

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 15 May 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.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: STURT WATER TANK REHABILITATION PROJECT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:02): I move:

That the 134th report of the committee, entitled Sturt Water Tank Rehabilitation Project, be noted.

The subject water storage tank is located approximately eight kilometres south of the Adelaide Central Business District at 960 Marion Road in Sturt. The existing tank is a 65-year-old concrete structure with an approximate capacity of nine million litres. Presently, it serves 86,000 people and is a critical component of the South Adelaide Water Distribution Zone.

Originally constructed in 1959, recent assessments have uncovered structural defects to the tank, consistent with assets of this age. These defects need to be addressed to reduce the risk of the tank's roof collapsing as well as to prevent accelerated water leakage. The proposed refurbishments aim to support long-term viability as well as sustained delivery of reliable baseline services for existing SA Water customers.

Two options were assessed to remedy the ageing tank. The first considered rehabilitating the existing tank, extending the asset's life by 40 years. The second involved demolishing the existing tank and constructing a replacement of equivalent size. SA Water has selected the rehabilitation pathway as it presents a cost-effective, sustainable and productive solution, and presents the most favourable net present value. It is also environmentally favourable as there is minimal impact to the existing construction footprint. The option to build a new tank was not preferred as it required significant capital expenditure costs as well as significant challenges to ongoing water supply for customers due to its longer projected construction period.

The rehabilitation works will replace the tank's roof and associated support structure, rehabilitate the tank's inlet and outlet pipework and concrete structures, including columns, wall and floor, as well as provide a new safe access point to the tank.

The site is owned by SA Water, and the submission states that there will be no ongoing operational costs. The project is confined predominantly to the existing infrastructure site location; however, communication with relevant stakeholders and landowners will continue throughout the planning and construction phases. Construction is expected to begin by midyear and is anticipated to be complete in early 2026.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Sturt Water Tank Rehabilitation Project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Emma Goldsworthy, Acting Senior Manager, Capital Delivery, SA Water; and Ben Muller, Senior Project Manager, SA Water. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GLENGOWRIE WALK-UP FLAT SITE UPGRADE PROJECT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:05): I move:

That the 135th report of the committee, entitled Glengowrie Walk-Up Flat Site Upgrade Project, be noted.

In 2023, the South Australian Housing Trust identified a roof leak in a single block of units at the Glengowrie Court complex. The tenants of the 12 dwellings affected by the water leak were duly relocated while repairs were made to the leak and the original asbestos roof was safely replaced. During the works, the trust also used the opportunity to make internal upgrades to the units, including laundries, flooring, lighting, stairwells and electrics.

Having completed these works, the trust has decided to refurbish the remaining dwellings at the location, which have been categorised as hard to let. The proposed project will fully renovate 32 units and 14 townhouses, including internal works, wet areas, common areas, stairs, external facade upgrades plus all external improvements, including landscaping and electrical works. The project will also introduce landscaping elements that will improve site amenity as well as benefit local tree canopy and biodiversity. The trust states that the works will improve occupancy by 35 per cent, reduce maintenance expenditure and modernise existing housing stock to meet current and future customer needs. Existing tenants at the site are being relocated, and the process is nearing completion.

Infrastructure upgrades will be completed concurrently with the refurbishment works to minimise any disruption to tenants. Construction is anticipated to commence in the 2nd quarter of this year, with the expectation for the project to be complete this December. The project is estimated to cost \$12.2 million, and ongoing management and maintenance costs will be drawn from existing trust budgets. The agency is in ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders, and the trust's media and communications team will manage any direct inquiries relating to the project.

One of the dwellings within the Glengowrie Court complex is currently allocated to the Wali Wiru program. The dwelling is currently vacant and no change to the program is proposed as part of the work.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Glengowrie Walk-Up Flat Site Upgrade Project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Tom Currie, Director Major Projects and Housing Initiatives, South Australian Housing Trust; and Daniel Sghirripa, Development Manager, South Australian Housing Trust. I also acknowledge that the member for Morphett appeared as a witness. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends this proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HEASLIP ROAD AND CURTIS ROAD INTERSECTION UPGRADE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:08): I move:

That the 136th report of the committee, entitled Heaslip Road and Curtis Road Intersection Upgrade, be noted.

The Heaslip Road and Curtis Road intersection is located in Angle Vale, approximately 30 kilometres north of Adelaide's central business district. Presently, it is an unsignalised intersection with channelised right-turn lanes on Heaslip Road and stop signs on both legs of Curtis Road. The intersection currently experiences an annual average daily traffic count of 15½ thousand vehicles, and motorists turning onto Heaslip Road from Curtis Road can experience delays of up to two minutes per vehicle during peak hours.

Between 2019 and 2023, there were 18 reported crashes at the intersection, including one serious injury crash, five minor injury crashes and one motorcycle rollover. The majority of these crashes were right-angle and right-turn crashes attributed to drivers either failing to stand or disobeying stop signs.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport proposes to construct a new dual-lane roundabout at the intersection to improve safety, reduce traffic congestion and cater for the rapid expansion of growth in northern Adelaide. The upgrade will include additional traffic lanes, shared-use paths, pedestrian and cyclist crossings, and upgrades to drainage infrastructure and road lighting.

The proposed works will enhance traffic capacity and complement other infrastructure upgrades that are being undertaken in the area to support the rapidly expanding residential developments occurring in Angle Vale and the broader northern Adelaide areas. Construction is anticipated to commence in late 2025 with the expectation to be complete and open to traffic by mid-2026.

The project is expected to cost \$30 million and is funded on a fifty-fifty basis between the Australian and South Australian governments. The design of the roundabout has required the partial acquisition of two privately held land parcels under the Land Acquisition Act, which has been successfully undertaken by the department. Ongoing maintenance costs for the proposed intersection upgrade will be sourced from the department's annual operating budget. The project is expected to support the development of 700 houses as well as 120 full-time equivalent jobs over the course of its construction.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Heaslip Road and Curtis Road intersection upgrade. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Andy Excell, Executive Director, Transport Strategy and Planning, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Craig Eckermann, Delivery Manager, Infrastructure Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PLYMPTON INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:11): I move:

That the 137th report of the committee, entitled Plympton International College Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Located within the City of West Torrens, Plympton International College was established in 1998 through the amalgamation of Plympton High School, Netley Primary School and Camden Primary School. The college was one of the first schools in metropolitan Adelaide to offer a reception to year 12 education at a single site. In 2016, the college became the first Chinese bilingual school in South Australia, teaching half of the Australian curriculum in Mandarin and the other half in English. As of February this year, the school has 822 enrolments out of a current capacity of approximately 900 students. The proposed redevelopment is projected to increase this capacity to 1,200 students.

The project will replace ageing buildings with purpose-built modern facilities consisting of two adjacent single-storey structures that form an educational precinct, integrating both internal and external learning spaces that can support individuals, small groups, classes and combined classes in various configurations. The new building will contain contemporary teaching and learning areas, specialist teaching spaces, library resources, a canteen and amenities for staff and students.

The works will provide learning areas that support contemporary teaching and learning pedagogies, as well as a connected multidisciplinary learning environment that engages all learners with creative, flexible spaces that enhance student engagement and allow collaborative teaching. The works will also include the demolition of aged buildings and the creation of outdoor learning areas and related landscaping.

The redevelopment will be managed and delivered by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and is expected to cost \$14 million, funded through the Department for Education's 2023-24 capital works program. Any change in the recurrent costs of the school's operation will be

funded from within the department's existing resources. Construction is anticipated to commence this September with the aim to be complete by September 2026.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Plympton International College redevelopment project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Libby Sowry, Assistant Director, Capital Programs and Projects, Department for Education; Aislinn Morris, Portfolio Manager, Education Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Gerald Matthews, Director, Matthews Architects. I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for Badcoe, who presented to the committee concerning this project in her electorate, for her staunch advocacy for this school.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (11:14): It is a great pleasure to be able to rise to speak to this report and to voice my support for Plympton International College, which is an outstanding public school in my area.

I am particularly proud of the progress that this school has had over the time that I have been fortunate enough to be the member for Badcoe. At the time that I first stood as a candidate, way back now in 2017, unfortunately parents in the area were coming to me bemoaning that they were zoned for Plympton International College, a very sad thing. They were often requesting recommendation letters from me to get into other public schools and non-government schools. Sadly, when I walked through Plympton International College, the facilities were clearly below the expectations of many parents.

One thing that really stuck with me was the age of the classrooms. Many of them were identical to the style of classrooms that I attended way back in the 1980s. The other thing that struck me was the expanses of really hot concrete, which were not really inviting, especially if you were on a principal's tour and you were considering whether this might be the right place for your child or children. Although I knew, even at that point, that the standard of teaching, the child safety and the curriculum were much better than in decades past, the reputation of the school had not yet caught up with what it was providing and what it was to provide in the coming years.

As a product of the public schooling system myself and a person whose life trajectory has utterly changed through getting a good quality education, it is my firm belief that all families should be able to send their child to their local public school and be absolutely confident that they are getting the best start in life. Your education and chances in life should not depend on your family's bank balance. In the public schooling system in South Australia, we should be striving for all public schools to have excellent reputations and offerings, not just a few marquee schools.

While bricks and mortar are not everything, it has been my view that upgrading facilities, as well as a range of other strategies, has improved Plympton International College's standing and parents' belief and faith in the quality of the school. I have been pleased to see under Labor the delivery of a performing arts centre and a \$4 million STEM centre—which I believe is the best in the state—as well as other classroom upgrades. Those were funded under the previous education minister, Susan Close, and we thank her for her early commitment to this school.

In around 2016-17, she was also the driver behind rebranding the school to be known as Plympton International College and making sure that it became South Australia's first Chinese bilingual school, where students learn half the Australian curriculum in Chinese and half in English. If you have not visited Plympton International and seen exactly what they are doing there, especially around languages, I would encourage you to do so. I would be happy to give you a tour myself.

I also had the pleasure to cut the ribbon more recently on the first part of my own 2022 election commitment at the school, along with the now education minister, Blair Boyer. This was a commitment of \$3 million, and that \$3 million has bought a lot. The school should be commended for the way that it has made that money stretch and the value they have managed to get out of that \$3 million. I cut the ribbon on the kiss and drop. The school was rated in the top five most dangerous

schools for road safety only a few years ago. I am really pleased that as a government we have now remedied that.

Out of that money they also managed to refurbish 16 classrooms at Plympton International College, and then the remaining money from that \$3 million is about to be unveiled with a series of road safety measures around the school, which have been completed in partnership with West Torrens city council, who have been fantastic to work with. Those safety measures are the Errington Street koala crossing, the Myer Avenue footpath upgrades and the nearly completed raised intersection works at Errington and Gardner streets.

Now we are following up those investments with this \$14 million upgrade to learning spaces, which I was pleased to present to the Public Works Committee earlier this week. What this money pays for is two new purpose-built buildings, accommodating an extra 250 students. We are talking about expanding the capacity of the school up to 1,200 students, and I will go into more detail about that later.

Those two new buildings include specialist food tech and multimedia spaces, a new library, a canteen and support areas, and outdoor learning spaces. Importantly, it also includes landscaped environments. As I mentioned before, this school has too much concrete, and what we really want to see these days is children having more of a connection with nature, having safe and comfortable, shaded places, especially in our hot summers, and areas where they can congregate that are not all hard surfaces.

The landscaped areas include a central green activity space with pathways and seating, where the old food tech block was; a learning street between the two new buildings, featuring a green corridor with tree arbors and seating platforms; and a specialised bush tucker and Chinese herb garden, which is just going to be amazing. The school has done some interesting things with its outdoor spaces, paying homage to their connection to China and particularly Jinan No. 5 School, including playgrounds, for example, that incorporate Chinese characters. The Chinese herb garden is really going to complement that and is also adjacent to the new food tech building, so perfectly placed.

The specialised bush tucker garden is obviously an opportunity for all students to learn more about our native vegetation, but particularly to learn about Aboriginal culture as well. There are thriving Aboriginal students at Plympton International College and it is lovely to see their culture celebrated as well. There is also a yarning circle for outdoor learning—once again, making sure Aboriginal students have their own spaces and spaces to invite others into—and outdoor seating and garden areas will be west of the new buildings.

The rationale for Plympton International College receiving this investment, aside from its obvious need for greater quality teaching spaces, is simple: the college is approaching capacity. Its capacity is 914 and it is very close to that now. This redevelopment will take a little time to build, but hopefully it will manage to be completed in time before capacity is hit and boost the school's capacity to 1,200 students to meet the growing enrolment needs in our area.

There has been extensive consultation with the school about these upgrades, and I congratulate the department on the work they have done on that front. That has included meeting with governing council several times—I have been really pleased to be there for part of those presentations—as well as, importantly, meeting with the students. The students have had a good hand in understanding what is being proposed and have offered their own suggestions to make sure that these are environments that are suitable for them and that they want to work and socialise in.

I have also conducted my own consultation on these upgrades on several occasions and I am pleased to report that the most recent online consultation that I did with my local community recorded 100 per cent support for the designs that have now been finalised. You do not get 100 per cent support for many things in politics, so it is lovely to see the school community really get behind these upgrades. Over time, we have managed to come up with some plans that everyone is on board with. Thank you very much to the school community for really getting involved in that work.

Without labouring the point, the Liberals did a sum total of absolutely nothing for this school during their time in office—absolutely not a dollar contributed to Plympton International College—

and that was at a time when the school was actually even in a Liberal seat. So I am glad that it is now back in my seat of Badcoe, and that I have had the capacity to be able to push hard for election commitments and now for this \$14 million investment in the expansion of the school.

I am delighted that Labor are back in and are investing in public schooling, particularly in schools like Plympton International College that really deserve public funding and are making great use of limited funds. Their principal, Amy Whyte, should be congratulated on the management of that and in the process changing the lives of the kids who need it the most in our community.

I would like to thank the school's leadership, particularly principal, Amy Whyte, and the governing council, as well as education ministers past and present, Susan Close and Blair Boyer, for their interest and commitment to Plympton International College. It is delivering results. There is more to achieve at Plympton International College, and I will continue to vehemently pursue the interests of its students, but we are making headway and I am absolutely thrilled to see the Public Works Committee now recommending that this \$14 million investment is indeed worth it. I recommend the project to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: THE QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL—36 ADDITIONAL INPATIENT BEDS PROJECT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:24): I move:

That the 138th report of the committee, entitled The Queen Elizabeth Hospital: 36 Additional Inpatient Beds Project, be noted.

The proposed project from the Department for Health and Wellbeing plans to refurbish existing clinical areas on level 2 of the existing north-east building at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This will also entail relocating the acute pain and diabetes services, presently located at the site, and establishing temporary decant spaces to support the provisions of ongoing services. The project had an initial budget of \$13.7 million, which has been updated to \$20.1 million due to the requirement for additional refurbishment works.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, hereon referred to as 'the hospital', is a 300-plus bed/acute care teaching hospital that provides inpatient, outpatient, emergency and mental health services to consumers living primarily in Adelaide's western suburbs. The north-east building at the hospital was completed in 2008 as a 72-bed inpatient facility; however, level 2 was subsequently repurposed to provide acute pain and diabetes outpatient services.

In mid-2024, the hospital opened the Kangkanthi clinical services building, which enhances the capability and capacity of surgical, procedural, cardiac, emergency, intensive care, rehabilitation and diagnostic imaging services. Following the completion of Kangkanthi, the department has recognised an opportunity to relocate the acute pain and diabetes services into the hospital's tower and podium buildings. The relocation of these services will allow the recommissioning of 36 inpatient beds within the north-east building as a mix of surgical and medical overnight inpatient beds to address growing demand. This will have system-wide benefits supporting growth in bed capacity, demand management and ramping strategies.

Works for the new 36 inpatient beds in the north-east building will include associated ensuites and clean utilities, including an automated drug-dispensing cabinet; works for the temporary pain service will include consulting rooms, a group therapy room, a patient waiting area, staff offices, work spaces, as well as a reception area; and works for the relocation of the permanent pain and diabetes services will include patient reception areas, consult rooms, support spaces, a staff base, patient infusion chair bays and staff amenities. Main construction is anticipated to commence this month, with the first 26 beds expected to be operational in July, and the remaining 10 beds to be operational in December.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital: 36 Additional Inpatient Beds Project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Melissa Nozza, Director, Capital Projects, Department for Health and Wellbeing; Louisa Flynn, Associate, Cheesman Architects; John Jenner, Portfolio Manager Health, Department for

Infrastructure and Transport; and Rachel Kay, Executive Director Operations and Performance, Central Adelaide Local Health Network.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT AUGUSTA HEALTH SERVICE UPGRADE

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Hood:

That the 126th report of the committee, entitled Port Augusta Health Service Upgrade, be noted.

(Continued from 3 April 2025.)

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:28): I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MOUNT BARKER ROAD AND RIVER ROAD JUNCTION UPGRADE

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Hood:

That the 118th report of the committee, entitled Mount Barker Road and River Road Junction Upgrade, be noted.

(Continued from 1 May 2025.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:29): On the previous occasion, I had the opportunity to continue my remarks in the context of this motion to note the Public Works Committee's rather now antiquated 118th report. We have moved some considerable distance forward in the time since the motion was moved by the Chair, and in that time we have now had the opportunity to have a look at the preparations for the necessary improvement of that intersection.

For those who are taking in the debate—and I certainly commend the report as a useful reference point for that work—we can see those among the million visitors who visit Hahndorf travelling past that intersection more or less entirely along that route, and that the plan of this government to divert heavy trucks along River Road has necessitated a transformation of the corner. Again, perhaps for easy reference, that is the corner that is now very visibly the home base for Sidewood Estate—cellar door and restaurant—and that has been a significant investment that has gone in right there just in recent years.

What is obvious to the casual observer is that that is an intersection that was never even remotely suitable for some kind of major use by trucks. We have heard the government say, throughout the whole process since it sort of announced this out of the blue, that these are general access roads and so it is possible to divert the trucks without any changes. That is all really clear but, of course, it is an unhelpful observation in that 'general access' describes pretty much every road in the state.

A road that passes by the front gate of a farm that is going to need a stock truck to come and collect or deliver animals from time to time is going to use a general access road to get there, and River Road is one such road. It is a general access road and no-one is arguing about that point. What is so clear is that we have had to see this sort of incremental adaption to just about attempt to make River Road bearably passably manageable for these trucks that have now been banned from heading on through to Main Street. We also know that we have ongoing congestion problems in Main Street, Hahndorf, that really are not relieved to any significant extent by the diversion of these trucks along River Road.

The report, of course, is concerned with the discrete works to the intersection which is a significant body of work, otherwise it would not have been the subject of a Public Works Committee report. That is on top of what have been relatively significant works to install barriers along River Road, to cut trees along River Road, significantly to add to some extent some shoulders on the side of what was a quiet Hills road, and all so as to facilitate trucks passing by, in many cases,

in relation to the residents on River Road, within metres of a front gate or even a front door. But in order to get there, in order to even get onto River Road, these trucks are having to, for the most part—if they are coming in from Verdun and then navigating their way south—execute a right-hand turn off Mount Barker Road and into River Road.

I have sat in both a livestock truck and a log truck attempting that turn, and I have also stood on the corner of the intersection while one and more have attempted it in the same and in opposite directions, as has, I am glad to say, my colleague the member for Hammond and the leader—regrettably, despite multiple invitations, not the minister, not the Premier. What is obvious is that the intersection cannot even remotely cope with doing that efficiently or safely. There have been very near misses, with cars parked at the top end of River Road looking to enter Mount Barker Road being at risk of being crushed, and having to reverse back to allow room.

Of course, this really highlights the extraordinary skill of those who are driving the trucks. They are a wonderful, generous and skilful group of people who are very much aware of how to navigate these twists and turns through the hills. However, even with such expertise it has proved to be just impossible and unworkable to navigate that corner. It is for good reason that the community has been up in arms.

The Hahndorf community—and I applaud the Hahndorf Community Association, which met again just overnight—and the River Road community, which is very directly affected, moved to pursue a petition signed by many thousands of people over the course of recent months. There will be more to say about that separately, but suffice to say, for the purposes of this motion and of the works the subject of this 118th report of the Public Works Committee, what we are seeing here is proving up what compounding bad effects occur when an ill thought through, suddenly imposed, apparent fix to what is a serious problem is just imposed, as the cliché describes it, as a sort of bandaid over what requires a thoroughgoing commitment based on proper assessment, and then a commitment to serious improvement.

Getting back to that bigger picture, the works on the Verdun exchange are vital; they will be done. The surrounding works that will ameliorate or reduce, hopefully, the number of vehicles that need to go into Hahndorf at all are vital, and need to be done, but we must see greater investment in bypassing traffic for both commuters and heavy vehicles in Hahndorf. This River Road diversion is no solution for that.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:38): I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GAWLER TANK PROJECT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Hood:

That the 114th report of the committee, entitled Gawler Tank Project, be noted.

(Continued from 20 February 2025.)

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:38): I continue my remarks on the Gawler Tank Project. SA Water Engineering has been responsible for analysis and concept design, and a design and construct model was selected to deliver the project, with a major framework partner submitting a proposal to complete the project.

The project will be managed in accordance with SA Water's corporate project management methodology by a project manager from the agency's Capital Planning and Delivery group. The project manager is responsible for the project development and delivery, including seeking approvals and overseeing works.

To manage risks, SA Water uses a business management policy and framework. Risk analysis has identified potential impacts on the environment, for which detailed design and construction methodology has considered adverse impacts to amenity, trees, native fauna and habitat. There are further concerns regarding network isolation failures and the loss of service supply to customers, for which detailed planning and coordination will aim to minimise interruptions.

SA Water is committed to operating sustainably and has implemented corporate-wide policies to support viability now and into the future. The selected contractor will be encouraged to develop processes that consider short-term and long-term local and global environmental, social and economic considerations. Initiatives include efficient use of resources, reducing carbon emissions, the use of local expertise and contractors, selecting flexible processes and products, and employing recycling and re-use where possible.

An environment control plan has been prepared to ensure the project is delivered in compliance with relevant legislative frameworks. Under the Water Civil Framework Delivery Partnership, the contractor has an established construction environmental management plan outlining general environmental controls and mitigation measures. A site environmental management plan will be developed to address site-specific environmental conditions. The agency does not expect the project to impact native vegetation, and approvals have been sought for the removal of two trees.

The agency has confirmed that native title has been extinguished on the site, provided the infrastructure and construction works remain within the gazetted road reserves and within previously disturbed corridors through SA Water or subject-owned land parcels. Assessments have indicated a medium-level risk of encountering or impacting Aboriginal heritage, and the construction contractor will be required to comply with SA Water's standard operating procedure if any discoveries are made. Additionally, all site construction employees will attend a site-specific Aboriginal cultural heritage induction. The agency has identified no project impact on European heritage places or items.

The new tank is proposed to be installed on existing SA Water land and will have minimal impact on the community. However, communication with relevant stakeholders will remain ongoing throughout the planning and construction phases of the project. The tank and associated road detouring are located within the Gawler council area, and SA Water has consulted with the council regarding plans to undertake works, ensuring there will be appropriate levels of traffic management in place. Internal stakeholders and partner organisations will be kept informed throughout the project via progress meetings. The submission has been circulated amongst relevant government departments, which have indicated support for the project.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Gawler tank project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Peter Seltsikas, Senior Manager Capital Delivery, SA Water and Jasmine Kabir, Project Manager, SA Water. I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for Light, who presented to the committee regarding this project in his electorate.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: YATALA LABOUR PRISON REDEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Hood:

That the 111th report of the committee, entitled Yatala Labour Prison New 312 Bed Redevelopment and Supporting Infrastructure, be noted.

(Continued from 6 February 2025.)

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:43): I continue my remarks in regard to the Yatala Labour Prison new 312-bed redevelopment and supporting infrastructure. As I was explaining in my previous remarks, the project will include addressing fire hazards due to prisoner access to the gas furnace.

The old education centre provided classrooms and a prisoner library, and the facility's decommissioning has led to the site's reliance on satellite programs and the repurposing of other spaces. This has resulted in restricted access for prisoners to rehabilitation programs, with the current access limited to 75 prisoners per day. Given the prison has a potential capacity of 847, not including the proposed 312-bed expansion, the redevelopment will provide an enhanced service delivery to prisoners.

The refurbishment will deliver a new rehabilitation, education and training centre that will support ongoing opportunities to reduce recidivism as well as enhance Closing the Gap initiatives. It will enhance the correctional environment and its capabilities to deliver dedicated infrastructure, aiding the application of contemporary practices and rehabilitation opportunities for occupants.

The department examined several options to deliver the project in an efficient and cost-effective approach that is supported by the major capital works committee. The selected option will meet project requirements, while benefiting from department experience building similar accommodation and infrastructure in previous projects.

The proposed works will build three new 104-bed high-security accommodation units with a mixture indoor and outdoor communal spaces, providing a level of independence while increasing the model of supervision through clear lines of sight and open plan communal spaces. Cells are designed to meet DCS safe call policy that supports a positive focus on rehabilitation and wellbeing for both prisoners and staff, encouraging positive engagement.

The project is expected to cost \$200 million, with annual operating expenses of \$5.6 million. The works will occur in two separate stages, with stage 1 construction anticipated to begin in June this year, aiming for completion in April 2027 for occupation that June. The second stage will aim for construction to begin in October this year, with a completion goal of June 2028 for occupation that July.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) is responsible for project procurement. DIT will appoint the lead design consultant under a lead professional services contract and a cost consultant under a cost management services contract. Contract tenders for the various categories of building works will be offered by invitation, seeking responses with demonstrated prisoner project experience. Capital works activities will be overseen by DCS's major capital works steering committee, chaired by an executive director. The project will be delivered in collaboration with DIT, following best practice principles for project management.

DCS has considered a holistic life cycle approach to planning, design, costing, construction and maintenance of the works. This includes considerations regarding the conservation of resources, water efficiency, material selection, waste disposal, equipment and furniture, user amenity and the natural environment. Geotechnical surveys have identified ground contamination and appropriate mitigation measures are in place.

The project design has been prepared in accordance with the SA government energy efficiency action plan and has provided a detailed sustainability report. Initiatives include use of photovoltaic energy systems; installation of efficient water services, rainwater harvesting and storage, and dual reticulation for non-potable uses; selection of high-efficiency lighting, including control systems; maximisation of natural ventilation and lighting; and a water management system.

The site and construction works will be managed under a site-specific site management plan to be prepared by the head contractor prior to commencement of the works. The department states that dust control, stormwater quality and control of stormwater run-off are standard inclusions of this site management plan.

The Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation division has confirmed no record of Aboriginal heritage sites or items in the proposed development locations. Similarly, DCS states there are no state or local heritage sites or items identified at this location. The prison is located in the City of Port Adelaide Enfield council, and the department is in ongoing consultation regarding any impact of the works, as well as in promoting opportunities for the engagement of local contractors. DCS has briefed relevant government departments and agencies to ensure the project is designed and delivered in accordance with the legal requirements and accepted procedures and guidelines, with no outstanding issues identified.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Yatala Labour Prison new 312-bed redevelopment and supporting infrastructure project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were David Brown, Chief Executive, Department for Correctional Services, and Sarah Taylor, Executive Director, People and Business Services, Department for Correctional Services. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (11:49): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Public Works Committee's 111th report into the Yatala Labour Prison's new facilities. Of course, we welcome the 312 new beds that will be coming to that particular prison, but we query what the plan is going forward, particularly in light of new data that emerged earlier this year that shows that our prisons are moments away from reaching maximum capacity.

Indeed, in response to questions put by the opposition, I think in a Budget and Finance Committee, the Department for Correctional Services revealed earlier this year that South Australia's prison population peaked on 18 March at 3,464. That number, that peak number, in March of this year is just 113 short of the department's current approved capacity of 3,577. That is a concerning proposition right now, that we are only moments away, potentially, from our prisons being at maximum capacity, and we have not heard from the government what their plans are when we reach that inevitable point quite soon.

If we project out in the short to medium term, it is even more concerning, because in five years, by 2030-31, the department has confirmed that they are projecting a peak of 4,384 prisoners. Based on current capacity, in five years' time we will be more than 800 prisoners over our current approved capacity. So while we welcome 300 new beds coming online at Yatala, in five years' time we are going to be 800 prison beds short, based on current projections by the Department for Correctional Services and based on current capacity.

We really think the government needs to be upfront with the public about its plans for prison capacity, particularly in light of this data which shows we are just moments away from our jails all being totally full. We need to be upfront and we need to know what the plan is for prison capacity, because the fact that we now have the highest prisoner numbers ever in South Australia is troubling. If this continues to rise, our prisons could be at maximum capacity by this time next year.

I am concerned at what will happen at that point, because what we certainly do not want to see are dangerous criminals being released on bail, or being let out on parole, or being given suspended sentences simply because our prisons are all full. I think, frankly, the public is sick and tired at the moment of dangerous criminals being handed bail or being given suspended sentences, and I am worried that that is going to continue to rise because they will simply have nowhere else to go.

This is a government that has its head in the sand on this issue, when we are potentially just months away from all of our prisons being at absolute capacity. It also feeds into a wider problem, I think, in the court systems. We have some of the biggest backlogs in our court systems in the entire country. This, of course, leads to a very high prison population on remand. We know that while prisoners are on remand they are not getting access to important rehabilitation programs, and of course they are also taking up a really valuable prison bed in a system that we know is already overstretched.

This is a government that has failed on law and order, and our prisons are filling up rapidly as a result of it. What we actually need to do, of course, is have proper rehabilitation and put an end to this constant cycle of violence and offending that is not only clogging up our prisons but making our community less safe.

It was, of course, the former Liberal government that funded a business case into a new rehabilitation prison, because we did not have our head in the sand on this issue. We recognised a serious problem with prison capacity and we recognised that we should not be letting dangerous criminals out on the street simply because our prisons are full. I have never seen that business case into a new rehabilitation prison. I think the public deserve to see it, and I would call on the government to release that business case so we can have an educated, informed and sensible discussion about what our plan for prison capacity is going forward. We need to have a serious effort to break the cycle so we are not just clogging up our prisons and then, when we reach that inevitable point, we are not just releasing hardened criminals out onto our streets.

We know when our prisons are crowded and overflowing it has a serious effect on the people inside those prisons as well. We have seen some really concerning reports in only the last few weeks about the amount of contraband being found in our prisons. Indeed, it is up 66 per cent in just the last year alone. There were 957 instances in 2022-23, and then by 2023-24 there were 1,590 instances of contraband, whether it is weapons or drug paraphernalia or other items that we do not want in our prisons being found in our prisons.

The number one prison they were found in, of course, was Yatala, the subject of this report. At prisons right across the state, whether it be the Women's Prison, Cadell, Mobilong or Port Augusta, we are seeing a really disturbing increase in contraband getting into our prisons. That is bound to happen when we have a system operating at absolute capacity. What will be the first thing that suffers? Well, perhaps regular searches of prisoners, of visitors. When you are operating in a really high-pressure, stretched environment, it is little surprise that we are seeing more contraband find its way into our prisons.

We are also seeing a whole lot more violent incidents in our prisons—assaults, prisoner on prisoner, but also really concerning assaults by prisoners against corrections officers. In fact, we have seen data this year that shows that violent incidents in our prisons have nearly doubled over the course of a year, reaching an all-time high.

Seemingly not content with losing control of law and order in our streets and suburbs, we now have the Malinauskas Labor government losing control of law and order inside our prisons and corrections facilities. In my view, and I am sure in everyone's view in this place, any assault against a corrections officer is absolutely unacceptable and should not be tolerated by any of us standing here. Again, we are going to see these sorts of incidents happen more, I think, if we have a prison system that is operating at absolute capacity, because it is a pressure cooker when we have our prisons overflowing. We know from data released this year that that is exactly the situation our prisoners and prison officers find themselves in.

Of course, we welcome the subject of this report and a few hundred new beds at Yatala, but in five years we are going to be about 800 beds short across the board, based on current projections and current capacity. We cannot keep our head-in-the-sand attitude to this. We need the government to come clean and be up-front with what their plan is for prison capacity before it is too late, because I do fear what will happen when we arrive at the inevitable position of our prisons being full: we will have nowhere for dangerous criminals to go. We know, because this government is weak on law and order, there are a lot more dangerous criminals. So it is an ever-present problem that we need to do something about, and I look forward to hearing from those opposite and the new minister for corrections on her plan for prison capacity in the short to medium term and to do something about this before it is too late.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:59): I thank members for their comments.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2025

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 May 2025.)

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:59): I wish to continue my remarks from yesterday. I was talking about the project to improve footpaths in Ingle Farm and Pooraka. The project involves the removal of existing footpaths, the widening of the footpath to 1.5 metres and the installation of a new paved footpath. Existing stormwater connections under footpaths were retained or reinstated as required if impacted or damaged during works. The finished works are bringing welcome benefit to footpath users in Pooraka and Ingle Farm.

When combined with the commonwealth funding provided through the Black Spot program to undertake upgrades to the intersection of Montague Road and Henderson Avenue, Pooraka in

particular has been the recent beneficiary of important and much welcome local infrastructure investment from two tiers of Labor government. Strengthened community safety and road safety for pedestrians, road users and, indeed, all people who move through the local area are good outcomes made possible by these worthwhile investments that have rightly been welcomed by the local community. I am proud to have played a part in advocating for these results to be achieved.

As a member of the South Australian parliament, as a Florey resident and also as a parent, I know that local reserves and play spaces contribute meaningfully to residents' quality of life through supporting physical health and wellbeing and social opportunity. I was proud when in August 2023 a \$100,000 upgrade was completed for Rains Drive Reserve at Pooraka. Nearby residents had raised with me in the past that an upgrade was needed at this reserve and, indeed, the amenity adjacent to the playground has been substantially improved by works, including irrigated turf areas, landscaping, new connecting paths and a new solar picnic shelter on a concrete pad.

A significant area of focus of public spending during the term of the Malinauskas government has been education. There are many areas in which investment in public education is crucially important. One of those is in the physical infrastructure of an educational setting. The quality of school facilities can have a significant impact on students in terms of their learning outcomes, as well as their personal and developmental growth.

Quality facilities support positive experiences for students and, indeed, for all members of a school community. That is why I am so pleased that the construction phase of the Ingle Farm East Primary School gymnasium upgrade is progressing well. I understand the project is on track for completion around July of this year.

Made possible through a total investment by the Malinauskas government of \$4 million, which represents a substantial increase on the initial commitment and which will deliver even better results than what we originally promised, the finished project will see Ingle Farm East Primary School with a new multipurpose gymnasium that more effectively supports the physical health and the wellbeing of students, as well as offering the capability to accommodate large gatherings for students and the wider school community. In addition to being a greatly improved facility in which students can learn, grow and be active, the fact that the completed gymnasium facility will offer benefit as an excellent venue for school assemblies and other gatherings of the school community will mean it is a broadly beneficial project for all local residents.

Another election commitment delivered for a school community in my local area, one that strengthens safety and accessibility, is the new footbridge at Mawson Lakes School. This is a much needed upgrade for a piece of infrastructure that is vitally important to the students, staff and families of Mawson Lakes School and, indeed, for all residents within our Mawson Lakes community. The old footbridge, which was technically a causeway, was affected by occasional flooding, posed safety concerns for school students in particular but, indeed, for all users of the bridge, including school staff, families and local residents. The new footbridge, which was designed to withstand flooding, was opened in June 2023 and it connects the two campuses of Mawson Lakes School over Dry Creek Reserve, facilitating easier movement between the two spaces for staff and students.

The City of Salisbury and the Department for Education collaboratively funded the project, with the department contributing \$410,000 towards the \$940,000 total cost for the project. It is my pleasure to work closely with the Minister for Education and Mayor Gillian Aldridge and I commend the hardworking staff within the Department for Education and the council who helped to get this important project delivered.

The Malinauskas Labor government maintains a steadfast commitment to strengthening our public education system in South Australia. We recognise that quality educational facilities go hand in hand with quality education. Providing schools and preschools with funding that helps to make sure they can pursue necessary upgrades to school facilities and infrastructure will support better experiences for students in my local community and across our state.

I have also been able to advocate for our local environment in my electorate of Florey. The Pledger Wetlands in Mawson Lakes run along the eastern side of the Gawler to Adelaide railway. The wetlands are well cared for in part by a community group known as the Friends of the Pledger Wetlands. They are a dedicated group of volunteers, many of whom are also Mawson Lakes

residents. Some time ago, I was delighted to write to the state government in support of the Pledger Wetlands irrigation and planting project, and \$100,000 in funding was secured through the Community Infrastructure Grant Program, which saw approximately 470 metres of irrigation installed along the northern side of the footpath at the Pledger Wetlands between Trinity Circuit and Brookside Drive.

The Malinauskas government continues our work to build a bigger health system. It is important for South Australians to know that we remain steadfastly committed to delivering better results across the health system and that we are working hard to do exactly that. We are continuing to build the state's health workforce with a record number of graduate registered nurses and midwives about to start across northern Adelaide. For the first time, all graduate nurses and midwives at the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network, which includes the Lyell McEwin Hospital and Modbury Hospital, have been guaranteed permanent contracts once they complete the 12-month graduate program. I understand that this year's record intake of 218 new nurses and midwives surpasses the previous record of 187 in 2023.

Very importantly for my electorate and the community of Adelaide's north, the Malinauskas government continues to deliver significant and crucial upgrades to the Lyell McEwin and Modbury hospitals. The Lyell McEwin Hospital saw 48 new beds open last year. This work continues in 2025 with 20 new acute beds and 12 acute surgical unit beds to come online this year. Recent developments at the Lyell McEwin have seen an increase in the capacity of the emergency department by 23 spaces, along with new services being set up in the hospital to help patients get home sooner.

At Modbury Hospital, construction is underway on a \$130 million capital works redevelopment. The build includes a \$92 million facility to accommodate a new 24-bed mental health rehabilitation unit as well as a 20-bed older person's mental health unit that will be relocated from the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Also included will be a new \$25 million Modbury Hospital cancer centre. A new multilevel car park will form part of the hospital precinct redevelopment, providing additional parking for staff and increasing accessibility for patients.

Of course, over a year ago now, we opened the Salisbury Plain 24/7 pharmacy. It delivered on a key election commitment to give South Australians easier access to medicines and health advice when they need it. Access to a pharmacy at all hours of the day and night has created tremendous benefit for my area. In the first year of operation, there were more than 123,000 visitors, over 48,000 scripts filled and over 3,300 calls. When combined with the new Para Hills Medicare Urgent Care Clinic, out-of-hours options for medical treatment and advice have expanded very significantly for the communities of Adelaide's northern suburbs.

Broadly, across our entire state, the Malinauskas government continues the work to deliver what South Australians elected us to achieve. We are acting to address the housing crisis that is affecting jurisdictions around our nation and the world. We have released our Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, which identifies where 315,000 new homes are to be built over the next 30 years and sets aside important land to accommodate future infrastructure requirements while providing increased protection for 88 per cent of Greater Adelaide's food production areas.

For the first time in a generation, the South Australian government is increasing the number of public houses in the state, following decades of cuts and sales of housing stock by former governments. Of course, we have returned our trains back into public hands where they belong. Bringing a privatised service back into public hands is no small achievement, and I want to pay credit to the dedication of the Minister for Transport for achieving this. This is an outcome that will benefit residents in my community and, indeed, South Australians from all communities each and every day.

I am proud of what we have thus far delivered and what we will continue to deliver for the benefit of residents in my community and those living across Adelaide's northern suburbs. We are achieving a great deal for our state and its people across so many areas of policy. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the ministers, ministerial staff and hardworking departmental staff who are committed to making South Australian lives better in all they do. It is a pleasure to commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

WHYALLA STEEL WORKS (PORT OF WHYALLA) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 May 2025.)

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:09): I take the opportunity in parliament today to speak about the Whyalla Steel Works (Port of Whyalla) Amendment Bill. I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill, which is a very important piece of legislation. It was introduced while the Whyalla Steelworks had some uncertainty about it. We have had OneSteel put into forced administration through a bill of this parliament, which was put through very quickly only in February.

Now, three months later, the administrator is going through a process. KordaMentha has been appointed as the administrator and we have this bill before us now. The notice for the parliament was through a ministerial statement on Tuesday from the Premier, who described that this was going to happen and then the bill was introduced to this house yesterday. Of course, the usual convention is that it sits on the table and waits until the following sitting week. However, because of the issues explained by the government of the need to move on this, the bill comes before us today. I am just putting that timeframe in place.

Of course, the opposition has used the limited time to the best of its ability, but obviously we will have more time between the houses. The comments I make today are based on the information provided so far. To that end, the government has provided a briefing to me and the opposition. I thank the public servants for providing me and the opposition with that briefing, because there are many questions arising out of this Port of Whyalla amendment bill that need to be worked through.

The basis informing judgement is wanting to see the success of the Whyalla Steelworks, for many reasons. One reason is for the people of Whyalla to ensure that their futures are positive. Also, the people of South Australia have always supported our regional towns because they provide so much economic impact to the state. Of course, Whyalla is very important, and the people of South Australia understand that. It is also important from a national point of view. I think all members in this parliament have put on the record the national sovereignty implications of being able to produce steel in your own country. Whyalla is the only steelmaker that makes structural steel in Australia, so it is very important in that regard.

This amendment bill amends the Whyalla Steel Works Act, the genesis of which was an indenture agreement in two parts back into the thirties, I think 1937, and then the indenture act of 1958. One of the key tenets of that act was recognising the opportunity of not only steelmaking but actually wider than that with the mines that feed the steelmaking and also the ports that allow that steel to be exported, whether that is out to South Australia or further on to Australia or the world. The integrated nature of that was one of the key tenets of the indenture act and they were not to be split.

Many times we will hear about keeping the mines tied to the steelworks, but equally so keeping the ports tied to it as well is vitally important and, to that end, tied to the one entity. If that entity tries to provide a right to another entity, whether that is a related party or an external party, that needs to be ratified by the state government and the minister of the day. That is a core tenet of the Whyalla Steel Works Act.

As has emerged and been provided to me in the briefing, there was a lease executed in 2018 between OneSteel and Whyalla Ports Pty Ltd, which was a related GFG Alliance entity. That was executed in 2018 in two parts from what I am led to believe. Of course we have the committee stage coming up, and we can ask questions about it, but I am led to believe that effectively it was a lease between 2012 and December 2018, formalising some form of lease and then an option to extend that lease by a further 99 years.

That is putting a 99-year lease on a port, which the South Australian public at large has a very big interest in. That is a substantial property rights transfer that no doubt the government of the day needs to (a) be aware of, and (b) needs to sign off on. We have seen issues around ports in other parts of Australia—the Darwin Port as well—and these significant long leases, and the issues that that has around sovereign capability as well. You can understand why that would need the

consent of the government. The government here, from the minister's second reading speech and from the briefings, has said it contends that consent was never sought nor was consent granted for that lease, and, as explained, the bill before us clarifies this for that very reason.

Firstly, the bill before us effectively talks to what happens in the case of a lease being in contravention of an indenture act or assignment in contravention, basically saying it is void, but then also further on—which I will get to later in my remarks—talks about the specific lease that we have been discussing, which is the lease to the Port of Whyalla.

The other aspect of this is trying to understand these corporate structures. The briefing provided said that Whyalla Ports Pty Ltd was an entity that predated the first administration, so it was in operation going back a time. My understanding is it was part of the first administration back in 2017-18, of which KordaMentha was again appointed administrator. It was sold on to GFG Alliance as well.

That is a bit of the background around it, which the committee will help to unpack. As I said, in terms of going through the bill itself, I will briefly put down the key points. As far as I am aware, and the minister can advise in the committee stage, it declares any lease or assignment of rights made without state consent to be void, meaning invalid from the beginning. It also confirms no compensation is payable to any party as a result. It deems certain port infrastructure to be part of the land rather than personal property. It empowers the Registrar-General to update land titles accordingly, and it introduces regulation-making powers to manage any transitional or related matters.

The briefing to me stated that the reason this is being done and is being argued by the government is that these measures resolve an ambiguity to try to ensure operational continuity for the port and preserve the integrity of the integrated indenture model. That is what the government is saying.

We can talk about the fact that Whyalla Ports and OneSteel did not get consent. There are issues around that, of course. Going back to the administration process, we all saw and watched with great apprehension as the situation and the crisis in Whyalla unfolded last year and got progressively worse. The real concern, quite rightly, for South Australians, over and above Whyalla Steelworks maintaining its operations, was of course all the contractors, employees and workers at the steelworks and then also the companies that contracted to the steelworks.

One of those contractors was responsible for the mining operations that basically dug up the ore to then provide to the steelworks, namely, Golding Contractors, which is a subsidiary of NRW Holdings. I think NRW Holdings was established in 2007; it is certainly ASX-listed. It is in the ASX 200 and is a significant Australian company, and Golding Contractors is a subsidiary of it. Golding has operated at Whyalla since 2019, providing mining services under a longstanding agreement with OneSteel. It has invested significantly in the region, employing over 1,000 people since 2019, and there are still 350 employees working on site.

While Whyalla was going through GFG not paying the bills, Golding Contractors still made sure—even though they were not getting paid—that their employees were getting paid. So they have been a good-faith actor. This is just to hold up one example; you would have to say that every company that was there was working to try to get the steelworks back up and running, while not being paid for that. They were all acting in good faith to try to get things across the line in the hope that, once the furnace was restarted, the money would begin to flow. Of course, while GFG was in charge, that did not happen, and it resulted in the administration.

Going back to Golding, they have explained that, during this process in 2024, they were doing things. I think it is not unusual for companies to have these sorts of outstanding debts, but it was getting to the stage where they wanted to get security. So they, with a lot of negotiation and even the stopping of mining operations, struck an agreement where they were able to negotiate a first-ranking security investment over the assets of Whyalla Ports, including the infrastructure located on the leased land. My understanding, and maybe the committee will be able to clear this up, is that this was done with the knowledge of the government—the understanding that the securities had been placed over to Whyalla Ports by Golding. In so doing, it provided a foundation for Golding to continue to run their operations and basically provide the iron ore out of the mines.

I am advised that Golding is owed around \$113 million, and despite this not being paid, as I said, the company continued to meet its obligations to workers and suppliers. The reason I say that is because, at the moment, there is also court action presently in place, because KordaMentha, the administrator, has sought to dispute the lease and basically take it to the court to allow the court to rule that the lease is in fact invalid.

There was a court order made, I think in late April, that allowed Golding to join these court proceedings as a defendant, with Whyalla Ports being the other defendant, as I noted in question time yesterday about this court action VID420/2025. That has been scheduled for a court hearing on 2 June to basically work through the lease and what the implications are: is it invalid? That is going on in parallel to the process that we are talking about here in parliament, which is a bill that basically rules that the lease is invalid and is void, as I explained before.

There are issues there, and I think all members of parliament would understand that that causes concern. Effectively, there is a court process in place, and the usual process is that parliament makes the rules, enacts the laws, and then the courts rule on those laws going forward. But this is an extraordinary situation we have here where the indenture act has to be clarified via this legislation.

The other aspect of the effect of this bill is when we look at schedule 4, clause 4 which talks about interests in certain rail and other infrastructure. I think there needs to be questions asked in committee around that. Whyalla Ports was a company in operation before 2018, before administration, and KordaMentha in its first turn at being the administrator sold that company to GFG Alliance. At the time, there was significant infrastructure and property on that port: ship loaders, conveyors, worth a significant amount of money. That plant, that property, was sold as part of the administration purpose.

I am advised that Golding, when they took security, were not only taking security over the lease but also over that property, which I think was recently valued at around \$100 million to \$200 million. Compare that to the \$113 million that they are owed. I am not speaking for them, but it seems that that gave them the confidence to continue providing the mining operations that allowed the steelworks to continue to operate and try to work its way out of administration.

It appears to me that one of the implications—and we will have to ask questions in committee—is that the clause itself is titled 'Interests in certain rail and other infrastructure void and of no effect.' So we have that property on there and we need to understand what that means to the security interests of Golding. Hopefully, the minister will be able to answer the question: is there a way commercially that there can be agreement reached?

My understanding is that part of the court orders with the current court proceedings is that KordaMentha had a mediation that involved Golding and there was an attempt to come to commercial agreement, and there are public statements such that Golding have talked about wanting to come to a commercial arrangement. So it will be very interesting to know the level of consultation with third parties such as Golding in terms of what the effect of this bill will be and how that can be remedied as well, because I think that as much as possible, as a state, we do not want to have a situation where we have good faith companies trying to help but being significantly disadvantaged. I think there are certainly questions that we can ask around that.

In terms of the process going forward, the minister has kindly informed me that because this is a hybrid bill, before the second reading speech concludes we will look to go into a select committee on that. Reflecting on that, it is worthwhile, because my understanding is that the reason for having a hybrid bill is because we are really affecting a narrow class of people—parties, I should say, not just people—by this bill and therefore it allows for the parliament, when it is making these decisions, to ensure that there are no interests being unfavourably advantaged by this and the select committee will allow that to take its course.

It can actually play a good role, in terms of informing parliament, because it will allow us the opportunity, potentially, on the public record, to take some evidence from some of the witnesses as well. I would like to hear first-hand from Golding around what this could mean. I would also like to hear the advice from KordaMentha as well. That would be an advantage to understand what advice they are getting from this. There are other bodies as well, such as Flinders Ports. I think they are a

debtor to Whyalla Ports for the operation they do in terms of helping out with piloting and mooring the ships as well.

Certainly by getting that evidence I think we will be able to clarify some of the questions that we, no doubt, have. I note that the intention is to have three government members, one opposition member and a crossbench, and I would welcome the opportunity to have additional opposition members as well, if it means enlarging the committee. I think it would be advantageous, certainly for the opposition to have two members on this committee.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Patto, you are worth three.

Mr PATTERSON: I would like three but I am mindful of the fact—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You are the whole team. You are the hope of the side.

Mr PATTERSON: And I take that responsibility earnestly, but I feel there is some talent that could also come to bear in this. It is an important and extraordinary position that the parliament is considering here today in terms of what actions it is taking.

As I said, you have got the court process allowing it to do its business and the action of this bill may well be that, effectively, rather than waiting for the end of that to hear what the court has to say, it basically just rules that this is the decision that is taken. That is why I have raised the questions around the property rights. The lease I have explained early in the remarks, that 99-year option, I think it is quite clear that needed consent. This bill will clarify that, as advised by the government.

Putting the property rights basically back to OneSteel, that certainly has raised some questions that I tried to go through in my earlier comments. What will the effect of this be on, as I said, Golding as A—and I am not here to be their main cheerleader. I am here to make sure that companies that will operate here in South Australia going forward, can have full confidence that they are in a jurisdiction where they are not exposed to heavy government intervention that could adversely impact them.

We have seen the impacts on NRW, as I said before. As they are ASX-listed, their share price has gone down \$500 million since the administration was announced. It has dropped by \$100 million only in the last day since these measures were announced by the government and we are now debating as we go through this.

There are certainly some issues there. It will be interesting in the committee stage as well to talk through some of the advice that has been received and as to whether that is the advice that is being received. Is it Crown law? Is the Crown Solicitor providing that advice? Is it another eminent legal practitioner who is providing that, and can we be given that advice as well?

As I was briefed, the government is of the firm opinion that their position is well founded and that this in fact would have been the eventual situation at the end of the actual pending court case listed for 2 June. I think, at the moment, court orders have it down to last for 3½ days, so the hearing should be finished by the end of that week, quite imminently.

They are some of the considerations that hopefully in the committee stage will be brought to bear. It certainly is a complex legal matter. It is a commercial matter as well, as I said, so the parliament here should and will make sure it is doing its rightful duty to go through these matters properly and that is the process we will go through. Ultimately, the intended legislation is to give clarity to what is going on with Whyalla Ports and in so doing reconfirm that the indenture which has the mine, the steelworks and the port, basically operate as one for not only Whyalla's benefit but the state's benefit as well.

We really urge the government to proceed carefully and transparently with us and to be open and take questions because, as I said in my opening remarks, it has come through quickly. It was announced that would be introduced Tuesday, was put into parliament Wednesday, and we are now deliberating on it on Thursday. So we have had to take a lot of information on a trust value and are hoping that trust can be continued and confirmed via the questions. We will continue to engage thoughtfully during the select committee stage, this being a hybrid bill, and then also the committee stage of this bill, just to make sure that the legislation will be implemented with fairness, accountability and the awareness of what the broader consequences could well be for this legislation.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:37): I rise to endorse the remarks just now of the shadow minister and perhaps just to highlight one or two points about what is undoubtedly an unusual piece of legislation, so defined. For good reason, it has been characterised as a hybrid bill and it is going to be referred off in a moment to a select committee, as the shadow minister has just flagged, before the opportunity to interrogate that via a committee of the whole house in due course.

I really urge the government in these circumstances to provide an opportunity for more than just a sort of perfunctory select committee process on this referral. There is a good reason why hybrid bills are referred to select committees. I have been a member of such committees in the past where the subject matter is uncontroversial, as has the minister, and I know what it is like to get leave to have those select committees sit at lunchtime so that the process can be run through. They start and finish within about 30 seconds and we come back, report to the house and so on. That is not this case.

This is a matter of considerable substance, and before I get to what might be a source of controversy, we are going to be talking a lot, I suspect, over not just the days and weeks ahead but the months ahead as this administration continues, about what team South Australia looks like. Of course, we are all on team South Australia.

We on this side of the house have provided the government with support earlier this year to pass through this house, at lightning speed, legislation that has characterised the administration that has been ongoing for some months. The administrators have gone to the courts a couple of times providing updates about how that is going and what it is costing, and we are all looking for an outcome that is going to get Whyalla back on track, that is going to get the steelworks back on track, that is going to have everybody thriving at Whyalla and in the region.

This is a hybrid bill, unlike the previous bit of legislation, because it is understood that it affects a narrow group of interested parties, including Golding—a party that has been given in recent weeks leave by the Federal Court of Australia to intervene in proceedings that are the subject of the purported lease. So there is no doubt about the narrow group of interests that are affected by this bill; and it is not only OneSteel, as is revealed on the face of the record of the Federal Court.

The shadow minister has referred in his remarks to the order that was made, and I understand that was made on 29 April. We are in circumstances, folks, where the government is acting to deal with what the Premier described on Tuesday in this house as a need to clarify something that is, in the Premier's words, 'purported' ahead of what might be controversial; we are not correcting something that the court has found is the subject of some ambiguity, but what is happening, we have discovered—because the Premier did not own up to it on Tuesday in his statement to the house, so we are all having to find out these things as we go—is that we are undoubtedly contemplating all of this in the midst of ongoing proceedings before the Federal Court.

That 29 April order made it clear—if it was not already clear—that there are real matters of substance that are being litigated and that, if they were not substantial, then more summary relief might have been sought by the administrators, and that might have been granted and all the rest of it. What we are seeing is undoubtedly a serious question of law that is to be tried, which has been set down for trial for three days, commencing 2 June.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Do you want to wait for that?

Mr TEAGUE: The minister interjects, 'Do you want to wait for that?' We will get to that in a moment, but let's just understand where we are. The government has not come to the house on Tuesday or, as I understand it in any of its briefings to the opposition, to explain the circumstances of why parties have been given leave by the Federal Court of Australia just a few days ago.

In the case of Golding Contractors Pty Ltd—a subsidiary of NRW Holdings, which has had some mention in the course of the debate—leave has been granted to that company to intervene in the proceedings, that is, to become a party, and leave has been granted to Whyalla Ports, which has also had some mention in the course of this debate, to file and serve a cross-claim in the proceedings—all of that on a fairly short timetable to the hearing that has been set, commencing 2 June. Alright, we might all say, 'Okay, that sounds like legal proceedings and that sounds like that

could run on endlessly,' so that is what we are all here for: to ensure that something happens immediately and with certainty, and all the rest of it, and that that is what team South Australia looks like.

Let's just put this in perspective. I stress that the government was given an opportunity yesterday in the parliament to tell us all about what it knew about the court proceedings, and it decided to say nothing more about that. That is on the record from yesterday. It was also asked specifically whether the administrators had requested this action and, again, the government had nothing to say about that.

So, at every turn, the government, in terms of doing its bit to be part of team South Australia, has chosen not to tell us in advance all about exactly why we are here, who is affected and why we can have full reassurance that team South Australia looks like looking after bona fide participants, including those who employ people in Whyalla and look for the best interests of those people, including the thousand or so that NRW says that it has employed in South Australia since assuming mining services work in 2019. There will be a bit more to say about that, I hope, also in the course of the select committee and the committee stage of debate in the course of the consideration of the bill in this house.

What else do we know? We are standing here on 15 May and, by an ASX announcement dated 14 May—yesterday—NRW has seen it as necessary to make an announcement through its company secretary to the stock market about its concern about the consequences for NRW. As I said earlier, NRW Holdings is the parent company of Golding Contractors that is providing services at the port.

The government has had nothing to say about that so far as I am aware. I just stress that the concerns that the shadow minister has highlighted are because not only does the bill go to—and I will put it in the terms that the Premier did—clarify the situation of the purported lease, but it also goes out of its way to void any personal property rights that might be the subject otherwise of assets at the port.

NRW makes clear in its announcement to the ASX that it has obtained comfort in respect of its ongoing works and employment of local people, and carrying on with a view to the steelworks achieving its best outcome. It has gained comfort from personal property rights that it thought were good, associated with assets at the port, and it would look like those personal property rights are voided by the consequence of this bill. So I will be very interested to know what the government has to say—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, you will have a chance to respond in your closing remarks.

Mr TEAGUE: —about the consequences for that company. Just a word or two about NRW Holdings: it is a publicly listed company. It will say it has shareholders, including South Australians, including pensioners, including all sorts of people who have seen fit to invest in that company. No-one is suggesting that NRW Holdings or Golding are anything other than bona fide. As I understand it, NRW was founded some 30 years or so ago and has a present market capitalisation in the order of \$1.2 billion on revenues of around \$3 billion.

Yes, it is WA-based and, yes, Golding is Queensland-based—mining services are provided all over the country, including, as I understand it, and particularly, in the Pilbara to BHP and to Fortescue and to Rio Tinto among others.

NRW has been moved—as I read about it as it moves along—to request a trading halt today, and has seen its share price drop by around 10 per cent, including in the circumstances of the announcement it was moved to make to the ASX. There is no doubt that the contemplation of the bill is having real-world consequences for NRW Holdings, so in a very real sense it is the responsibility of this place to scrutinise just what exactly this bill is going to do to that bona fide participant in keeping things working at Whyalla.

The mining industry in Australia is of huge importance to the nation, and the mining industry in South Australia is, no doubt, of huge importance to South Australia. Just earlier this week I was grateful to be a guest of the minister, and had an opportunity to hear from BHP, in particular, about the tremendous work it is doing in South Australia on the copper side. BHP is obviously operating very significantly in South Australia as part of its operations around the rest of the country, indeed around the world. It is one of South Australia's—and Australia's—proudest achievements.

As I said, in a very general sense BHP is drawing on the services of expert and bona fide participants in the industry, I fully expect including NRW Holdings and Golding, and other subsidiaries of NRW Holdings, providing a whole range of different services to the industry. In the broadest sense, let alone in the very immediate sense, in terms of their rights, the healthy capacity for investors, large and small, in the industry to have confidence in what they going to find when they are in South Australia is right at the core of what team South Australia looks like. We want to know, on this side, that what the government is proposing is going to actually work out in the best interests of Whyalla and of the people of Whyalla in that vein, and in the interests of those who would invest in Whyalla now and into the future.

To get back to the present moment, in terms of these ongoing court proceedings the shadow minister referred to what we all understand occurred on or about 18 April, being a mediation between the parties. We know about that because it was noted in the previous court order that that was to occur. We can presume that any mediation that has taken place has not yet resolved the proceedings because they are still heading towards resolution by findings. So there is one live means by which competing legal interests might be resolved.

The government has chosen not to provide a front-end explanation as to why that is not going to be suitable for the resolution of those competing interests. It would be of great help to this place to see the select committee take the opportunity for at least that to be better elucidated, so that it can report back here and perhaps inform the committee of the whole house. But that is as much as we know.

I say this to all of those in Whyalla, all of those associated with the steelworks, all of those interested in the long-term best interests of Whyalla and the region: we want to be acting with integrity in the course of this process. We will work with the government to that end, but it is a hybrid bill for a reason. It is doubly unusual because it is right in the middle of fairly short-run legal proceedings that clearly involve serious differences of view that are being litigated. We need to know more than what the government has chosen to put on the record so far.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:55): I thank the opposition for its support of this bill. They have confirmed already that they agree that no lease exists and that they will proceed to support this bill. On that basis, I conclude my remarks and thank the opposition.

Bill read a second time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In respect of the Whyalla Steel Works (Port of Whyalla) Amendment Bill 2025, the bill is designed to rectify an error in its operation, namely, to rectify the illegal lease on a parcel of land for which OneSteel is the registered proprietor for the purpose of operating the Port of Whyalla. The intent of the bill is to invalidate the lease so that no further obligation is present to fulfil the lease and its terms, with the land being returned. As such, OneSteel will be a beneficiary.

While the Whyalla Steel Works (Port of Whyalla) Amendment Bill 2025 by its nature is a private bill, it has been introduced by the government and therefore the application of the joint standing orders as they apply to private bills is not relevant. This leaves the provisions of the joint standing orders as they apply to hybrid bills.

The joint standing orders provide for two forms of hybrid bills. The first is a bill introduced by the government, whose object is to promote the interests of one or more municipal corporations or local bodies and not those of municipal corporations or local bodies generally. The second is a bill introduced by the government authorising the grant of Crown or wastelands to an individual person, a company, a corporation, or a local body.

Clearly, this bill does not fit the second category, but it does fit the first because it satisfies the definition based on precedent of a local body encompassing a corporation or company that has some benefit of, or operating within a confined geographical locality.

Based on the precedents established by this house and the consistent application of the joint standing orders and the principles that guide the consideration of such bills, I rule the bill to be a hybrid.

Referred to Select Committee

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:57): I move:

That this bill be referred to a select committee pursuant to joint standing order No. 2.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move:

That a committee be appointed consisting of the Minister for Energy and Mining, Mr Patterson, the Hon. D.R. Cregan, Mr Odenwalder and Ms Clancy.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move:

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to adjourn from place to place, and that the committee report later today.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

BIODIVERSITY BILL

Message from Governor

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Public Sector Act 2009—Overseas and Interstate Travel Report—
Premier—8 February 2025

By the Minister for Defence and Space Industries (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Public Sector Act 2009—Overseas and Interstate Travel Report—
Minister for Defence and Space Industries—24-26 March 2025

By the Minister for Education, Training and Skills (Hon. B.I. Boyer)—

Education, Department for—Annual Report 2024

By the Minister for Trade and Investment (Hon. J.K. Szakacs)—

Public Sector Act 2009—Overseas and Interstate Travel Report—
Minister for Trade and Investment—25-26 March 2025

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from Norwood International High School. They are the guests of the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Hartley. Welcome to parliament; it is great to have you here. I hope you enjoy the next hour or so of question time and that you have had a good look around the building as well. We also are soon to be joined by students from Grant High School down in Mount Gambier. They are guests of the member for Mount Gambier. I saw them touring around the building during the lunch break.

Question Time

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. How much taxpayer money has been spent to date on the government's new Women's and Children's Hospital project?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:04): It would be quite a substantial amount, as the Leader of the Opposition would be familiar with. If you drive down Port Road at the moment, you would see the abolition of the old Thebarton barracks site, the clearing of it. There is construction activity underway and enormous amounts of civil works.

In fact, it's quite interesting if you look at what this government has achieved in the course of a couple years at that particular location, and then look just on the other side of the train line, where the former government on that handkerchief were going to build the Women's and Children's site; there is nothing—nothing. There is just the same grass that was planted back in circa 2010-14, when the old RAH was being constructed. There has been zero activity in four years. Across the other side of the train line, where we are building this new hospital, an extraordinary amount of civil works and construction activity is very much underway.

I am advised more specifically that there has obviously been a substantial amount of investment made in the preliminary design works that are underway, through the discussions that have occurred with clinicians on the site. I am more than happy to take on notice those numbers. I have at hand numbers that we have spent on making sure that the existing Women's and Children's Hospital is sustained as best as possible, but I am more than happy to take on notice any sort of specific number for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the project that has been undertaken thus far.

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Premier. Has Wendy Rowell, Director of Engagement and Commissioning of the new Women's and Children's Hospital, resigned from her role? If so, when and why?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:06): I would have to again take that question on notice. There are probably hundreds of people working on this project. As you would probably expect, as Premier of the state I don't know the name of each and every of the individuals working on the project, but I would take the opportunity to thank them for their hard work. There's a lot that's happening—a lot that's happening.

Let me enlighten the Leader of the Opposition: of the thousands of people who will work on this project through the course of its design and construction, someone will resign. Someone will resign and move on to new opportunities. More people will come on board. The Leader of the Opposition points to somehow people resigning seeming to insinuate that that is a problem with project. I am not too sure what that says about him, though. Imagine a project with hundreds of people and having some occasionally resign versus having a team of 14 which people continually quit. It is a line of questioning I would invite the Leader of the Opposition to contemplate.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the minister spoken with the CEO of the Women's and Children's Health

Network, Rebecca Graham, about the minutes of the board meeting held on 17 November 2024? If so, what was the nature of that conversation? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Women's and Children's Health Network CEO, Rebecca Graham, was present in the meeting on 17 November when the executive project lead of the new Women's and Children's Hospital provided an update that the completion was projected by 2033-34, and in the subsequent meeting confirmed that the previous minutes were true and accurate.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:08): As I said to the house yesterday, I spoke to the Chair of the Women's and Children's Health Network board, Christine Dennis, and I outlined my conversations about it to the house yesterday. I haven't spoken specifically about this to Rebecca Graham, who is an outstanding public servant and is doing an excellent job as the CEO of the Women's and Children's Health Network.

While, of course, the Women's and Children's Health Network is not responsible for the delivery of the new Women's and Children's Hospital, both Rebecca Graham and Christine Dennis are making sure that their clinicians and their teams have input into the planning, the design and the function of the new hospital, to make sure that it is going to deliver the ultimate outcome that we want.

Of course, as I said to the house yesterday, in the delivery of the new Women's and Children's Hospital in 2022 the cabinet made responsible the key officers of the government, three of the most senior public servants in this state: the CEO of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the CEO for the Department of Treasury and Finance and the CEO of the Department for Health and Wellbeing. They are the officers responsible to cabinet for the delivery of this project, and they are the officers to which the project director reports in terms of their delivery of the project.

Rebecca Graham and Christine Dennis are doing an excellent job in delivering services for women and children in this state. They continue to have input in terms of the design and the planning of the hospital to make sure that it meets the needs of the future, and they are obviously focused on not only providing that input but, importantly, the day-to-day running of those health services.

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the minister spoken with the executive lead for the new Women's and Children's Hospital project, Jane Jennings, about the minutes of the board meeting held on 17 November 2024 and, if so, what was the nature of that conversation? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Ms Jennings presented an update to the board on 17 November and included the fact that the new Women's and Children's Hospital completion was projected by 2033-34.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:10): As I previously explained, I have spoken to Christine Dennis. I have outlined my conversation with her. I haven't spoken to other officers about this in the Women's and Children's Health Network. I have been focused on my job in terms of delivering health services for this state, as are all of those officers. I have to say, as well as Rebecca Graham being an excellent public servant, Jane Jennings is an excellent public servant. We are very well served by these officers who are working very hard to deliver health services and also to provide that input in terms of the planning of the new hospital as well to make sure that project delivers what we need for the women and children of this state in the future.

I am very happy to continue to answer questions on this, but I am also not sure what it is that the opposition is proposing that they would do differently. I am not sure what it is that they are proposing that they would do differently. In terms of the key policy decisions here, the government has made the policy decision to build this hospital on a bigger site, with more capacity, with more beds, to meet the future needs of this state long into the future. We've got the projections of when

that's expected to be complete—by the end of 2031. If the opposition has a different alternative, if they have a different proposal, if they have got a different plan, then they should put that out there, and the people can decide at the next election which proposal for this new hospital people want to back.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You don't have the call, leader, and I warn you for your interjections and for using the Christian name of the minister instead of using his parliamentary term, which is the correct way of addressing a minister.

DALRYMPLE BATTERY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:12): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Is the Dalrymple battery providing an acceptable level of support to the southern Yorke Peninsula energy group? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: Southern Yorke Peninsula is subject to frequent power outages and flickers despite having a battery there to ostensibly provide grid stability and support during outages.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:13): I know the member is getting pretty frustrated with power outages caused by distributional transmission networks in his electorate, and he has every right to be frustrated about that. I don't blame him one bit and, in fact, he has been able to articulate on behalf of his constituents, I think quite eloquently, their concerns, the impacts on businesses, the impacts on enterprises, the impacts on the amenity of families in the area. They should have just as much right to regular and reliable power as everyone else, and it is getting quite frustrating.

I also add to that. Do you know who else is very frustrated with that? ElectraNet and SA Power Networks. They are also getting very, very frustrated, and the drought does have consequences for the impacts. I know it's difficult for us to hear the explanations from SA Power Networks and ElectraNet. I think that they are reasonable. We live in a time now when people turn their light switches on and aren't really interested in any excuses about why power isn't there, which is fair enough. We are a First World country; they deserve to turn the power on, and it should be there. But things do occur and we are working very, very hard to make sure that we can mitigate those issues caused by environmental factors that are causing blackouts, but it is important to note that it's never from a lack of supply, which is a fundamental difference.

Now, for context, in terms of the question the member asked—it's a good one—it is the Dalrymple battery near Stansbury on Yorke Peninsula. It's an 8-megawatt hour grid-connected battery. It was part of an ARENA grant. It's a relatively small-scale battery. It was developed by ElectraNet aiming to demonstrate how energy storage can support the grid while providing competitive market services. It has been operated by AGL since 2018 and continues to provide energy storage to support renewable generation and provide fast-frequency response.

The FCAS market, which batteries do service, is an auxiliary market to the National Electricity Market. This is a market that had been gamed by Gentailers for a long time. Providing frequency response in this alternative market was generating millions and millions of dollars worth of royalties to these companies. What batteries have done is basically soaked up that market and made it very hard for generators and other companies to profit off fast-frequency response. That's why batteries are a very, very good fast responding solution.

For example, a normal synchronist generator to respond to a frequency issue can take minutes, half an hour, maybe an hour; a battery can respond within under a second and stabilise a grid. It is a very, very important service to the grid but because they are fast and they are so numerous now, that market has considerably dropped, so it's a good service.

I am advised that the battery was one of the first in Australia to have a grid-forming inverter, which could establish a 50-hertz frequency that operates on a biological island. If Yorke Peninsula is ever islanded, it can actually provide frequency support as well, which is very, very important. I am

running out of time, but if you are looking for a battery of this size, of 8-megawatt hours, to be able to supply the entire Yorke Peninsula with power if there is an issue, the answer to that would probably be no. You would need a lot more battery supply than just this, but its services are doing a lot to stabilise the grid, to help the grid be operated if it was ever islanded and give other benefits to consumers on Yorke Peninsula, but I share your frustrations.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Black I issue a final warning to the member for Morialta for addressing the Speaker without standing, and so it is an interjection which is against the standing orders, but also for disputing my not giving the leader the call.

For more than a year we have had—and you know this because you were the Leader of the Opposition Business—a system in place where the leader or the opposition gets four questions, the next question goes to an Independent and the next question goes to the government and then it returns to three to the opposition, one to the Independent and one to the government and so on. It was very clear, for anyone who can count to four, that it wasn't the opposition's turn for another question. I don't accept your challenge and I don't appreciate the interjection either.

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order. On the ruling that you have just now made, Speaker, I just note by reference to standing order 104 and, in turn, 106 that it is necessary according to the standing orders that if any other member is seeking the call they need to stand and seek the call. Conventions notwithstanding, which are helpful for the house, in my view at least, that is something we are all bound by in terms of the standing orders. In terms of the capacity for the call to be given elsewhere, a member needs to seek the call.

The SPEAKER: That was a frivolous and unnecessary point of order. The member for Narungga was about to stand up. I can see everyone from here and he was about to stand up when the leader stood up, so perhaps the member for Narungga thought he had miscounted. We have some very, very simple rules in place in here where it is an orderly fashion.

If you look at the statistics since I have been the Speaker, the opposition has had by far more questions to the government of the day than happened under your Speakership, under the leader's Speakership or under the member for Kavel's Speakership. If you want to change the system, we will go one to one, all day every day.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome students from Grant High School, who are here today from Mount Gambier. They are guests of the member for Mount Gambier.

Question Time

INTERNATIONAL AIRLINE TRAFFIC TO ADELAIDE

Mr DIGHTON (Black) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier provide an update to the house on international airlines choosing Adelaide as a destination?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:20): I thank the member for Black for his question. The member for Black well appreciates the importance of having an economy that provides opportunity to as many people as possible. This government has been unapologetic in seeking to attract investment in and around the tourism sector, and it is very much showing dividends. The Minister for Tourism and her team have diligently gone about making sure that we are as attractive a destination as possible for international markets, and one of the things that has underpinned that is international connectivity. I very much look forward to an announcement being made officially, not too long after question time, about how that may yet improve.

Over the course of the last 12 months, we have seen international visitation coming through our airport grow by 9.5 per cent—9.5 per cent in a period of 12 months. That is growth that would be envied around the country, and it is directly attributable—not exclusively but able to be directly attributed—to the work that has been undertaken in terms of government policy in this area, and we know that there is yet more to be achieved in this regard.

With the advent of United Airlines as the first airline in the history of the state to travel directly between Adelaide and the US market, we can see growth on the back of that. We also know that our events calendar, along with the work around other investment attraction activities has lent itself to seeing more people internationally looking at South Australia as a destination to visit, as a destination to invest in, or as a destination to study in. That is something we are steadfast in our commitment to growing.

It's important that people understand why. The first element is this: the tourism industry is labour-intensive by nature. You can't really do tourism without people. You can't have a computer algorithm and you can't have a machine that provides customer service. That is only done by people and the hospitality sector, and the nature of the warmth and generosity of South Australians lends itself to being something that we do well.

Actually even more powerfully than that, we know that people travelling internationally, in particular to our state but also domestically too, lends itself to gaining a different insight to what is occurring here on the ground in South Australia in terms of its attraction as an investment destination. The performance of the South Australian economy in areas that lend themselves to international investment attraction, particularly around how our economy continues to lead the world in decarbonisation, is important. This is because people are more likely to invest in a location if they have been on the ground and were a witness to the activity that is occurring.

It was one of the things that was discussed about the power and the potential around COP, which South Australia is very much in the mix to be able to host in the second half of next year. That is about getting more international visitation to our state, not just so that they can have a good time and fill the hotel rooms and the bars and the restaurants, as valuable as that is, but more because it gives them an insight into the activities that are occurring in our state's economy, which is then more likely to lend itself to investment.

Our strategy is deliberate. Our purpose is clear. We want people travelling to South Australia from outside our borders, not just interstate but overseas. The statistics that have been released at the beginning of this month by the airport show a 4.6 per cent growth over the course of a 12-month period across the financial year and 9.5 per cent growth year on year. It speaks to excellence and to the policy effort resulting in outcomes in a way that means so many other people are beneficiaries.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL PAEDIATRIC INTENSIVE CARE UNIT

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the care of any children be compromised as a result of the relocation of the Women's and Children's Hospital Paediatric Intensive Care Unit? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: It was reported in *The Advertiser* that the Women's and Children's Hospital's troubled Paediatric Intensive Care Unit will shut for at least three months and that staff will have to make do in a new location with fewer beds.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): I am very happy to outline this very important project, why it is necessary and what is being done to make sure that we can continue to provide excellent care for the sickest children of this state.

The paediatric intensive care unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital is a vital service for this state. It's the only intensive care unit for the sickest children in this state. For some time, for many years, there have been issues in terms of the infrastructure of that unit. It came to a head in the past couple of years when the College of Intensive Care Medicine raised concerns about it, despite original warnings being made back in 2018 by the college about the unit's condition and infrastructure works that needed to happen.

So we have embarked on—and the Treasurer has allocated the funds to undertake—a substantial redevelopment of that unit, including an expansion of the number of beds that will be part of that unit. It's a \$20 million investment that will deliver an upgraded intensive care unit and

three new PICU beds, increasing from 13 to 16 beds. It will provide centralised single equipment storage and larger, improved staff and patient amenities as well.

Careful planning has been occurring with the staff, with the teams, to make sure that while these vital redevelopment works occur they are going to be done in a way that makes sure we can provide care for the sickest children in this state. The works are being conducted in a staged approach, including the temporary relocation of the intensive care unit which is due to occur later this year. That, of course, is essential for those works to be able to happen.

It will be established within the medical day unit over the Christmas period, identified as the optimal time to relocate the service and reduce disruption. Obviously, Christmas periods in hospitals tend to involve fewer elective surgery operations taking place and are often times in which we will seek to undertake works. This will allow not only the existing 10 beds to be in the medical unit but also an overflow area of an additional four beds on top of that.

At no stage will there be any closure of the intensive care unit; this is a temporary relocation of that to allow those upgrades to occur. The medical day unit, which will then be displaced, will be operated from the short stay medical ward during this time. Very importantly, this is all being done to make sure we can continue to provide high-quality care to patients right through that redevelopment.

I thank the Treasurer for allocating the funds for this project—these are really important works—and I thank the staff of the intensive care unit. Over my time as the minister I have met a number of the doctors and nurses who work in that intensive care unit, and you could not find a more committed workforce for their patients than those who work in PICU. I know that they have been very heavily engaged in terms of the design, delivery and implementation of how these upgrades are going to occur, and it is ultimately going to give them the facilities that they need to be able to provide this care for the sickest children of our state.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL PAEDIATRIC INTENSIVE CARE UNIT

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the temporary paediatric ICU at the Women's and Children's Hospital have fewer beds than the current one? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: Information provided to the Public Works Committee in February noted that the number of treatment spaces would remain the same in the temporary unit as the current one; however, *The Advertiser* reported that PICU staff will have to make do in a new location with three fewer beds.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): As I just outlined, not only are we using the 10 beds in the medical day unit but also there are four additional beds that are being used, so that's larger than the current 13-bed capacity of the paediatric intensive care unit. So we are making sure that we can deliver those services that we are currently delivering, and this is ultimately being done with the objective of increasing that number to 16 beds to lead to an increase in terms of the permanent capacity of that intensive care unit.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL PAEDIATRIC INTENSIVE CARE UNIT

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. When will the new paediatric ICU at the current Women's and Children's Hospital be open and operational?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:29): My advice is that the current program of works is scheduled to be complete by mid next year.

BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Education, representing the Minister for Emergency Services, who sits in the other place. Can the minister outline to my community the additional resources being put in to ensure that despite ongoing dry conditions, and the fact that the bushfire season has come to a close, further bushfire protection will be required until there is significant rain?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:29): I thank the member for Kavel for this very important question. As the minister representing the Minister for Emergency Services in this place, I will go away and endeavour to get a more fulsome answer to the member's question, but there are a few things that I can say.

The fire danger season came to an end yesterday in the Mount Lofty Ranges district. I think it was after a two-week extension, which I think we could all tell is an indication of conditions, which of course remain serious, and I am sure that is the genesis of the member for Kavel's question here, beyond the fact that there was a two-week extension to the fire ban period in the Mount Lofty Ranges district.

It has now ceased as of yesterday, but of course all the messages we have heard from the minister in the other place are around making sure that communities do not get complacent because of that. The conditions remain some of the driest that we have seen and a risk remains right across the state. I am advised, though, that the aerial fleet will be on standby over the coming days to support volunteers who have been tirelessly serving their communities year round, under very trying conditions.

I am also advised that this is the same aerial fleet which completed around 3,000 drops this fire danger season, and I believe that that is nearly double the number of drops that were completed in the last season, which is very impressive, and I want to commend them for their work. The end of the season is an opportunity to remind all South Australians planning to conduct any burn-offs, especially in proximity to any scrub or timbered vegetation—which would be a particular concern, I am sure, of the constituents of the member for Kavel—to maintain safe practices and, if they are looking for more advice about how to do that, to make sure they visit the CFS website.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LABOUR FORCE

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:31): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on the state of the South Australian labour force?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:31): Can I thank the member for her question, because the Australian Bureau of Statistics has released its latest monthly update on the labour force across the country, and including in South Australia. It was really pleasing to see another strong month of performance when it comes to the state's unemployment rate. Last month the state recorded an unemployment rate of 4 per cent, which was fractionally below the national unemployment rate of 4.1 per cent. This month the nation's unemployment rate has remained the same at 4.1 per cent, but the South Australian unemployment rate has fallen to 3.9 per cent.

Mr Speaker, you would remember that I have advised the house previously that the records of the unemployment rate started in South Australia in 1978, 47 years ago—it was a good year for some of us, back in the very old days, it feels like increasingly. It has only been 16 times that the state's unemployment rate has had a three in front of it; it has been three something per cent. Across 47 years of records, all of those occasions have been recorded in the three years of the Malinauskas government.

It shows just how strong the state's economy has been performing during the last three years when our unemployment rate has not only fallen to such historic lows, but at the same time, since I think September 2023, so the last 18 months of unemployment statistics, our state has shaken that unwelcome reputation for having either the highest unemployment rate in the nation or an unemployment rate above the national average. We have on a regular basis now, over the last 18 months, recorded an unemployment rate at or below the national average and sometimes even the lowest.

This comes, of course, after yesterday's statistics were released by the ABS, which show there are still some 20,000 job vacancies here in South Australia. Over the last three years, there have been approximately 63,000 extra jobs added to the state's economy and, even though we have seen such strong jobs growth, there are still some 20,000 jobs available for South Australians either looking to get into the labour market or looking to change jobs in the labour market.

We are advised that these jobs are available across a range of industries. There is a huge amount of work being done, as the Minister for Housing was advising the house earlier this week, ramping up the number of houses under construction each year. We are consistently reporting figures of 14,000 houses under construction during the course of this year and last year—a huge step up in output for our housing industry.

There is a huge pipeline of commercial construction for South Australia, and that's before we see the Department for Infrastructure and Transport start up these tunnel-boring machines for the tunnels project, and as we get into other major projects. We have BAE Systems at Osborne recruiting some 80 to 90 additional staff per month during the course of this year, and every month for the next five years—so a strong labour market now, still a lot of job vacancies available and lots of jobs to come for South Australians.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is the current Women's and Children's Hospital fit for purpose, and will it remain so until 2033-34?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:36): Obviously, the state government is investing \$3.2 billion in building a new hospital because we think that that is needed to provide care in the long term for the children and women of this state. We wouldn't be doing so if we thought that the infrastructure of the current hospital was going to meet those long-term needs.

In the meantime, we will continue to invest in terms of upgrading the existing hospital until the new hospital opens. There has already been \$80 million worth of sustainment upgrades at that hospital. I just outlined in question time today another \$20 million that we are spending on top of that in terms of the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit, and we will continue to make decisions as necessary to make sure that we balance investing in the current hospital, but obviously making sure that we are delivering that new hospital to serve the long-term needs of this state.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the government be allocating any additional money for upgrades to the existing Women's and Children's Hospital in the upcoming state budget and, if so, how much and for what purpose?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:37): Well, I wasn't going to say anything about the budget that I am going to hand down in three weeks but—do you know what?—now I will. In fact, here it all is; let me get it out now. I understand the question that the member for Schubert asks, and it does go to the fact that in our first budgets we had allocated additional funds for the Women's and Children's Hospital for perhaps what you would call sustainment works or periodic upgrades, bearing in mind that when we came to government we only had an unreleased business case which was done for the previous government that dated back to 2019 without any updated cost estimates. As the Minister for Health outlined to the house yesterday, that was contingent on a plan to deliver a new hospital that only had one extra bed in it.

When we came to government, we did a piece of work superintended by Jim Hallion, supported by SA Health staff, and other infrastructure advisers, to update the options for the government, as the Premier has articulated to the house. We chose a much bigger site at Thebarton so that we could have a hospital that was fit for purpose, that was expandable into the future, and when it was open it would have additional beds. But we recognised in the course of that work that we would need to provide and allocate some additional funds. So I think our record stands pretty clear on that. We have done that for the existing Women's and Children's Hospital and, as for what is in the budget on Thursday in three weeks, I look forward to updating the house in three weeks' time.

REGIONAL NURSES, WORK SAFETY

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What is the government's response to evidence given today by the Australian Nursing and Midwifery

Federation to the Economic and Finance Committee? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: Regional nurses gave confronting witness statements about threats to their personal safety at work.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): I obviously do not sit on the Economic and Finance Committee of the parliament. I know a number of members do. I know a number of members of the Labor Party do. I am advised that only one member of the Liberal Party managed to attend the hearing this morning, interestingly enough. This is an inquiry that the government—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Did you have more than one person at the committee? No? I understood that of three members of the committee, only one Liberal bothered to turn up. This is a serious topic, and that is why we had members turning up to the committee to hear that evidence. This is a topic that we supported having an inquiry into by the Economic and Finance Committee. They have travelled to the region, and I understand our members also turned up to that. Only one out of the three Liberal members of the committee turned up on Yorke Peninsula to hear the evidence from the local community.

That is why we are taking it seriously, and that is why our members turned up to those hearings. Obviously, our regional health services are incredibly important. Obviously, we are listening through that committee to the members of the Yorke Peninsula community in terms of their needs for their local health services. We have been increasing our budgets for regional health right across the state, increasing both the recurrent budgets and also the capital works budgets across the state. In fact, when we came to office, just \$34 million a year was being spent on capital works across regional health services. We have increased that not by a little bit but by a lot: we are now spending up to \$166 million a year. That is an increase of 388 per cent.

The operating budgets have also increased by 25 per cent, or \$260 million, under this government compared with the last budget of the previous government. This is a government that is taking regional health seriously. We have invested in both recurrent and capital works projects, and we are also investing in terms of workforce as well. In fact, in the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network, we have increased the capital works budget by 500 per cent since coming to government, from just \$4 million to \$20 million. The operational budget has increased by 26 per cent, from \$173 million to \$219 million.

So we will continue to listen to the community and to workers on Yorke Peninsula and elsewhere. We will continue to invest in regional health services across the state, and we will continue to turn up to these important committees, listen to the evidence and formulate responses to help improve health services.

VETERANS

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs. Can the minister update the house and also the veterans in my electorate on the government's commitment to commemorating the service of South Australian veterans and their families? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: With the recent passing of the 110th anniversary of our diggers landing at the Gallipoli Peninsula—I had the great privilege and pleasure of attending five events on that ANZAC Day just recently—and also the significance of the 80th anniversary of the end of World War II, it is now more than ever important that we as a state commemorate the services and sacrifice of South Australian servicemen and their families in South Australia. Can you update the house on what you are doing as the minister?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:43): I thank the member for his question. Of particular note is today's special occasion of Veterans' Families Day. In noting the occasion, can I pay a special thank you to the member for Stuart, who was, as former Minister for Veterans' Affairs, instrumental in ensuring that South Australia became the first state, and remains to this day the only state, to recognise Veterans' Families Day. Member for Stuart, the veterans community have a great deal of thanks for you, particularly on days like today.

This morning I had the pleasure of attending a morning tea at the Port Adelaide footy club, in fact in my electorate of Cheltenham, to note and recognise this year's Veterans' Families Day. We this year are very proud to partner with the MFS. The Metropolitan Fire Service is one of the state public sector's largest employer of veterans. In fact, 12 per cent of the entire workforce of the MFS are veterans. Of particular note is a special wrap that a general purpose pumper from the MFS has undertaken this year. You will see it around Adelaide, and that is a great wrap to recognise the service of the families of veterans. As it says on the side of the truck, 'No-one serves alone'. We truly do recognise that the sacrifice of families in support of those who serve our nation is profound and important. It is very much seen by this government.

Along with a number of participants this morning was the Partners of Veterans Association of Australia South Australia branch, which, across the next couple of days, has organised a big event on Sunday 18 May in conjunction with the Payneham RSL. There will be a full day of activities, including live music, games, raffle prizes and face painting. You can also sit in a military service vehicle provided by the wonderful volunteers from the National Military Vehicle Museum, which is in South Australia.

The Alberton Oval was a fitting place to hold this morning's morning tea, particularly to note the strong connection between the Australian Defence Force and their families and the Port Adelaide footy club. The state government is very proud to partner with the Port Adelaide Football Club to support the continuation and expansion of the Port Adelaide ADF Veterans Program.

The member for Stuart would indeed know well that there is no act of public service more noble or more honourable than to serve our nation as a member of the Australian Defence Force, and remembering those who serve and have served is our most important duty as a community. On 25 April the nation commemorated the 110th anniversary of the Australian and New Zealand landing on the Gallipoli Peninsula. As so many people in this place did, I attended a number of ANZAC Day services—I am not sure if it was five, as many as the member for Stuart. But again, we note the extraordinarily solemn day that 25 April provides.

To coincide with ANZAC Day this year I had the pleasure of announcing the largest ever funding round from the state government in war commemoration. In recognition of ANZAC Day and the 80th anniversary of the end of World War II, \$328,000 of new funding for new grants to further demonstrate the commemoration of service is now hitting the grassroots organisations around our state.

DISABILITY INCLUSION AND ACCESS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Can the minister explain why disability inclusion and access is everyone's business?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (14:48): I thank the member for Badcoe for the question. She is a really fantastic advocate for her diverse community. Disability access and inclusion is everyone's business because in the end we all benefit. This is true whether you are an expectant mother navigating an uneven path to the park, an older person with a mobility device or someone feeling anxious about visiting a new place. Accessible and inclusive design supports us all. It makes life easier, safer and more welcoming for everyone.

Our State Disability Inclusion Plan, also known as Inclusive SA, is acting as the driver for that change by supporting opportunity, increasing awareness and encouraging full participation in community life. It is about breaking down barriers and making sure everyone, no matter their circumstances, can take part equally and with dignity.

Our approach to the plan has evolved since the first one in 2019 through community consultation and codesign, with a focus on practical, real-world changes that improve people's daily lives. One of the key focus areas is clear communication. That means making sure information is easy to understand, particularly for people with intellectual disability. This includes using simpler language, images and visual tools, like story boards. The benefits are huge. I think we all know the problems when people with intellectual disability are not communicated with properly.

These benefits of simple communication absolutely go beyond the disability community. These communication strategies also help people with dementia, people with language barriers, and even young children. It is a powerful example of how inclusion supports a better experience for everyone.

Employment is another vital part of the plan. A job is not just about a pay cheque. It is about a connection, a social experience and building relationships, and also it is about safeguarding in your community, self-worth and belonging. I recently employed a young man called Jesse. Jesse lives with Down syndrome. I have employed him in my electorate office. He is a local community member, a very big advocate in the area of disability.

With the right support in terms of his job and the roles that he is able to undertake, he is absolutely thriving. He contributes meaningfully. He is gaining confidence and he is growing, both personally and professionally. But truthfully, we are the lucky ones. His presence enriches our workplace and it reminds us all how much people can offer when they are given a chance. He earns award wages and contributes well above and beyond this value.

We are also investing broadly across the community in education and training for frontline staff. This includes police, corrections and other service providers, so that people with disabilities are treated with respect, understanding and compassion. Too often, people with slurred speech or unfamiliar behaviour are misunderstood or wrongly judged. This has to change, and through the plan it is changing. It is our road map to a more inclusive and fairer society.

The plan empowers people and supports our community to be better, because not everybody qualifies for the NDIS. In fact, about 2 per cent of the population qualify for the NDIS, compared to about 20 per cent who live with disability. We want to hear from the South Australian community about the plan. The plan is up for consultation, and people can have their say on YourSAy up until 26 May. Help us to shape a future in our community that is fairer, more inclusive and serves all of us better.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is it acceptable for a patient to wait over a week at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for urgent surgery, being told that surgery is imminent and forced to fast every day for an extended period of time? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: Mr Stephen Rees from Port Lincoln, after suffering a dislocated ankle and broken leg, was flown to Adelaide by the RFDS and left languishing for nine days, waiting for surgery, isolated from family and friends 700 kilometres from home.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:52): I am familiar with the case of Mr Rees, who obviously there was some media about in the past few days. I understand he did receive his surgery on 13 May. I understand that it wasn't until the Friday that he was clinically cleared to be able to have that surgery.

Mr Telfer: That's not what he was told.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: This is what I am being informed by the clinicians at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, that he was not cleared until the Friday to be able to have that surgery. I am advised that the Central Adelaide Local Health Network medical team assessed his situation daily and on Friday determined that the injury was suitable for the surgery to be able to proceed. Obviously, we certainly regret the delay that Mr Rees had in terms of being able to wait for his surgery. I am advised that he was well cared for at the Royal Adelaide Hospital up until that surgery.

was able to proceed. I understand the surgery was successful and went well, and I wish Mr Rees the best for the future.

DROUGHT HUB

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Is the government getting rid of all their SA Drought Hub node coordinators who are tasked with on-the-ground drought activities in vulnerable drought-stricken communities such as Minnipa and Orroroo and, if so, why?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:54): I thank the member for Flinders for his question. I think I answered a similar question from one of the other members—the member for Stuart, I think it was—either in the last sitting week or the sitting week before. I do not have any further information to the answer that I gave. I am just trying to find whether I have some information from my colleague in the other place, the Minister for Primary Industries. My understanding is that the plan, as announced, is to ensure that these nodes of the drought assistance hubs remain open.

But I will check the concerns that the member for Flinders has raised, because I can appreciate for him as well as for other members representing regional constituencies in this place that they obviously want to be assured that the hub and its nodes in different parts of the state remain open and available, so that for members of their communities, who may be in need of supports that those nodes are providing, they remain available. Sorry, I cannot provide any further information to what I provided to the house in response to the member for Stuart's question, but I will come back directly to the member for Flinders and I will come back to the house as well.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT BOARD

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. When was the Premier first made aware of unpaid debts owed to the Motor Sport Board? Sir, with your leave, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: On 8 May, it was reported in *The Advertiser* that the former naming rights sponsor of the Adelaide 500, VAILO, owned by bankrupt Aaron Hickmann, owes the SA Motor Sports Board close to \$430,000. The Premier said in parliament on 12 November:

...VAILO has been a good payer in terms of its obligations—which are substantial—to the state, or to the Motor Sport Board regarding the sponsorship arrangements.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:56): I can confirm, for the benefit of the member for Unley, that the state government is in active discussions with VAILO and their representatives, including any sort of potential administration actions, regarding funds that remain outstanding with the state. There is a range of options that are being examined by the South Australian Motor Sport Board regarding this. There were a number of things that underpinned the agreement that existed between the South Australian Motor Sport Board and VAILO regarding its sponsorship of the Adelaide 500.

There was, obviously, sponsorship. Part of the sponsorship of course was financial, but other parts were in kind, including the provision of the screens that are pretty important in terms of the spectator experience at a motor sport event that are particularly high functioning, with respect to the Adelaide 500, in a way that I know was appreciated by a lot of the attendees. The government is looking at ways to ensure its position is protected as much as possible, as far as the obligations to the state, through this arrangement by exploring arrangements around the screens into the future versus other ways to settle the matter.

From our perspective, what we have been most concerned with, more than anything else, is making sure that, since the conclusion of the VAILO sponsorship agreement with the South Australian Motor Sport Board, we find a new sponsor. I am very pleased to report to the house that that of course is now being done. There was a lot of interest from other major sponsors, in fact more interest than was the case when we were reinstating the race. The member for Unley will recall when he was party to the decision to abolish the Adelaide 500 in a way which offended so many sport fans throughout the state.

Once that decision was taken, having made a commitment to reinstate the race following our election, we had to do that expeditiously, and we were able to get VAILO on board as a sponsor pretty quickly. But at that time, the market was itself trying to assess whether or not it was even viable or feasible for us to get a race back up so quickly, and we did it in basically six months. Now, having had the opportunity to go back out to the market for an alternative sponsorship arrangement, there was a lot more interest. We are very grateful for that. It's now landed BP sponsoring the event in a way that represents very good value for the taxpayer and the event more broadly. We appreciate that. To that end, we've got long-term security that underpins the event in the future, and we will continue to work through—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order under standing order 98(a). The question was very clearly when the Premier was first made aware of the outstanding debt to the Motor Sport Board. With respect to the Premier, the balance of the answer might be interesting but it is debate and it is not responsive to the question very specifically directed to a point in time.

The SPEAKER: I don't agree that it's debate. I think the Premier is giving people some historical context around the event. He had four minutes to answer the question and he still has a minute on the clock.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: To go to the member for Unley's question, the Motor Sport Board has sought to keep me advised throughout the journey over the course of the last three years regarding a whole range of matters to do with the Adelaide 500 and its finances and the improving nature of those in many respects, including arrangements around sponsorship agreements.

The Motor Sport Board first advised me—it would have been in the second half of last year—that they saw things heading in a direction that best spoke to potentially finding a new sponsor for the event. I'm pretty sure it was in the second half of last year and obviously we have been able to pursue that. As far as we are concerned, we are very grateful for the ongoing security of the event into the future subject, of course, to the will of the South Australian people, given that this event hasn't always enjoyed bipartisan support.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT BOARD

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (15:01): Did VAILO meet all its in-kind obligations as part of the sponsorship?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:01): I am happy to take that on notice. Off the top of my head, I am not aware of any failure to meet their obligations in that regard, but I would want to double-check that so as to ensure I didn't mislead the house.

UNLAWFUL BUSINESS PRACTICES

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs. Can the minister update the house on how the government is seeking to assist consumers in response to unfair practices by a small number of tradespeople?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:02): Thanks to the member for Newland for the question. I know that many people in this place probably have seen the recent media articles about some of the unsettling business practices in particular of Metropolitan Plumbing and its associated businesses.

This week I have actually received more emails through, including one from a couple in my electorate who had fallen victim to Metropolitan Plumbing's high-pressure tactics and overcharging. Can I say, by and large, most tradies are absolutely doing the right thing, but we are seeing, I guess, a particular surge in complaints through largely the media around Metropolitan Plumbing. In the email I received this week, I had constituents who were charged over \$6,000 to replace a hot-water system only for them to later compare prices and receive other quotes of between \$2,000 and \$2,500 for the same job.

Yesterday, the Malinauskas government launched a new campaign to warn South Australians about the practices of rogue tradies charging excessively and also charging for unnecessary work. As I said, there has been a sharp spike in the number of complaints received

from South Australians over the past few months, with hundreds more complaints received than usual. South Australians have contacted Consumer and Business Services saying they have been charged excessive amounts, including for unnecessary work and for shoddy work.

CBS, as the state's consumer watchdog, is investigating a significant number of these complaints for potentially breaching Australian Consumer Law, but at the same time, I am urging people to take steps to protect themselves from being taken advantage of in the first place and to be aware of the red flags when hiring a tradesperson, as well as understanding consumer rights under Australian Consumer Law.

When seeking to engage a tradesperson, people should firstly get the scope right and our recommendation is to seek advice from at least three different tradespeople to help you know what tasks need to be carried out and whether anyone is suggesting tasks that are unnecessary. For example, one tradie might insist on a total replacement for a hot water system, while another might suggest repairs for a fraction of that cost.

Of course, requesting quotes is something we should be encouraging our constituents to do, as well as, when seeking advice on the scope of work, inviting each tradesperson to give you a quote, preferably a fixed-price quote, and making sure that you are shopping around. We know that some tradies are charging thousands more dollars than others for the same work.

We are also making sure that people avoid high-pressure situations—a tradie might be trying to convince you that a situation is urgent. It really is important to do that research and make those calls to multiple tradespeople. It is also really important to know who to call. Some companies, like Metropolitan Plumbing, trade under many different names. You might think you are calling different companies, but you need to check the licence number and make sure that you are genuinely getting quotes from different tradies.

There is a simple way to check on the CBS website's licence register to see which business you are contacting. The licence number needs to be displayed on any advertising, including social media, so make sure you are paying attention to that and doing those searches and that you are only dealing with a licensed tradie.

Anyone doing work without a licence is of course actually breaching the law, and their work could be substandard. Check if the person is licensed by checking either their card or their digital licence, by looking them up on the CBS register or by calling CBS on 131 882. It's very important that we are making sure our constituents are being protected. There is material provided to all the MPs to provide to their constituents.

Grievance Debate

COST OF LIVING

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Today I rise to speak about the cost-of-living crisis that is impacting the lives and livelihoods of South Australians. As we approach the delivery of the budget, which is the final one of this Labor government before the next state election, we hear a lot of conjecture from those opposite about how great they think things are going out there in the community.

Let's have a look at how they are really going. We have seen this Labor government's press releases and heard their speeches, often citing the NAB Business Confidence Survey—but not now, because for three consecutive months South Australia has had the worst business confidence of all states in the nation. We have heard this Labor Premier point to the CommSec State of the States report—a whole range of events in the business community—yet by that measure the state has now slipped to sixth in real economic growth under Labor.

Similarly, the South Australian Business Chamber's Survey of Business Expectations this month found that South Australian businesses are actually experiencing conditions similar to the peak of the COVID pandemic, citing the impact of government red tape. Just today, if you look at the ABS labour force statistics, you will see that they reveal that this month more South Australians are working fewer hours than they would like and more have chosen to exit the labour force altogether. So there is a pattern emerging here.

These are not some abstract sets of figures plucked from the sky. There are people and small businesses, lives and livelihoods, behind these statistics. What South Australian workers and small businesses are doing is signalling a problem. Confidence is down. Investment in new plant and equipment is at a national low, while costs continue to skyrocket.

Just this past week, I actually met with Steven, the owner of a small business in the seat of Dunstan, who told us how water bills are actually becoming an increasingly large expense, jumping from around \$1,300 to nearly \$2,200 in a year. We need to be doing everything we can to relieve the cost-of-living pressure for South Australians, not increase the pressure through unfair price hikes to pay for this Labor government's failure to adequately and appropriately fund water infrastructure upgrades.

We know that at the end of January this year there were around 55,000 people who owed around \$63 million to SA Water due to bills that are past their due date. South Australians are hurting. It is a cost-of-living crisis, well and truly. People are struggling to make ends meet and to afford essentials, even for things as basic as water and also electricity.

The last thing South Australians need right now is higher fees and charges. We are pleading with this Labor government to see reason and, as we have already called for, to end the water bill price hike of 3.5 per cent above CPI. We know hardworking South Australian families should not have to foot an extra \$85, and small business owners around an extra \$348, annually for their water bills because of Labor's poor planning. What is worse is that this is compounded by this government's mismanagement of the electricity grid. Under Labor, we have seen that the average household is paying around \$800 more on their annual power bill, or nearly 44 per cent more, which is a substantial rise for South Australian families during a cost-of-living crisis.

This bill crunch continues; it flows on to small business. We see electricity prices for small businesses rising from around \$3,679 under the former Liberal government to \$5,364 under the Malinauskas Labor government. That is an increase of \$1,685 or nearly 46 per cent. Do not forget that in 2021, what did Labor do? They promised to deliver a \$593 million Hydrogen Jobs Plan, including a power plant, by the end of 2025 that they said would reduce wholesale electricity prices by 8 per cent. That has not happened and that is another broken promise.

There is no plan from them to reduce electricity prices, no plan to reduce water bill price hikes and seemingly no plan to return confidence to small business. The upcoming state budget offers the last and best chance for this government to show that it is listening. It is an opportunity to deliver real relief for households and small businesses.

We need to ease the cost-of-living pressure on people and on businesses, and we need to unshackle small businesses from these exorbitant input costs and reignite what is needed in this state: an entrepreneurial spirit. Only then can we return confidence to workers and a small business community that at the moment is struggling under three years of hard Labor. If this Labor government will not improve the situation, then we will.

FRIENDS OF HALLETT COVE CONSERVATION PARK

Mr DIGHTON (Black) (15:11): Today, I want to acknowledge the work of the Friends of Hallett Cove Conservation Park. I recently visited the Hallett Cove Conservation Park and met with Penny Rendle, the President of the Friends of Hallett Cove Conservation Park, and other members of the friends group. Before I spend some time acknowledging the work that the friends group does, I want to share with the house a little bit about the significance of the Hallett Cove Conservation Park, and I thank the Friends of Hallett Cove Conservation Park for providing this information.

The area of the park was previously inhabited by Aboriginal people for tens of thousands of years. The camping area at Hallett Cove covers many hectares and is possibly the largest and oldest Aboriginal camping area in the vicinity of Adelaide. A large number and range of stone implements were found at the site and indicate a long period of Aboriginal occupation, including from the ancient Kartan culture. The most recent occupants were the Kaurna people. These implements are on display at the South Australian Museum.

In terms of European settlement, the park and the surrounding suburb were named after John Hallett, who arrived in South Australia in November 1836. Hallett first visited in 1837 looking for

lost cattle and then decided to take up grazing in that particular area; consequently, the area became known as Hallett's Cove. From colonisation until the 1960s the area was farmed and grazed. Between the sixties and 1976 there was a series of negotiations before, finally, declaration was made in 1976 that 51 hectares would become a conservation park, hence this unique environmental space was protected.

I want to mention why it is unique: the significant geology of the park. There is evidence of episodes of the earth's history from the last 600 million years, including from an Australian ice age some 280 million years ago. The outstanding glacial pavements along the northern clifftops are recognised as the best record of Permian glaciation in Australia and have international significance. That draws a number of visitors to the park, including many geography and geology students.

In terms of vegetation, the alteration of Hallett Cove vegetation began in the early days of South Australian settlement. In the 1840s, logging occurred to feed the boilers of nearby copper mines. Other settlement impacts included clearing and the erection of holiday shacks along the coastline, which added further to the strain on vegetation and introduced various exotic species. By the time the park was proclaimed the upper slopes of the amphitheatre and coastal clifftops were the only areas where remnant vegetation existed.

Since then the revegetation has been ongoing, initially using indigenous plant species, but more recently local provenance species as a seed source. The wide variety of soil layers and types throughout the park has caused a number of different plant communities to evolve and there are distinct areas throughout the park, including coastal dunes, coastal heath and grassy woodlands.

The Friends of Hallett Cove Conservation Park are a dedicated group of volunteers, who have been guardians of this unique coastal landscape since 1987. Over the past decades their commitment has transformed the park into a thriving refuge for native flora and fauna. The Friends have adopted bushcare methods, in conjunction with a planting program, which have removed invasive woody weeds, such as olives and African boxthorn and feral garden escapees. There has been significant revegetation works, including a reconstruction of the woodland, which formerly had the inland area. Approximately 35,000 plants have been planted across the park.

The friends group meets weekly on a Thursday morning and are always looking for new volunteers to join the group. It was interesting to learn that the focus in recent times—and not surprisingly—has been on weed removal rather than revegetation. The friends group have played a pivotal role in community engagement as well. I want to pay tribute to the work of Penny and the friends group. My family and I live nearby and we are lucky that this important park has been protected due to the service of these volunteers.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): National Volunteer Week is next week and it is an opportunity for all of us in this place and around the community to step out and to seek out those wonderful volunteers in all of our communities. We all know, and we speak about it often in this place, the vital and indispensable role that volunteers play in a wide range of areas that very much build and hold the fabric of local communities together.

I want to pay particular tribute to The Hut at Aldgate, which at present count has 220 active and dedicated volunteers assisting the vital community work that The Hut plays. For those who are not familiar with our local area in the Hills, The Hut occupies what was the Aldgate Railway Station. One of the achievements, of which I am very proud as local member, is in recent years helping The Hut to secure long-term tenure at that location. It is an ARTC site and The Hut has a long-term lease to continue its work right there at the Aldgate train station.

That is just the starting point base for so much outreach work that The Hut does. At the risk of missing some, I will just refer to my notes in that regard, because the volunteers are helping with everything from reception to facilitating interest and fitness programs, gardening, and driving buses that enable our older community members to get to the shops and social outings. Many volunteers will get involved in volunteering to support a wide range of programs.

Whenever we get together to say thank you to the volunteers, it is just a moment of great joy and solidarity, looking around on the railway platform, as we did on the Easter weekend, to say thank

you, because there are so many people who are both benefiting from those wonderful services and providing them. It is a wonderful thing to both give and receive those wonderful services. I will just draw attention to a couple of them, in particular, in a moment.

This effort cannot be done without a very effective governance and leadership team and I pay particular tribute to the executive officer at The Hut, Deb Bates. Deb Bates is a true leader in the state in this area. She has been an effective leader at The Hut now for many years, and I am proud to say I have worked very closely with her over that time. She has a very able team: Finance Officer, Ivonne Allen; Administrative Support Officer, Jo Jarvis; Community Development Manager, Bernadette Reading; Community Programs Officer/Financial Wellbeing Officer, Courtney Dean; and Community Connections Coordinator, Cally Tierney. And I want to pay particular tribute to the Spark & Loneliness Project coordinator, Hayley Everuss.

Dear Hayley has taken great care in the initiative, in particular in relation to Spark. Spark mateship is one of the new Spark initiatives. It is a men's wellbeing initiative, and in this case it is led by eight volunteers who are working to create a space that can bring men together for good company and meaningful conversation. They are doing that at the Bridgewater Sports and Social Club. It is still a fledgling initiative, but showing what can be done when efforts are made to bring men together in the interests of wellbeing.

Another program, The Book Shed—places at both Stirling and Woodside—are critically important for The Hut's work. That in turn contributes to provisioning for the Food Pantry. The Hut tells me that there are presently 26 volunteers who make the Food Pantry happen week after week. That is part of the overall financial wellbeing program. I visit the Food Pantry frequently and applaud the work that is done there in a sensitive, discreet and effective way. I give particular recognition also to the board, and the board members, led by the Chair, Dr David Rawnsley. May The Hut continue to go from strength to strength.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:21): Volunteering is the beating heart of our vibrant community, and during National Volunteer Week, from 19 to 25 May, we take the opportunity to not only recognise but deeply appreciate the thousands of people who selflessly contribute their time, energy and expertise for the betterment of others. South Australia boasts a staggering 951,000 volunteers, equating to nearly 63 per cent of our population who are aged between 15 and 84. That is more than half of our adult population engaged in shaping a stronger, compassionate and more connected society. Their efforts amount to 223 million hours of unpaid work every year.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the South Australian Volunteer Awards, and I was very excited to hear from Andrea Stretton from the Lions Club of Blackwood that their nominee, Tom Rungie, has been successful in the finalists list for the award. Tom is a dedicated and selfless community volunteer. He plays a vital role in various local initiatives, demonstrating exceptional commitment to service. Not only has he stood the ground at the ANZAC War Memorial in Blackwood for many years but he is also a member of the Lions Club of Blackwood. He actively participates in all of their events, such as the Blackwood Christmas Pageant, and he is there every weekend at the Lions mart. He also helps me out in particular in some of the events that I put on when I call on the Lions to assist.

Tom is also a really great role model for all of the young people within the community, because he exemplifies the spirit of volunteering, and he serves as an inspiration to his peers. He also encourages other youth to get involved. His unwavering dedication and enthusiasm make him a cherished member of our Blackwood community, embodying the essence of volunteerism and community spirit, and I wish him well in the awards.

A group of volunteers that may get overlooked when we think about those who give their time in our community are our volunteer Justices of the Peace. Whilst their work is often quiet, in a room somewhere—or, in our case, at a little table in our Waite electorate office—their work is essential. JPs across South Australia witness thousands of documents every year. Their work is foundational to safeguarding against identity fraud and protecting vulnerable people by ensuring critical documents are witnessed accurately and safely.

In my office, we welcome many community members every day who are seeking this vital service, and I would like to give a special mention to the JPs who volunteer in my office to help our community: Tom Kelsey, Mike Marshall, Elaine Waddell, Peter Cahalan, Marty Forgan, Geoff Kay, Francis Muldoon, David Poole, Graeme Payne and Doug Melvin. Between them, they have signed and witnessed thousands of documents. Not only do they help our community but they also provide a listening ear.

A special mention goes to not technically a volunteer but my office manager, Daniel Clutterbuck, who is renowned in our community as an excellent, understanding and skilled JP. He gets a lot of practise. He takes the time to make sure community members know what they are signing and they have what they need, but he also just sits and listens to them. Thanks Dan and all of our JPs for supporting our community in this way.

I will just mention one more group of volunteers who are incredibly special to me, and that is our Belair National Park parkrun community, led by my co-event director, the very awesome Jason Hughes, who works so hard in his spare time to keep the run running to ensure that we have what we need and to support our volunteers. Recently, Jason launched the Blokes at the Back initiative under the banner of The Man Walk, bringing together a really great community of blokes who walk at the back of the runners and chew the fat, helping to create a safe space for a certain group who are not always very good at talking to each other. The numbers are growing, which is just lovely to see.

I have a fantastic group of volunteers in our parkrun family. Whilst I do not have time to name them all, they are there every weekend to make sure our parkrun is the best in the state—self assessed. A huge thank you to all of them. I would like to give a special mention to Karrek, Lowenek and Claire, who are our youngest volunteers. These three kids from Hawthorndene primary come along pretty much every week with their parents to help, and they just give so much.

Not only do they volunteer, whether it be token sorting or tail walking, but last year I set them a challenge to create our very own Acknowledgement of Country for our parkrun. Not only did they do it with some Kurna language but they stand up in front of hundreds of people every weekend and remind us that we are about to run on Kurna country. It is a very special way to start the day, and they are so brave. I thank them for being so invested in helping our community with the run as well as perhaps showing to all that they and their generation understand about why we should show our respects to 65,000 years of culture and care for the land.

Finally, the end of the fire season was yesterday. A very big thank you to all of our CFS brigades, members and their families, who drop what they are doing and come along to serve and protect our community. Without you, we would be lost. Not only do you help our communities but you help communities across the state in strike teams—thank you. Our volunteers, young and old, are our heart, and I thank each and every one of you.

SCHUBERT HEALTH SERVICES

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:26): I have two really fantastic hospitals in my local community: I have the Angaston hospital and the Tanunda hospital, both of which have served our community exceptionally well for a long period of time. There are some really remarkable doctors and nurses who are employed within those hospitals. But locals are unfortunately becoming increasingly alarmed about the future of the emergency department at the Angaston District Hospital.

The accident and emergency service at Angaston has already been closed, unfortunately, for a number of days this year due to difficulty in having it staffed, which is obviously a critically important element of having a hospital. This is in addition to the fact that the Tanunda hospital has also had a reduction in bed numbers over the last couple of months, and it is unclear when these bed numbers will be lifted up again. It has now been brought to my attention over the last couple of days that the after-hours emergency care at the Angaston hospital may cease altogether.

It should clearly go without saying that any reduction in service for my local community would be completely and utterly unacceptable. We need to have first-class services in regional communities, just like we deserve them in the city as well. It is especially the case that having a reduction in service would clearly be concerning when you look at the entire state of the health

system, which is under some really extraordinary pressure through emergency departments that are bursting at the seams, extensive and long waiting lists for elective surgery and, of course, the record ramping that we have seen under this government.

That is exactly why we cannot afford for there to be a single reduction in service anywhere in the community but particularly in regional communities, like mine of the Barossa Valley and the Adelaide Hills. So I have written to the minister and urged him to work with all relevant stakeholders, whether that is the local health network or the two fantastic local GP clinics that service the Tanunda hospital and the Angaston hospital, to ensure that we can retain this vital service going forward.

I have asked, and it has been an issue that I have actually raised with the minister on a separate occasion, that our local health network has a rollout of the SAVES program, the South Australian Virtual Emergency Service. It is operated through the RDWA and operates from 7pm until 7am at rural hospitals across the state. The RDWA does have on their website all of the fantastic things they are designed to do. In particular the website says SAVES is designed to support rural doctors and provide greater flexibility for their operating hours.

This is a service that clinicians are really hoping to see roll out across the entire LHN, and I have raised this with the minister. It is something that GPs have said might assist with some of the pressures that are being faced at the Tanunda and Angaston hospitals. So I am really, really hoping that this situation can be rectified because to lose such a service would be really unfortunate, and frankly I do not think our community would accept it in any way, shape or form. I will keep advocating for it to remain open for the foreseeable future—well into the future.

It would be probably pretty remiss of me not to mention the new Barossa hospital again. This is something that our local community has been pushing for a very long time, and with the budget coming up again there is another opportunity for the government to invest in the capital works required to build the hospital. I am looking forward to continuing to push for that cause here in the parliament on behalf of my local community.

Our region is expanding. If you look at the Barossa, we have a growing population. If you look at what is happening right on our doorstep in Concordia, Roseworthy and Two Wells, we need more services in our regions, not fewer, so any talk of the Angaston hospital having a reduction in its emergency department hours would just be silly. Our community deserves the very best care.

With the state budget coming up, one of the things I am really hopeful to see is additional money injected into our regional road maintenance. It is no secret that there is a \$2 billion road maintenance backlog in South Australia, and it is absolutely causing havoc and mayhem in regional communities like mine. Not a single day goes by where a local constituent does not come to me complaining about another road. It is raising attention and raising awareness to these roads that need to be addressed for safety, and I will keep pushing on behalf of my local community.

GILLES STREET PRIMARY SCHOOL

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:31): Yesterday I had the enormous privilege of spending the morning at Gilles Street Primary School along with the education minister, the member for Wright, to celebrate its 125th birthday. On 14 May 1900, Gilles Street Primary School opened. It was designed for 500 students, but just a couple of months after it opened inspectors found that there were actually 588 students enrolled at the school.

It has a remarkable history as one of South Australia's first public schools. It first began as two separate schools, the Gilles Street Practising School and the Gilles Street Infant Practising School. The period of the 1920s to 1960s marked the start of other organisations using the school's buildings, such as Correspondence School, Girls' Special Classes, the Deaf Blind Unit, the Language Centre and the Curriculum Unit. Then, in 1962, those two schools amalgamated into the present day Gilles Street Primary.

It was such a beautiful celebration yesterday at the school. We were treated to beautiful performances by the students, including their taiko drumming. Gilles Street Primary is quite well known for its taiko drumming. It is quite an iconic instrument for the school, and I want to thank Pauline Thomas for her teaching of the taiko drumming to students over very many years.

The school captains of the school did such a tremendous job MC'ing the event, and we were also treated to a beautiful rendition of *I Am Australian* which included sign language, and the Australian national anthem.

I had the pleasure of meeting one of the former students of the school. Her name is Bernice Dean, and she went to the school in 1942. She said that she had lived on Halifax Street and would walk to Gilles Street Primary but after the war her family did have to move down to Ascot Park. You could see that she was quite sad about the fact that she had to leave the beautiful Gilles Street Primary. My mum informed me last night, actually, when I was telling her about my day that my great-uncle Frank Major was the headmaster at Gilles Street Primary, Mum recalls, in around the 1950s. I think that is just an example of the one degree of separation that we have here in Adelaide.

Some other interesting history about the school was that it was actually named after Osmond Gilles, who was an early Treasurer of the colony. Today, it operates with approximately 300 students. It has a mainstream primary school and also an intensive English language program for newly arrived students.

I love the school's motto, which is 'The world in our city school', because it actually has students from over 40 different cultural backgrounds. I think that is also part of the magic of Gilles Street. It is such a diverse, inclusive, welcoming and creative school community that they have really been able to foster in the heart of our city. That is something they should be so incredibly proud of.

One of the other special moments yesterday was the unveiling of a specially commissioned artwork of the facade of Gilles Street Primary, which was painted by renowned South Australian artist George Linou. It was such a beautiful painting, and when the principal of Gilles Street, Angela Van Enkhuyzen, unveiled the portrait you could hear all the little voices of the students gasping in awe at just how beautiful this painting was of their school.

That was an effort by the parents and community engagement group, otherwise known as PACE, at Gilles Street Primary. I want to thank Sarah Ladewig-Jones and all of the parents on PACE at Gilles Street Primary School for organising such a beautifully commissioned artwork. They are going to be selling signed prints of that artwork as a fundraiser for the school as well. Congratulations to all of those parents on that effort.

It is also a very caring school, and that is why I worked with the school community, as one of my election commitments, to deliver a school crossing out the front of the school, a 25km school crossing. Cars used to be able to just drive past at 50 km/h. I worked with the school community to be able to deliver that crossing, so that we do have a much safer school community in front of Gilles Street and Pulteney. A huge congratulations to the students past and present, staff past and present and the wonderful school community that makes up Gilles Street Primary. Happy 125th.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (15:37): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 3 June 2025 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2025

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:40): In closing the debate on the bill, can I firstly thank members for their contributions. Contributions on the Supply Bill are often taken as an opportunity by members to reflect on matters concerning the state budget, whether it is priorities of the state budget for funding or whether it is overall budget settings. But I think what is even more beneficial are the contributions that members make with direct reference to their constituencies, to their electorates that they represent here in the house. I have been listening assiduously to members' contributions about matters of importance in West Torrens.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: The forgotten west.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The forgotten west, I think it is called, the member for West Torrens' electorate. It has been a great opportunity for me, and I am sure many others, to listen to some of the contributions that members have made, raising in the house some of the issues that their communities are experiencing. It might be matters about the delivery of government services in local communities, it might be the condition of infrastructure provided by the government or supported by the government in their electorate, quite commonly local roads, or it might be some of the drought conditions that particularly those members representing regional communities across South Australia have raised and some of the potential ways in which this place and the government could be helping to address some of the concerns that arise as a result of those drought conditions.

I hope it is, then, an opportunity for all members to reflect on those contributions, particularly, not just in the context in the coming weeks of the release of the government's fourth state budget of this term but also in the lead-up to the next election how some of those contributions might allow those members and potentially the government to reflect on how they might respond to the concerns that have been raised. Again, thank you to members for their contributions. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:43): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE WHYALLA STEEL WORKS (PORT OF WHYALLA) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:43): I bring up the report of the committee, together with the minutes of the proceedings.

Report received.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:45): I move:

That the time allotted for completion of all remaining stages of the Whyalla Steel Works (Port of Whyalla) Amendment Bill be until 5.30pm.

Motion carried.

*Bills***WHYALLA STEEL WORKS (PORT OF WHYALLA) AMENDMENT BILL***Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PATTERSON: I did not speak on the fact that we had a hybrid select committee, but it is worth opening up and acknowledging that that occurred. We sat over the lunch break and gave it consideration. As I said in my contribution earlier, the ability to have access to KordaMentha and some of the affected parties subject to the court proceedings would have also helped; however, that was not to be the case. We did ask some questions and maybe we will go over some of those questions here in this forum to put them on the record.

As a first question, minister: a lot of this is based upon the purported lease that is said to be in existence between OneSteel Manufacturing and Whyalla Ports Pty Ltd. Can the minister talk through the timelines of that purported lease and what the implications are of potentially having a purported lease in place?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I want to thank the shadow minister because he was very constructive in the stages of the select committee. It is a unique situation. It is understood, based on the information filed with the federal court, that the purported lease was apparently executed by OneSteel and Whyalla Ports on 29 June 2018. The initial term of the purported lease is stated to be 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2018. The purported lease contains a 99-year extension clause. No evidence has been forthcoming that this extension has ever been exercised. Whyalla Ports Pty Ltd claims that a party seeking to terminate the purported lease during the holdover period must give two years' notice under this purported lease.

The purported lease, in an alternative provision, provides for termination upon six months' notice. A few departmental officials and contractors associated with the Steel Task Force became aware of this purported lease in 2021. OneSteel never requested consent from the state for the lease; accordingly, a decision-making process was never commenced by the previous government.

So it is fair to say that what this legislation does is enliven what we believe to be the case as of today, anyway. The reason we do so is that it was the vision of Premier Playford that, when the indenture was first granted, a pit-to-port operation was governed by an indenture. The ability of one party to alter or enter into an agreement without the support of the government undermines the indenture process. So what in fact the parliament is doing—rather than any claims of sovereign risk, what we are actually doing is protecting the rights of the indenture and the right of the state to make indentures. What we are actually doing is preserving rights rather than restricting them.

I think that answers the question the member asked. I know he asked questions of the chief executive. We are confident in our position, but we want to have clarity for the sale process. We want to make sure that we get the very best opportunity to see Whyalla ultimately sold in a process by the administrator in a way which maintains the integrity of the indenture, which is an integrated operation from mine to process to plant to port.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you for outlining that, minister. We talked about the fact that there is a judicial process underway, subject to court proceedings. My understanding is that the administrator, KordaMentha, has taken up, prior to this legislation coming into parliament, the cause that the purported lease is invalid and other means. This has led to court orders being issued to hear this matter, I think on 2 June 2025. It will take about 3½ days, according to the court order.

It states in the matter, if I read the court order of OneSteel Manufacturing Pty Ltd—who is taking the action via the administrator, named here as the plaintiff—that Whyalla Ports is the defendant. In addition to that, which we will touch on in other questions, Golding Contractors Pty Ltd has had leave to intervene to be added as a defendant. We are mindful that there is a judicial process listed reasonably expeditiously, because the application to the court has obviously been since the administrators were appointed in February. That is expected to last for 3½ days, after

which—as your advice indicates—the expectation, it seems, from the government is that the matter will be found in favour of the plaintiff.

Maybe, to start off with, if you could talk about what advice you have been given, and by whom, as to allowing the court process to take place in the natural way. What advice has been given, and by whom, to instead be able to put this legislation which, as has been said, aims to give clarity to the indenture? As I said in my speech, that is what is underpinning the indenture: the fact that the mine, the steelworks and the port are joined. I am not asking this in a combative way but in a way so that the committee and the public of South Australia can understand, because this is a quite a serious bill we are dealing with.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We did seek legal advice, as you would be aware, but obviously I cannot share that legal advice with you, as is longstanding practice. Also, I do not think you are being negative at all; I think you have been very constructive throughout this entire process. From the initial legislation that we brought to the parliament that enabled the state to put GFG Whyalla Steelworks into administration through to this process, you have done what any good opposition spokesperson would do, and that is: question, ask, but ultimately make your own independent decision. You have decided to support it and we are grateful for it.

The government is confident that we are doing the right thing. The government is confident that out of an abundance of caution we want to clarify the consequences of noncompliance with the consent clauses in the indenture. The matter is being pursued in the Federal Court involving KordaMentha, Whyalla Ports and other parties. It goes to matters beyond what is being dealt with by this bill, including extending to the channels.

I have outlined the reasons earlier, but we are confident in our standing in what would occur in any court proceedings—but that is for a court to decide. What we are doing out of an abundance of caution is making sure that we can maintain what we believe was always the intention of the indenture: to maintain an integrated steelworks that went from mine to port. That has been a universal, bipartisan vision since it was implemented by Sir Thomas Playford, whose portrait hangs behind me.

The reason we have done that is that the mining operations in isolation are profitable. The port operations in isolation are profitable. What makes the steelworks able to survive is the two other operations sitting alongside it. The mine produces more ore than is used in the steelworks, so the export of that ore helps to, in some respects, hold up the operations of the steelworks, and the port gives us access to markets and the ability to move product as quickly as possible.

As I said earlier, the intent of our legislation is not to introduce sovereign risk; it is to protect the indenture and protect companies that enter into an indenture agreement with the government to know that they are robust and that one party cannot simply make a change to an indenture agreement without the consent of the government.

I think the opposition already know this: if the previous government had wanted to give consent to Whyalla Ports, they would have, but they did not. Either they did not know about it or a process was not begun, but for whatever reason consent was not given. What we are simply doing is clarifying that position today because of the unique circumstances that we are in where OneSteel is in administration and we are seeking to save Australian steelmaking.

We have billions of dollars of commonwealth money on the line here that is going to be invested in South Australia. We want to be able to, as quickly as possible, have this integrated steelworks sold to another party clean—as the indenture had always intended it to be. The indenture had always intended an integrated steelworks and that is what we are preserving through this legislation.

Mr PATTERSON: My question went to what advice have you received and who did you receive it from? I perhaps did not hear exactly. If you could still provide that as part of this follow-up question. Has the government undertaken any consultation with external stakeholders, including KordaMentha, prior to the introduction of this bill? If so, could the minister please outline who they were and how those discussions helped to inform this course of action?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: KordaMentha operate independently from us. They operate under the Corporations Act, so they do not take instructions from us. We have consulted with the Solicitor-General and we have received advice from him. We have received advice from Brendon Roberts KC and Lipman Karas on this process and we are confident that we are acting in the best interests of the state based on that.

In terms of the consultation, this is a matter of an indenture in this parliament. We have had the select committee on the hybrid bill. The only other interested party is OneSteel; OneSteel is in administration. We are protecting the integrity of the indenture.

Mr TEAGUE: Perhaps just while we are characterising the circumstances that we are dealing with, it might be convenient to have reference to NRW Holdings announcement to the ASX yesterday. I wonder what, if any, part of this summary of the circumstances does the government disagree with. NRW indicates in its announcement that it was confident of a successful outcome for its subsidiary Golding at the trial that is listed to start on 2 June, based on but not limited to the following facts:

- NRW notes that Whyalla Ports was incorporated and operated as its own entity and business for approximately six years prior to ownership by GFG Alliance.
- Whyalla Ports was incorporated on 14 September 2011.
- On 29 August 2016, KordaMentha, when appointed as administrators of Arrium, filed a report as to the affairs in relation to Whyalla Ports, which listed and valued the plant and equipment owned by Whyalla Ports Pty Ltd at \$199,386,602.91.
- On 31 August 2017, KordaMentha sold the shares in OneSteel and Whyalla Ports from Arrium to GFG Alliance.
- To the extent the South Australian government purports to say it was unaware of the lease, specifically from at least 9 July 2021, the State of South Australia has been on notice about the lease between Whyalla Ports and OneSteel.

In those circumstances, NRW Holding raises a concern that this legislation will, in effect, determine certain, if not all of the issues that are before the Federal Court for determination at a trial to commence in three weeks' time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I cannot speak for NRW or the chief executive when he entered into this purported arrangement with security over this purported lease at the very end of the long and troubled relationship he had with OneSteel. There was a long period of time of non-payment; they were trading at the point where they had over \$113 million being owed without payment. That was something that Goldings, a subsidiary of NRW, did themselves. The state did not force them to do that.

Then at the very end of that, as the financial realities were becoming quite clear, they claimed to have some sort of security over a purported lease. Whatever due diligence they did over that lease obviously will be examined by their board rather than me giving a critique on the way that they conducted themselves. That is a matter for them to understand that, but we fundamentally disagree with NRW's statement about the merits of their case because the security that they rely on was granted without any consent.

We are a party to that and members opposite were in government at the time, and they did not grant consent, and quite frankly they did the right thing. I suspect that even if the application had been made and there was a process to assess it, the answer would have been the same—the answer would have been no. The reason is for the same reason now: we seek to maintain the indenture because we want an integrated steelworks.

Mines in isolation make money; the port in isolation is an access and would have use; the steelworks is the hard part, and the steelworks is by far the largest employer in the town. The commonwealth government and the commonwealth opposition both agree that it is a strategic interest of this country to maintain structural steelmaking, not just unfinished products but rolled products—structural steel, rail line—for obvious geopolitical reasons and obvious strategic reasons, and the most obvious reason is, of course, defence.

The state knows this is not like a standard commercial relationship. Consent is critical—it just is—because the indenture is what governs everything that occurs within the precincts of the steelworks. NRW are entitled to have their views, they are entitled to have their opinions, but it does not make them right.

Mr TEAGUE: That summary that I was providing, an extract from NRW's statement, might have just been a convenient way to cover a range of things, including the circumstances that are presently being litigated. One observation of NRW was that Whyalla Ports was incorporated back in 2011, and I know it might be regarded as ancient history in many ways, but we have been referring to Tom Playford and the beauty of the indenture.

Is the government able to make some observations just conveniently at this moment about what, if any, difficulty might have been foreshadowed by the incorporation of Whyalla Ports back in 2011 and the events that have led on since then in terms of that separate entity? Was it not a difficulty at all in 2011 and something went off the rails during Arrium's time that led to this difficulty and the need to clarify, then leading to the purported lease? Is there something the government can put on the record about that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Arrium are entitled to incorporate any entity that they like, but if they enter a lease that is when the indenture is triggered. I do not think it changes our view that we disagree with NRW's assertions, and we disagree with their filings, and we are confident that what we are attempting to do today would have been reflected in any decision. But the courts are independent—they make up their own minds—but we are confident. What we are attempting to do is, in effect, legislate what we know to be the case today: there is no lease because there is a process to grant and approve a lease, and that process was not conducted.

Mr TEAGUE: In light of those answers, does the government have therefore any broader residual concern about this particular point in time of legislating? Has it sought advice about that, knowing that a trial to determine these matters is listed to commence on 2 June? Can the government give an indication as to the comfort it has drawn about the particular issues involved in legislating in the course of litigation that would, I think we all agree, be an alternative means of determining these questions?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the best way to put it is obviously the advice is not given to us in isolation: the advice is given to us in the full knowledge that there is a court proceeding on foot. I cannot give you the advice we received. The government is confident the advice was given in the full knowledge that there are court proceedings at hand. We are comfortable that that advice navigates all those potential outcomes, and we are confident that we are on strong ground. That is the advice I have from Lipman Karas, Brendon Roberts, the Solicitor-General and the Crown Solicitor.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr PATTERSON: Commencement: obviously, this act will come into operation on the day when it is assented to, which will be imminent; that is my understanding as we go through this. Going back to some of the questions about timelines, which then goes to the commencement, the advice given is that there was a purported lease set up in June 2018. There was no knowledge of that provided to the government, and it only came to light I think in 2021 with green steel.

That has been sitting there and never was elevated to a stage where a minister could rule on it. I concur with your observation that had that been formally put to a minister, that there should be a lease on the port subject to an option to extend it to 99 years, it would have been rejected. I think that is a fair observation. If I was then the mining minister, I would have rejected it. It comes to February this year, and the government put through legislation forcing OneSteel Manufacturing into administration. The legislation that went through was carefully crafted to protect the state's interests.

At that stage, had the purported lease been elevated into the Public Service? Was it in the full knowledge of those writing the legislation that they could have also put this amendment and tied it up as part of that legislation, or did the implications of this lease only become understood as KordaMentha were going through their administration process post February and then they realised

this was going to delay, cause uncertainty and lack of clarity for a potential buyer, and understandably that is why KordaMentha took the action to take it to court to have this lease ruled as null and void, effectively? I am trying to work through the timelines as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Before the administration I had written to OneSteel Manufacturing, which was under the care and control of Mr Sanjeev Gupta, and asked about details of this purported lease, which was being reported on. There was no response. I wasn't getting the information I needed. So when we drafted the initial legislation we weren't attempting a holistic measure to wrap everything up in one bow. What we wanted to do was remove GFG from the operation, care and control of OneSteel Manufacturing because of the harm that was being done to the blast furnace, the operations, the creditors, the general reputation of OneSteel Manufacturing and because of the loss of market share and the fact that the steelworks was on its knees and he only had about a day or two of coke and coal in storage and on the water. The whole thing was unravelling.

Once the administration had been put in place we were able to garner more information, and as we have been garnering that information we have been able to have a secondary approach to all of this. It would have been a bit difficult to move this bill as a wrapped up bill at the beginning if we didn't have the information. So we weren't attempting to go in with—this might sound strange in hindsight—a sledgehammer. It was a surgical operation to remove OneSteel Manufacturing into administration.

As far as we were concerned there was no lease on the Port of Whyalla. More information has become available to us as the administration has got hold of documents and property that was not being shared with the government that should be, under the indenture. Now we are fully aware of what has occurred, and that is why we are bringing this legislation now. In terms of the clause on assent, that will be obviously as quickly as possible.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you for that; it is useful information to understand. In terms of commencement and 'as soon as possible', in my understanding debate is being guillotined today by 5.30pm with the intention now to pass it in the Legislative Council. Previously it was the understanding that there would be that delay between the sitting weeks where our upper house colleagues could understand this; however, it seems they are ready to move on posthaste. In all likelihood that means it will be assented to quite quickly.

In light of that, previously, as I said, that court order talks to there being a court hearing commencing 2 June, which was before the next sitting week, so potentially the court proceedings would have begun. Can the minister inform the committee what advice has been given about the effect of this piece of legislation on the current court proceedings? Will it in fact render them unnecessary by virtue of the fact that the lease will have been declared invalid and no compensation payable and then interests in rail infrastructure across as well?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In short, no, it will not make the core process futile. It will clarify some of the aspects of the facts of the case, and it should expedite the core procedures.

Mr PATTERSON: Going to that, from that answer I feel I know where this could potentially go, but it is still worth asking: have you received any advice on whether the action here could be challenged constitutionally or in the High Court by, probably not the plaintiff, but the defendants in the court matter that is subject to the order of VID 420/2025?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government is confident we can withstand any challenge.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr PATTERSON: My understanding is that this clause is about clarifying, because the current indenture is not clear on what the implications are if the lease is not found to be consented to. This says that the indenture will be void and of no effect, and also talks to compensation. This act has its genesis from the 1937 act and then over to the 1958 act. Are there any instances over the life

of the indenture act where consent has been asked for and not given, or any rights conferred along the way, or is this the first time this has occurred?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, Mr Gupta would regularly ask me to separate the mines out of the indenture, and I would say no.

Mr PATTERSON: In terms of the compensation clause, here it says, 'No compensation payable in respect of operation of certain provisions of the act.' I take it that means there is no compensation to, in this case, the purported leaseholder. Certainly, I raised observations in my speech and was able to ask questions in the select committee, but for the benefit of this committee—and I think also the shadow attorney has touched on this—Golding, which is a subsidiary of NRW Holdings, took security over the lease of Whyalla Ports, which is purported. Then also—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: These are not the leases you are looking for.

Mr PATTERSON: Good, not looking for these—property rights as well. They have it as an outstanding debt of \$113 million tied up with security there, which the court may well find was non-existent. We are not disputing that. This bill is trying to make that quite clear around the lease aspect of it. To clarify, this will mean not only that Whyalla Ports would not be able to seek compensation but that any third party such as I have mentioned—NRW or Golding—would not be able to either. I will leave it at that and ask you a follow-up question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a belt and braces amendment, as I am advised, to make sure that there can be no unusual action taken against the state afterwards. They have claims on the chattels that are associated in and around. We are not attempting to change anything there, but as far as we are concerned there is no lease. We agree on this. This is in an abundance of caution, and the state should not be liable for these things anyway.

Mr PATTERSON: Following up from that, it is a belt and braces approach and it signals to those that that is the case. We talked about what consultation you had with stakeholders before introducing this bill to parliament. It does appear, from that explanation, and I think most people have reached the conclusion as well, that, should this go through, Golding's, which has an outstanding debt—security will be effectively worthless from that point of view. It also talks here about putting up a regulatory power so that if there are instances where potentially the belt and braces approach has had an unintended side effect, where there was an assignment in place or some right that we want to keep in place, can the minister confirm the effect of regulatory power? Is this something anticipated, or is that in place, the fact of prescribed regulation, in case something does arise? Have you thought through the process and tried to work with good-faith parties, such as NRW Holdings, knowing that they have accrued a significant debt?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So you are talking about subsection (3)?

Mr Patterson: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That was put in place in case something unintended was captured and we could remove it from this process. I go back to the point that you made earlier. NRW, or Golding's, or whatever the organisation was that was conducting the mining operations, as a subsidiary of NRW, the publicly listed company, entered into this debt knowingly. They were operating on the basis that they presumed they were going to get paid one day. At the very end of this process, they were reaching out trying to grab everything they could because they knew—I think they were the largest creditor—that Mr Gupta did not have the resources to pay NRW, or Golding's, so they latched onto this purported lease as purported security over this port, which they do not have.

We are not the ones who are removing any security that they have. It is not us. NRW, Golding's, entered into this arrangement where they operated for GFG knowing they were not being paid and continued to accumulate debt. I know that is not what you are saying, but someone reading this may think that is what you are asserting. Golding's have accumulated \$113 million in debt, from my understanding—well over \$100 million worth of debt, well over \$80 million of debt—before they even attempted to get security over a port. But there was no lease on the port to have security over, so their due diligence is up to them. This regulatory power is to make sure that, if you capture something unintentionally, we can remove it from the process if we need to.

Mr TEAGUE: I turn to new section 6A(1), which is expressed in general terms and purports to capture everything under the Indenture Act 1937 or clause 31 of the indenture, and then has the general proviso that if the assignment or purported assignment was made with the consent of the state, granted before the assignment or purported assignment, then it is okay. Is there a reason for that clause being drafted in the general as opposed to being drafted in the specific, given that we are focused on what we know is a single purported lease and purported security taken over it?

Is the government confident of both sides of the coin in the general, that is that by voiding everything under this new subsection it is not disturbing anything else inadvertently? On the other side, I take it from everything that the government has said it is confident that there is no form of consent granted by the state that might yet be litigated even in reliance on this clause?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Subsection (3) deals with the unintended consequence that you talked about. Part 2 is the general aspect of what we are attempting to do to preserve the indenture and then we start prescribing later on in the bill the specific parts. So we have the general application, the carve-out for an unintended consequence, and then, quite brilliantly drafted, a specific focus on the lease.

Mr TEAGUE: To progress that then—tell me if this is not right—there is no present known unintended consequence that will find its way into the regulations. It is not a known unknown or an unknown known. There are no present contents of said regulation. That is actually a safety valve and there is no present intent of the government to regulate pursuant to subsection (3)?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I don't think we want to be coming back to the parliament with every agreement we might uncover.

Mr TEAGUE: We agree on it; we do not need to.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly. Because the information is coming through piecemeal, this gives us the ability to deal with it generally and for what we know, specifically, and then have the carve-out for any unintended consequence.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr PATTERSON: Just with the regulations, this gives effect to what we spoke about in the previous clause in 6A(3). These are what the regulations can stipulate. In terms of the court case that is scheduled for 2 June, that will decide on property rights or rights that have been conferred potentially. If it turns out that the court finds in favour of the defendant—that there seem to be some rights that are able to be conferred—would this regulation then allow that to be inserted back in, or is it basically 'belts and braces', as the minister explained?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not think it is a scenario that the government believes will occur, given that we know no lease has been granted. So I am just not sure how that could eventuate, and we obviously still have, in the earlier provision, what I have coined the 'safety valve'—subsection (3)—which allows us to remove any unintended consequence.

Mr PATTERSON: I am comfortable with that. That talks more to the regulation-making powers to be in place if something comes to light—a right or a property that is required—as opposed to being there because the government think the advice they are getting is sound and that the court case, the action that KordaMentha is taking, will be successful, as that may not be the case. So, for the absence of doubt: the government have not received advice—because your evidence to the committee is that the government are doing this because they have advice that the position is sound—there is no advice provided (I cannot remember the names of each of the legal advisers you outlined) that states that actually the government is at risk in certain situations and that therefore you may have to introduce it back in.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice we have from Lipman Karas, Brendon Roberts and the Crown—lawyers of the Crown, from the Solicitor-General down—is that there are no issues that we anticipate will cause us any problems.

Mr PATTERSON: Can the minister advise, in terms of this amendment, if this could alter any rights of parties that are registered with the national Personal Properties Securities Register and, if there are alterations, what they might be?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My understanding is, from what has been explained to me—and I have forgotten the acronym that you used—that the only property that is protected for the purposes of the PPSA is property that is appropriately covered by the indenture. Or rather, the only property taken out of the operation of the PPSA is property controlled by the indenture.

Mr PATTERSON: Just to make sure we are talking about the same thing: it is the PPSR, the Personal Property Securities Register. Sorry I did not correct you before. I am assuming you mean the same register, but just in case you were referring to a different one.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are talking about the act, but yes.

Mr TEAGUE: That is helpful for the record, that the intent of all this is to limit its scope to those things that are properly the subject of the indenture: so fixtures, real property and doing away with the purported lease. There might be an opportunity to deal with that at clause 5 in a moment because there has been quite a lot of particularisation of various fixtures.

Given that the regulations speak to new section 6A(3) and the unintended consequences, and that we understand nothing is specifically known to the government at the moment—so there are no regulations that are in the works—and it is a hybrid bill and the government I think has said, 'It's a hybrid bill because it's affecting OneSteel,' and I think I said in the course of the second reading debate, 'It's also, we see from the proceedings, arguably affecting the private interests of one contractor in particular: the subsidiary of NRW, Golding,' is the government able to advise the house in terms of the general characterisation of this so far as Golding is concerned?

Is this proposition good: that the government has satisfied itself that Golding—or anybody else who has been doing business with Gupta over the last period of time, the period that Golding purported to take security and then continued to trade—was foolish to do so and was on thin ice and that the chips fall where they may as a result? Is the government content that it is not necessary to provide any more comfort to Golding and it has just taken its chances and that is the way it crumbles, to put it in the vernacular?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The way I view what Golding has done is: anyone who looks at this business knows that it is governed by an indenture. It had a royalty regime governed by an indenture, it had development approvals governed by an indenture, it had land access governed by an indenture and it had maritime access governed by an indenture.

If you are taking security over a piece of land that is covered by an indenture, I would have thought you would hire someone like yourself or the Solicitor-General or whoever to go through it and say, 'We are being offered this security at the end of a very long process where we are owed \$113 million and this guy is not paying his bills to anyone, but, by the way, he is holding up this bauble and he says it's worth X.' Where is the DD on that? The first DD is: you go to the indenture. Has the lease between Whyalla Ports Pty Ltd and OneSteel Manufacturing been approved by the South Australian government? Otherwise, there is no lease. There is no 99-year lease to have security over. There is nothing you can sell. There is nothing you can do with it.

As I said earlier, I have met Jules Pemberton a couple of times. I do not make any disparaging remarks about him at all. He is a businessman and the board has confidence in him. The board and their risk committee will look at this after this has all washed out and probably ask themselves some very difficult questions. But I do not blame Golding. I blame Sanjeev Gupta, who used dry cleaners, snack bars, steel fabricators not as customers but as banks. He borrowed money from them and he was not paying it back, and Golding were no different here.

Golding, unfortunately I think, got into the trap where they were owed too much to stop and had to keep on going to try to get some of their money back. I do not know what internal discussions that they had, that is a matter for them, but any due diligence over a purported port lease with OneSteel, a quick email or a letter to the South Australian government maybe could have sorted all that out.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr PATTERSON: As I think I spoke to previously, the first part of the bill, the clauses that we have gone through to date, 1 through 4, talk about giving clarity to what happens if there was not consent asked for or given to the transfer of property rights assignments. This clause here inserts schedule 4 and it is specifically around the lease relating to the Port of Whyalla, declaring that specifically void. If the minister can talk through the fact that we have already got clause 3, which talks about: this is what happens when it is void, no compensation payable.

The rationale for having this particular schedule is because it is now talking to the specifics, so it is actually specifically mentioning the purported lease and going through in great detail around that. It declares that, 'Lease or purported lease over prescribed land is void,' which I think we have talked through here. We are in furious agreement and we can agree with that. Then there is, 'Interests in certain rail and other infrastructure is void and of no effect,' as well. Maybe if the minister can give some commentary, at a broader level, around the schedule 4, but then focusing in on, 'Interests in certain rail and other infrastructure,' which is over and above the lease, because I think there is quite a good understanding around the lease from the questions we have asked. It is this next part around rail and other infrastructure which gives cause to additional questions.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The understanding that I have from the advice I have received is that the first clauses that we are talking about were general. In the schedule we are now talking about the specific parts of the lease and the parts of the land that are particular to the lease. That should be covered and protected within the indenture. We are now drilling down out of an abundance of caution and it is spelling out what it is we are interested in. That is probably poorly put, but I think you understand the intent of what I am trying to say is we have a general clause, we have the general cover all, we have the regulation to any inadvertent mistake and here we are now homing in on the parts that we are focused on, which are in the lease, impacted by the lease and covered by the lease. This purported lease says X and we are covering the things that we think are connected to the indenture.

Mr PATTERSON: Picking up on more questions along the line of that schedule about the interests in certain rail and other infrastructure being void, I note that NRW put out a release to the ASX yesterday. I will go through it a little bit and that will help give information as to the question I am talking to. They made the claim here that NRW Holdings Limited had a 'first-ranking security over the assets and shares of Whyalla Ports in respect of money owed by OneSteel Manufacturing'. We have talked through the prudence of them so doing that. The announcement states:

Golding's security interest attaches to both Whyalla Ports' assets and its contractual rights, including Whyalla Port's rights under a lease with OneSteel.

We have talked a lot about the lease, and I think we are in furious agreement about that. The next question is going to relate to that other part, which is the assets of Whyalla Ports, and I go back to what NRW Holdings said:

A number of Whyalla Ports' key assets with substantial value (which are the subject of Golding's security) are located on the leased Port premises.

They then go on to say:

That security was granted to secure OneSteel's indebtedness to Golding...

Again, we can talk about the prudence of that. The amount owed is \$113 million. They then go on to talk about the implication of the specific section within schedule 4, section 4, basically stating interests in certain rail and other infrastructure being void. I will ask for clarification or an outline from the minister around what 'other infrastructure' entails as well. The press release goes on to say:

The likely effect of the Proposed Bill is to cause the lease agreement granted by OneSteel...to have never had legal effect.

Yes. It then goes on to say:

...the Proposed Bill will clarify that the creation of an interest in certain infrastructure constructed on the port facilities is void and that the infrastructure forms part of the land is not personal property. This will likely mean that the

Proposed Bill will cause ownership of the infrastructure constructed and paid for by Whyalla Ports on the port facilities to now be owned by OneSteel...

So the question then becomes—and we did talk about this in the select committee, and I think it would be worth elevating this to the broader committee on the bill as well—what is the impact of other infrastructure? Whyalla Ports was started back in 2011. Over time, it would have built up infrastructure, such as the conveyor belts that go along there, the ship loaders. Those assets are purported, according to NRW, to have a substantial material value approximating the \$113 million that they are owed. We can argue about that, but if we just talk about those assets, can the minister talk through the other infrastructure?

Will that impact, as I said, all the conveyor belts that go on there, the ship loaders, the other assets that are on the port? Will they be moved over to OneSteel? The impact of this transfer means that obviously it would impair and undermine Golding's security. We can understand that. Trying to get to the point of this decision, is there an issue as well if it is the case that these assets are getting transferred? Is there certainty from the government that Whyalla Ports, between 2011 and 2018—when it was sold as part of the first administration process—has not then built up those assets and that they are then getting transferred across to OneSteel? As NRW says, this would:

...enable OneSteel to usurp that personal property by declaring it void and part of the land, with ownership vesting to OneSteel without any mention of compensation to Whyalla Ports.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Obviously, the rail infrastructure is dealt with in paragraph (a):

- (a) a tramway or railway made, formed, laid down, constructed by or on behalf of the Company, or an extension of a tramway or railway, on the prescribed land...

That prescribed land is land owned by OneSteel. Other infrastructure is dealt with by:

- (b) any jetties, wharves, works, buildings, approaches, road ways, conveniences, vermin fences, dog proof fences or rabbit proof fences erected or constructed by or on behalf of the Company on the prescribed land...

—owned by OneSteel for the operation of a port under the indenture. So if Whyalla Ports Pty Ltd, whatever that is, built anything permanent, it was being built on OneSteel's land because Whyalla Ports Pty Ltd did not excise that land. If it did, it would need ministerial approval under the indenture. So whatever has been built for the operation of a port has been built on OneSteel's land. What we are doing here is dealing with that to make sure it is clear that the real property is preserved for the operation of a port under the indenture, the purpose for which it was built.

I will also go a step further: I think it is correct to say to the house that the approvals under the indenture to build this infrastructure were to build in the interests of OneSteel under the indenture. Whatever NRW or Golding claim that they have as security through a purported lease, whatever that purported lease claims to be, the land all of this is on is OneSteel's land. Any separation of that under the indenture needs ministerial approval, and none was given. So we are clarifying exactly what is in the interests of the land under the indenture for the safe and secure operation of a port, and we are securing it.

Mr PATTERSON: I am trying to work my way through this and relate it back to everyday circumstances. Say, for example, in council areas there is council land and a sporting club wants to build a building for a training facility. Usually they have a lease, so then the sporting club can say, 'If we go to the extent of spending our money, at least we know we have tenure over the land.' Unlike when you have Torrens title and you own everything, they are building that building and know that ultimately, effectively, they are improving the council's land. 'We do not really have claims to that building, but because there is a valid lease in place, we will get to use it.' Correct me if that analogy is wrong.

In enacting this bill, effectively this schedule is really honing in and putting property under OneSteel Manufacturing's control. The point of the exercise is to allow a potential buyer to have some clarity and certainty. I know that KordaMentha has said publicly that two buyers have already gone through the site. Is this legislation being put in place now because there is a buyer ready and willing to buy it when this act is assented to? Is that forcing the expeditious nature of this bill, going to the

upper house today, or in fact is this just clearing the decks and then the normal process of buying will continue?

As my final question, maybe the minister could talk through where the process is at in terms of a buyer. Is it that the buyer is basically ready to go, and once this is cleared that can commence, or are we still looking into the future where the process of securing a buyer still has to be undertaken?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the analogy about the council is a good one—about the port as being a subsidiary of the council. Improving the land ultimately still vests with the council at the end.

In terms of the buyer, no, to my knowledge there is not a buyer ready to go who is going to hand over a cheque tomorrow and purchase it. There is a process underway by the administrator. They are doing an independent process. Yes, the state and commonwealth government are funding the administration, and that would imply that we are doing our very best to make sure that this process is done properly. But KordaMentha have 333 Capital, which is assessing potential buyers; and there is a data room that is open, and people are looking at the data available for mine expansion, operation of the steelworks, what the money from the commonwealth and state governments is linked to in terms of a beneficiation of the electric arc furnace and a direct iron reduction facility, what the gas availability is, and, of course, the access to the port.

So what we are attempting to do here is to spell out what is already the case now but make it clear to clear the way for a sale process. We are not rushing this through because there is a buyer waiting at the end. There is a process to go through, and that process is conducted under the Corporations Act by the administrator who has been appointed. So they will conduct a sale process, but we as the state and commonwealth government control the moneys for the reinvestment, not the administrator. We fund the administration, we are funding recapitalisation and we have got the money for the transformation.

So, obviously, we are an interested party. We want to see who has the capability to deliver these things. What is their reputation? I think it is fair to say that the Sanjeev Guptas of this world need not apply. I think we are looking for people with demonstrable experience in steelmaking, transformation, distribution, mining capability, port operation and operation of an integrated steelworks.

I cannot tell you the number of times people have come to me in my office to tell me to close the blast furnace. 'Don't worry about the jobs. Close the blast furnace. The port will be fine. We will use it to export the ore, fund met 1, met 2—the mining expansion programs—and just make it an iron ore mine.' It will be, 'Oh, well, we used to make steel, bad luck.' That is not the government's aspiration, not the commonwealth government's aspiration, not the commonwealth opposition's aspiration and I do not think it is your aspiration. We want to see steel made in Australia, so we want to see a good buyer.

One of the things we need to clear up is to make clear what is the case now, and because of what is occurring with the administrator and any potential legal action we are just stating what the state believes are the facts to protect the indenture for any successful purchaser to know that they have a clean site.

Mr TEAGUE: Just in respect of the lease or the purported lease, as we are calling it, is it or was it registrable? Was it ever registered? Has there ever been duty paid on it? Has there ever been any trigger for it to be otherwise evidenced?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is an excellent question. I am glad you asked it. No. And I would have thought in that statement published to the ASX if that was available they would have said so. No duties have been paid. It was not registered. That is the advice I have. So I am not quite sure on what basis this purported lease was taken as security.

Mr TEAGUE: I think I referred earlier to the fact that there has been a fair bit of effort to spell out, and now we are getting very specific, a whole variety of items—this is particularly at clause 4 of the new schedule—that all fall into the category of fixtures and, according to ordinary principles, that would all therefore be captured. Is there any particular reason for spelling out each and every one of those fixtures? Is it because it is a diligent exercise and they are all known to be fixtures at the site?

For example, there are various different kinds of fences that are stipulated, but they are all characterised by the nature of being fixtures.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That infrastructure listed is all the infrastructure that is recognised by the current indenture.

Mr TEAGUE: So that is the rationale, rather than that they are all necessarily to be found on the site? It is that they are recognised by reference to the indenture. My final question on clause 5 goes to, perhaps, a broad point. Is the government satisfied—it might be an easy answer to say that no-one is getting windfall gains out of any of what is going on—by dint of Golding not being able to enjoy the security it thought it had, and given it is continuing to trade and provide services and invest in the whole operation, that there is no windfall that is coming OneSteel's way the result directly of this legislation; that is, there is not an unfairness being visited upon Golding beyond the taking away of what the government has already described as an attempt to gain some security that was not really there?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Their debts are still part of the administration process. No-one is saying that that \$113 million debt no longer exists: it is still part of the administration process. But I say the reverse is true. If I were to be unkind to Golding, they are trying to deprive OneSteel of something that is rightly theirs on the basis of a purported lease and a purported security done under distress at the very end of a long drawn-out process of non-payment.

There are two ways of looking at this. An ASX-listed company is seeking to deprive OneSteel of land that belongs to it under an indenture, under which the government did not agree to this 99-year lease, and wants us to recognise it. What we are doing here in this process is preserving what the state has agreed to with OneSteel under an indenture. I take your point, and Golding's rights under the administration are preserved, but we are also preserving our rights under the indenture.

Mr TEAGUE: I appreciate the answer. If the Chair wants to deprive me, I will cop that and maybe put it in the third reading. It can be dealt with quickly.

The CHAIR: Okay. I will take your word for it.

Mr TEAGUE: I understand that. I understand the proposition about the potential for that attempt at security to deprive other creditors and so on. The question is going, really, to whether or not the government is aware of any particular super-added investment that Golding made in the interests of keeping the show on the road directly off the back of its purported security, and therefore by taking away the security there is a sort of windfall of a kind to OneSteel as a result.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Good point. This is my understanding of how it operates. This is going to be an inarticulate explanation of the way that mining operations work. Golding are not being paid. There is a cost in de-escalating, that is, withdrawing from the site. They would incur a cost and they have to write up the debt. They have to recognise that debt immediately. By continuing to work, Golding are not having to realise the debt and they are saving costs in demobilising their workforce.

They were receiving some payments in arrears, but not covering their debt. Every month that went on, their debt was going up and up and, if they demobilised at any point, they would have to realise that debt or get to the point where it became obvious that they were no longer the miner, they had no leverage over continuing the mining operations. The leverage that Golding had, in my opinion, from looking at their operations, was they were the miner, they were the ones generating the revenue for GFG, so they were attempting to do what they could to try to maintain their position.

Did they get any windfall? Did they grant us any windfall? No, I do not think they did. In fact, I think at every stage Golding have acted in the interests of its shareholders rather than in the interests of Whyalla, as you would expect them to do. I do not think there is an ASX-listed company anywhere in Australia that acts in the interests of its community that it operates in above its shareholders. It operates in the interests of its shareholders; in fact, it has a legal requirement to do so.

Mr PATTERSON: There are many to go through. In terms of Whyalla Ports itself, by not having a lease, not having assets, how does it generate income? Has the government received any

advice or consideration, as part of this, that it may cause Whyalla Ports to go into administration? I do not think you will get too many tears for Whyalla Ports going into administration, but what is the flow-on effect to companies that may well have debts accrued? Also, potentially, will it have an effect on the current administration of OneSteel Manufacturing, and what advice might that be?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suppose if you ask Mr Gupta, all of his companies are trading solvent and there is no reason to believe that Whyalla Ports is trading insolvent. That would be an offence under numerous pieces of legislation. I do not know. The administrator has an obligation to act in the best interests of OneSteel. We are acting in the best interests of the state. We are preserving and protecting the integrity of the indenture, and for other companies that wish to enter indentures with us to know the indentures will be upheld.

I think we are exercising the very best of the indenture model, as first touted by Mr Playford standing behind me, to give certainty to companies that enter into agreements with the South Australian government, and that is what we are maintaining. Whyalla Ports going into administration or otherwise is a matter for their directors, not a matter for the South Australian government.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:14): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL LAW (FORENSIC PROCEDURES) (BLOOD TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (17:14): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) (Blood Testing) Amendment Bill 2024. The bill delivers on an election commitment made by the government to compel offenders who bite or spit on our police officers or emergency workers to undergo blood testing for communicable diseases. The government has made it a priority to support our frontline emergency workers who take on high-risk roles in order to keep the community safe. Police and emergency workers are all too often assaulted, bitten and spat on in the course of their duties.

Section 20AA of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 now contains specific offences to deal with offenders who assault or cause harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties. These attract high penalties, reflecting the seriousness with which the parliament deems this type of offending.

As at 26 February 2024, 2,711 defendants have been charged with assaulting or causing harm to emergency workers under those provisions since coming into operation in October 2019. This kind of antisocial behaviour is completely unacceptable and puts police and emergency workers at risk, not only in terms of physical and psychological injury but also in relation to the transmission of a communicable disease.

When a person is exposed to blood-borne diseases, including HIV or hepatitis B or C, it can be some time before any infection becomes detectable in that person's blood. This period between exposure and possible detection called the window period can last several months. Police and emergency workers who have been exposed to biological material in the course of their work may experience extreme levels of stress and anxiety during the window period because they do not know

whether they have been exposed to a communicable disease. The intent of the election commitment, and of this bill, is to ensure that the affected worker has timely access to information about whether they have been exposed to a communicable disease should they wish to be so informed.

The bill builds on existing provisions in division 4 of part 2 of the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007, which provide a mechanism for a senior police officer, referred to as the authorising officer, to authorise the taking of blood from a person who assaults a police officer or other emergency services worker. Section 20B(1) of the act currently gives the authorising officer a discretion to authorise the taking of blood samples from a person who is suspected of a prescribed serious offence if satisfied that it is likely a person engaged in prescribed employment came into contact with or was otherwise exposed to the suspect's biological material as a result of the suspected offence.

Relevant definitions, including a 'prescribed serious offence' and 'prescribed employment' are contained in section 20A of the act. The bill deletes section 20B of the act and substitutes new section 20B, the key changes of which are contained in subsections (1a), (2) and (3). The remainder of new section 20B replicates the existing provisions.

Under new section 20B(2), if the person engaged in prescribed employment requests authorisation of blood testing within the prescribed time period following the exposure and in a manner determined by the Commissioner of Police, the authorising officer must grant the request. That time period is seven days or, if the authorising officer considers that the person did not have a reasonable opportunity to make the request in that timeframe due to injury or other extenuating circumstances, such longer period, not exceeding six months, as the authorising officer considers appropriate in the circumstances.

The authorising officer must still be satisfied that the requirements in section 20B(1) are met before granting the authorisation. That is, the authorising officer must be satisfied that the person from whom the sample is to be taken is suspected of a prescribed serious offence and that, as a result of the suspected offending, the affected worker came into contact with, or was exposed to, the suspect's biological material. Provided these conditions are met, new subsection (2) provides that the authorising officer must authorise blood testing in accordance with the affected worker's request.

However, under subsection (3) the changes in subsection (2) do not apply if the authorising officer knows that the person on whom the forensic procedure would be carried out is a protected person. A protected person is defined in the act as a child or a person physically or mentally incapable of understanding the nature and consequences of a forensic procedure. A senior police officer would still retain the existing discretion to authorise blood testing in cases where no request is made by the affected worker or where the authorising officer knows the suspect is a protected person.

New subsection (1a) of section 20B, moved as an amendment to the bill by the Hon. Robert Simms MLC in the other place, was supported by the government. It makes the purpose of these provisions abundantly clear; that is, to facilitate blood testing of a suspect for the purposes of testing for the presence of any communicable disease which may be detected in blood.

The bill also makes changes to some of the definitions contained in section 20A of the act. Firstly, an authorisation under section 20B of the act may only be granted following contact with, or exposure to, biological material by a person in prescribed employment. The bill amends the definition of prescribed employment and the related definition of emergency work in section 20A of the act to include additional categories of workers who perform emergency work or who are at a similarly high risk of being bitten or spat on.

Under the current provision, the categories of workers include police officers; certain hospital workers, including medical practitioners, nurses and midwives; correctional services workers; and those employed in emergency work in SA Ambulance Service, Country Fire Service, Metropolitan Fire Service, State Emergency Service, St John's Ambulance, Surf Life Saving, marine rescue or the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The bill extends the scope of these provisions to include all persons authorised to provide emergency and non-emergency ambulance services under sections 57 and 58 of the Health Care Act 2008: police security officers, health practitioners in a hospital, and youth justice officers. The bill also provides a mechanism for further classes of workers to be prescribed by regulation, should the need arise.

The bill also makes amendments to the definition of a prescribed serious offence to reflect changes made to the criminal law since the commencement of division 4 of part 2 of the act. As I have outlined, an authorisation pursuant to section 20B of the act may only be made in respect of a person suspected of committing a prescribed serious offence. The bill expands the definition of 'prescribed serious offence' to include offences against sections 20AA and 2AB of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, which were introduced in 2019; that is, the offence of causing harm to or assaulting a prescribed emergency worker, and the offence of committing a prohibited act by intentionally causing human biological material to come into contact with another person.

Clause 5 amends section 28 of the act by adding a note at the foot of the section that makes it clear that a forensic procedure authorised under part 2, division 4 of the act is, for the purposes of part 3 of the act, a suspects procedure, and therefore the special provisions in part 3, division 2 apply when carrying out such a procedure.

I would like to thank the Police Association of South Australia for its tireless advocacy to improve the safety and wellbeing of its members and others affected by this issue and for its contributions to the development of this bill. This government is making a concerted effort to improve conditions for police and emergency services workers. The 2022-23 state budget delivered on an election commitment by providing additional funding to SAPOL to purchase an additional 1,500 protective vests for all frontline police. We also established a Premier's task force to review and make recommendations on increasing the number of sworn officers and police security officers over the next 10 to 15 years, along with funding for 189 sworn police security officers in the 2023-24 state budget.

I commend the bill to members and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007*

3—Amendment of section 20A—Interpretation

This clause makes amendments to the definitions of *emergency service provider*, *prescribed employment* and *prescribed serious offence* for the purposes of the measure and consequentially deletes the definition of *medical practitioner* as it will no longer be necessary.

4—Substitution of section 20B

This clause substitutes section 20B of the Act as follows:

20B—Senior police officer may authorise taking of blood sample from certain persons

Proposed section 20B allows a person working in certain types of employment to make a request to a senior police officer to authorise a forensic procedure consisting of the taking of a blood sample from a person where they have come into contact with, or otherwise been exposed to, the biological material of the person as a result of an offence the person is suspected of committing, and makes related procedural provisions, including providing for circumstances where the senior police officer must authorise the forensic procedure.

5—Amendment of section 28—Application of Division

This clause amends section 28 by adding a note at the foot the section which makes it clear that a forensic procedure authorised under Part 2 Division 4 of the Act is, for the purposes of Part 3 of the Act, a suspects procedure, and therefore the provisions in Part 3 Division 2 apply when carrying out such a procedure.

Debate adjourned on motion of S.E. Andrews.

STATE DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION AND FACILITATION BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed not to insist on its amendment No. 4 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed; and agreed to the alternative amendment made by the House of Assembly without any amendment.

*Parliamentary Procedure***SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (17:25): I move:

That the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 17:25 to 18:20.

*Bills***CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DEFENCES—INTOXICATION) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (BARRING NOTICES AND OTHER PROTECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES (DISABILITY PARKING PERMIT SCHEME) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

WHYALLA STEEL WORKS (PORT OF WHYALLA) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:22 the house adjourned until Tuesday 3 June 2025 at 11:00.