but also the potential for it. This is why I have long been an advocate for specific regional policy which can be put in place to enable those communities. In regional areas we need to get the basics right. We need to set the foundation for our communities, and it starts with education, it starts with health care, and we need to get some of the aspects right such as child care in regional centres.

I certainly welcome the federal Liberal opposition putting forward a commitment, if they are elected, to put significant investment into regional child care in particular. This is an aspect which is a handbrake on the economy of regional South Australia and regional Australia. If we do not get the basics right, we are going to miss the opportunity and let our communities down. There are so many different aspects to what we are putting forward as a Liberal opposition that I think, as we lead up to the next state election, we will have people reflecting on, 'Were the promises that were made to me at the last election kept?' We have seen the promises that I have highlighted today, where this government, despite the rhetoric, has let the community of South Australia down. This is why, in the lead-up to the next state election, as we go through the next state budget, I think there will be a lot of questions for this government to answer about why those promises to the people of South Australia have not been kept.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (17:24): I rise today in support of the Supply Bill 2025. This bill brought forward by the Malinauskas Labor government is not simply a financial mechanism to keep

the machinery of government running, it is a living expression of our priorities, our values and our promise to the people of South Australia.

It is easy in discussions of budgets and bills to focus on numbers, appropriations and percentages, but what these figures truly represent are people—individuals, families and communities—who rely on us as elected representatives to make decisions that uplift lives, enable opportunity and build a fairer society. This bill continues that mission. It funds the services that matter, supports the economy we are building for the future and takes real steps to address the challenges facing everyday South Australians, from housing and infrastructure to jobs and climate resilience.

I will begin with one of the most fundamental pillars of any society, economic opportunity. The Supply Bill 2025 represents a continuation of the Malinauskas Labor government's proactive approach to economic growth and job creation. We understand that a thriving economy does not happen by chance: it is built through vision, investment and strategic reform.

Take, for instance, the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Bill 2025. This is not just legislative reform, it is a long-overdue shift in how we coordinate development across our state. By streamlining outdated and often duplicative approval processes, we are unlocking opportunities faster. For decades, South Australia has had world-class standards when it comes to planning and development but, too often, the road to realising those projects has been blocked by red tape. We are cutting through that without compromising on quality, safety or environmental stewardship. That is smart reform, the kind that attracts business, encourages investment and creates jobs.

When we talk about industry, we cannot overlook the critical situation at the Whyalla Steelworks. The decision to step in, to appoint administrators and work to secure a future for the site, was not one made lightly, but it was one made with resolve. Steelmaking is not just a part of our industrial history, it is part of our industrial future. Whyalla matters. It matters for the thousands of families whose livelihoods depend on the site. It matters for our construction sector, for our renewable energy projects and for our state's economic independence.

By acting swiftly and decisively, we have demonstrated what responsible government looks like, intervening to stabilise a vital economic asset while seeking a sustainable, long-term solution that secures jobs and encourages reinvestment in regional South Australia.

Of course, economic growth must go hand in hand with tackling the immediate pressures people face in their daily lives, and chief among those is housing. Across Australia, we are facing a housing affordability crisis driven by rapid population growth, high construction costs and insufficient supply. South Australia is not immune to these pressures, but we are taking clear and confident steps to address them.

The Supply Bill 2025 funds vital initiatives to unlock more land, streamline development approvals and invest in the infrastructure that makes housing viable. Through amendments to the environment and food production areas, we are responsibly expanding the land available for housing, making space for over 61,000 new dwellings. This is not about reckless sprawl or unchecked development: it is about balance. We are ensuring that South Australians, especially young people and families, can find an affordable home in a connected, liveable community.

Again, the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Bill 2025 plays a crucial role here. By establishing designated state development areas, we are setting the stage for fast-tracked projects that already meet our environmental and planning standards. This cuts delays, attracts builders and accelerates construction at a time when we need it most. We are also investing in the essential infrastructure—roads, water and sewerage—that unlocks the potential of these developments and connects people to opportunity. This is not just a housing policy, it is an opportunity policy.

We must also speak plainly about the financial pressures facing South Australian households. The rising cost of groceries, energy, rent and fuel is squeezing budgets across the state. These are not abstract statistics; they are real stresses that keep families up at night. That is why I welcome the significant \$266.2 million cost-of-living relief package announced in the 2024-25 state budget. This includes a one-off additional Cost of Living Concession payment of over \$243.90 to over 210,000 eligible households, payments that have already flowed into homes where they are needed most. For some, that money might mean keeping the heater on longer over winter. For

others, it is more groceries in the fridge, or covering the cost of school uniforms. Mr Speaker, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:31 the house adjourned until Wednesday 30 April 2025 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (29 October 2024).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police): I have been advised:

The Department of Treasury and Finance's increase of 74 FTEs in 2023-24 compared to 2022-23 is primarily due to additional resources associated with a range of strategic projects including:

- The Finance Reform Program, a significant across-government initiative to replace the existing Masterpiece financial management system with the contemporary Oracle platform;
- Transition of the whole of government banking arrangements from CBA to ANZ across 64 agencies;
- The payroll reform project; and
- Establishing the team to administer the Digital Investment Fund, which partners with government agencies to drive targeted investment to lift digital capabilities across the public sector.

Lower staff vacancies across the department in 2023-24 have also contributed.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (29 October 2024).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police): I have been advised:

Part B (Controls Opinion) of the Auditor-General's annual report outlines the Auditor-General's opinion on the sufficiency of controls exercised by the Treasurer and public authorities relating to a 'range of financial transactions...to provide reasonable assurance that those transactions have been conducted properly and in accordance with law' (page 3).

To form their opinion, 56 public authorities were included in Auditor-General's 2023-24 controls audit opinion program.

Part C (Agency Audit Reports) provides details of the specific 'controls opinion' findings for each individual agency. These findings collectively inform the significant outcomes that are presented in Part B. Details about issues relating to asset management, contract management, procurement and payroll, and other issues, as well as agency responses, are identified in Part C (Agency Audit Reports).

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (29 October 2024).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police): I have been advised:

That as part of the payroll audit, different samples of 19 transactions were reviewed for new starters, employee transfers and pay increments respectively, to find evidence of quality checks and/or supporting documentation.

Shared Services SA acknowledges that some records were not maintained and filed consistently during 2023-24. This was primarily due to payroll staff relocating between floors and associated building works, which impacted regular filing activities, and the timely location of records requested during the audit.

Applicable payroll team members have been reminded of their responsibility to ensure that all required supporting documentation and quality assurance checks are actioned and filed appropriately.

An improvement to the employee transfer process has also been introduced to streamline the workflow of documentation between the payroll processing teams and quality assurance team. This should reduce the risk of incomplete employee transfer documentation and associated checking moving forward.

Additionally, Shared Services SA is currently exploring longer-term options to implement an electronic workflow and records storage solution. Implementation of an appropriate solution would significantly improve accessibility to, and the correct storage of, payroll transaction supporting documentation and quality-checking details.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (29 October 2024).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police): I have been advised:

All SA Water dividend and income tax equivalent payments are paid into consolidated revenue. Although dividends from SA Water increased from 2022-23 to 2023-24, SA Water was the recipient of net contributions from

government totalling \$8.0 million in 2023-24 (i.e. payments made to SA Water from the government exceeded distributions paid by SA Water to the government). This largely reflects that the government makes community service obligation payments to SA Water to undertake various non-commercial operations, including the implementation of state-wide pricing.

Dividends paid by SA Water have no impact on the amount of infrastructure investment undertaken by SA Water. The level of SA Water investment is primarily informed by the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) through its regulatory determination.