

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 5 June 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.

Motions

TRURO BYPASS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:02): I move:

That this house refers the eligible petition presented to the House of Assembly on 17 October 2023 from 12,436 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to commit to the duplication of the Sturt Highway Truro freight route to address safety concerns and boost productivity for the 4,500 vehicles that travel the Sturt Highway daily to the Economic and Finance Committee.

I rise to contribute to this important opportunity with regard to the Truro freight route petition that was lodged late last year with the South Australian parliament. I take this opportunity to put on the record that the Sturt Highway in South Australia is a primary route from the Northern Connector via the Riverland to the Eastern States. It is a vital link to our regions and a critical route for freight and tourism.

The 12,436 South Australians signed that petition in good faith that the current state Labor government would act on it, and it really showed the dedication of those who use the Sturt Highway, some of them on a daily basis, some of them on an intermittent basis for different reasons. The Sturt Highway, particularly the stretch between Gawler and Renmark, has become one of the state's deadliest roads. This initiative, this petition, is not only a productivity gain but an absolute monumental safety concern. What we are looking for is to make South Australia's roads safer, particularly the Sturt Highway.

Some of the stats on the average road use of that 50-kilometre section through Truro show that about 40,000 vehicles traverse that section of road daily. Of those, 2,600 are private class vehicles, class 1 and class 2. Class 1 is a standard passenger vehicle. Class 2 is a passenger vehicle towing either a trailer, caravan or boat, and 35 per cent are heavy commercial vehicles. A breakdown would show that 340 are class 3 to 5 vehicles, which are rigid trucks, through to a class 6 three-axle articulated vehicle. There are 300 class 6 to 9 vehicles, which are from a six to a 19-metre semitrailer. There are 500 class 10 vehicles, which are a typical dual-axle drive, tri-axle trailer or a B-double.

There are 190 class 11 vehicles. The class 11s are really interesting. We have seen those vehicles introduced over recent years on the Sturt Highway to reduce the number of heavy vehicles on our road. Yes, they are longer; they vary between 30 and 36 metres. It is showing that we are reducing the number of heavy vehicles on the Sturt Highway, but it is also quite intimidating for those who are uninitiated in dealing with a large, heavy-mass vehicle, because of its length and because of the power that they are putting in prime movers today. Some of those prime movers can almost travel at 90 km/h in most instances, some of them up to 100 km/h, at any given time.

There is a bit of a bottleneck as we move past Halfway House Road, which is the Sedan turn-off, which is part of the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass. As they make their way up Accommodation Hill, some of those big vehicles are then coming back down to between 40 and 60 km/h. It really does take the breath away of those who are not ready for some of those big vehicles that are travelling slowly. But if you are in a passenger vehicle travelling at 110 km/h, you come up on those vehicles very, very quickly, so we need to be prepared. That is why we need to have the upgrades of the Sturt Highway and particularly for the Truro freight bypass.

Tourism is one of the great industries in South Australia, no more so than in the Riverland, where it is the second largest industry. The Riverland had approximately 410,000 domestic overnight visitors. If you extrapolate that and put that into context, whether you are a private citizen driving a class 1 or a class 2 vehicle coming up on a holiday or for a destination into the Riverland, whether you are just travelling home or whether you are coming up to visit, it shows the importance of the road network and how road safety must be of paramount importance. It is also good for our economy and good for South Australia when we have people visiting by road, creating an economy that otherwise would not be there.

Road safety is the number one issue on regional roads in South Australia and, as I have said, no more so than on the Sturt Highway, because it is South Australia's second deadliest road. It has a high fatality rate. Since 2018, over 40 people have been killed on the Sturt Highway in South Australia, with another four recorded just last year.

I travel the Sturt Highway on a regular basis. Obviously, the great electorate of Chaffey makes its way from the border all the way down to Mannum. The Sturt Highway is an introduction out of the Riverland, down through the Truro Flats, through the Barossa and into the Adelaide Plains. It is one of the great arterial roads, not only for a freight network but for destination travelling.

I call for the delivery of the Truro freight bypass. It is a dual-lane bypass, essentially for safety, and also for freight productivity and efficiency, the network reliability and to make sure that people feel safe on the Sturt Highway, either when they are travelling or when they are using it to visit the Riverland. The duplication must be a priority for the region, and I know that it is strongly supported by the community.

To give a little bit more technical detail, there are a number of local MPs on this side of the chamber who have a connection with not only the Sturt Highway but also the proposed Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass, which incorporates the Truro freight bypass. Of course, the member for Hammond has the great electorate just to the south-east of Chaffey, and that connection is off the South Eastern Freeway through the Halfway House Road. Potentially, there is another idea that has been put on the table with that connection, and that is the turn-off at the Murray Bridge Road before the Swanport Bridge when heading south. That is another connection that hooks directly between the South Eastern Freeway and the Sturt Highway.

We do not want to put our blinkers on and say that we have to turn off at Monarto, head through the Halfway House Road connection, onto the Sturt Highway and then come in to the north of Adelaide via the Sturt Highway, onto the Northern Expressway, onto the Northern Connector and then into the port or into the Adelaide CBD.

This project has been, and always will be, strongly supported by the community. Not only is there a connection between Hammond and Chaffey, there is also Schubert. Truro is in the electorate of Schubert, and those people are also very concerned about the safety aspect of the Sturt Highway running through that small community. We must be mindful that that transition with a freight bypass is there for the longevity of Truro, making sure that it does retain its small economy, because it does have visitation. Truro is a small country town that is on a federal highway.

It also must be mentioned that local governments have all put their support behind this project. I have six councils in my electorate and all three Riverland councils, their mayors and their elected members are very much in favour and support this project, as are the Mid Murray Council and the Barossa and Light councils. They want to make sure that any federal highway that runs through their area is up to speed.

The Sturt Highway is seeing a lot of heavy vehicles, and we are seeing a lot more heavy vehicles on the highway. Sadly, the cessation of rail between Pinnaroo and Tailem Bend, between Tookayerta or Loxton and Tailem Bend, saw those two rail lines cease, so all of that grain freight was then put onto the road. What we are seeing now is that the majority of the grain freight is either on the Mallee Highway or the Sturt Highway. A lot of trucking lines and freight companies are bypassing off the Mallee Highway through the Browns Well Highway onto the Sturt Highway, and that is increasing the load on that highway.

Never before have we seen such an increase in the horticulture sector. We are now seeing large tonnages of almonds and citrus that were never there before and are now traversing, because it is one of the great export sectors here in South Australia, and we are seeing other products. A lot more inputs are coming up along the Sturt Highway for farming enterprises so that they can actually make their businesses viable. That is adding to the pressure on the highways and it is adding to the number of vehicles on our highways.

We have a growing tourism sector, a growing horticulture sector and a growing ag sector. I pay tribute to our farmers who are doing it pretty tough at the moment, but they will rise and they will make sure that they get those tonnages and quotas back up, potentially in the upcoming season.

The RAA's senior safety manager, Charles Mountain, has also stated that duplicating the Sturt Highway would substantially improve safety on our roads, and this is an opportunity to improve safety on one of South Australia's most dangerous highways. This petition has been in the best interests of all those who use the highway regularly—as I said, as do I—and it is critical that the state government commit to delivering the freight route project as a dual-lane highway.

The state government must not hide from the offering of the federal government's fifty-fifty split—or, if they do not want to stump up the fifty-fifty, how about they renegotiate? How about they go back to the negotiating table and look for that 80:20 split? I know that the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport claimed yesterday that they have just spent \$2.4 billion to save a town; just over \$200 million is about saving a life. I plead with this government, I plead with the minister, to stump it up. Make our Sturt Highway safer, give it efficiencies and give people a better experience utilising the Sturt Highway.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:17): I rise to support this motion by the member for Chaffey:

That this house refers the eligible petition presented to the House of Assembly on 17 October 2023 from 12,436 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to commit to the duplication of the Sturt Highway Truro freight route to address safety concerns and boost productivity for the 4,500 vehicles that travel the Sturt Highway daily to the Economic and Finance Committee.

As the house has been informed by the member for Chaffey, this is a vitally important project. This was a project that was previously funded—albeit, I believe, as a single lane each-way freight route bypass project—for \$202 million. Sadly, Labor governments pushed back and pulled the funding, so this project was put on the backburner. It is a vital project because in the town of Truro, if anyone travels through it, the road is very close to many businesses on each side of the road, whether it be fuel stops, bakeries, hotels and some dwellings as well, so it is of deep-seated concern to the residents and business owners of Truro that this freight bypass be appropriately put in place.

This brings to mind the greater issue of the three great freight routes around our area in South Australia. We obviously have the Augusta Highway which still needs close to 180 kilometres of duplication to get the Port Wakefield to Lochiel section finished, which we started in about 2020. It took a long time to get that completed, but my understanding is that section has been completed, so we need that opened up so that we can get triple road trains or 53-metre vehicles to be able to travel from Adelaide through to Darwin. But what we also need is the full duplication of the Sturt Highway and full duplication of the Dukes Highway.

To do these three projects will be somewhere north of \$10 billion, I believe, but that is not a bad value for money figure. I know it is a lot of money when you compare that to the few kilometres we are getting in this state for the \$15.4 billion Torrens to Darlington upgrade on South Road—which does need to happen, I will say, but we must compare it to the number of kilometres that can be done so that people travelling on these regional highways can travel more safely, saving those many, sadly, dozens of deaths on these highways and physical injuries. We can see how dangerous it is, especially for freight vehicles on these highways during dust storms. You have got drivers who are under pressure to get their freight through, and travelling in very severe conditions like those exhibited the other day during the massive dust storm. So we need this vital work, especially this freight bypass to go around Truro.

It is part of the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass and the current planning is to come off at Halfway House, and the intersection has already been built there for triple road train access, the 53-metre long vehicles, to turn down to Sedan and Cambrai, and those two small towns will need a

bypass around them as well, because essentially the road now goes directly through them. Like Truro, heavy trucks come straight through those towns and they come down towards Mannum and then onto the Mannum to Murray Bridge Road and then on the freight bypass around Murray Bridge.

The proposal is for that to go around to Monarto, and I note that already there are quite a few trucks coming out on the Monarto end. If that is the proposed route into the future that will need a roundabout and it will need works around how it comes across the Adelaide-Melbourne railway line as well. Certainly as part of that project, my understanding at the moment is it would be the duplication of the Swanport Bridge, which has to happen to allow those triple road trains access over that bridge. As I have indicated in this place here before, that should have happened way back in the late 1970s when the single lane each-way Swanport Bridge opened in 1979.

This is a vital upgrade for heavy freight and it actually takes away many thousands of tonnes having to come through Adelaide, but we need to make it convenient, because the thing that people sometimes forget about truck drivers is they are up against logbook hours and it does take extra time to go on the bypass. It might be an hour and a half extra, or something like that. It may be a little bit different to that, but it does take up time. Drivers, as they should be, are heavily regulated on the hours they can drive and the hours that they have to rest, and that is heavily policed, I must say as well, which is a good thing. We have to be mindful of that. It is not just about seeing how far out we can push the freight. We have to have the reality of real life, of how the drivers have to operate.

The stark reality is—and I know there are lots of conversations about freight coming down the freeway, and there will be some of that still over time, for the freight that has to come into the southern end of Adelaide. The biggest trucks that can come down the freeway are B-doubles. On these longer freight routes you can have B-triples, B-quads, two-trailer road trains, and you can already have AB-doubles, which are like a single semitrailer towing a B-double behind that.

Eventually, as the road network is being built up so that those three-trailer road trains can be utilised, there will be fewer truck drivers on the road and a lesser amount of vehicles on the road. Yes, they will be longer vehicles. As the member for Chaffey indicated, some of these vehicles, especially the road trains, the two-trailer road trains and above, only travel at 90 km/h. They are more regulated than semitrailers and B-doubles.

We just have to be mindful of how that is going to operate, because people, no matter where they live, appreciate their goods being delivered and they have to get there somehow, but everyone has to act in a safe manner on the road, and if we can do our bit from this place to ensure that happens that is better for the whole of society. I fully commend the motion and I want to see it go through the relevant committee and get the right outcomes, because that freight bypass has to be built and the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass has to be fully completed into the future.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:24): I rise simply to indicate that the government supports the motion to refer this petition to the Economic and Finance Committee, and I hope they do a speedy job.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:25): I thank the member for Hammond for his contribution and the government for its support for the petition to be referred to the Economic and Finance Committee. It is a very, very important piece of infrastructure that could save lives. As I stated in my contribution, there have been 44 lives lost on that section of the Sturt Highway since 2018, and that is 44 lives too many. Again, it is a piece of infrastructure that is critical to progressing regional highways and the regional road network.

I must say—and it was remiss of me not to mention it in my contribution—that the member for Hammond, the member for Schubert and myself, as the member for Chaffey, all have a vested interest in making this freight route a better highway, a safer highway with more efficiencies, getting a lot of those heavy mass vehicles off Portrush Road, getting them off Mount Barker Road and out of the Hills so that we make it a safer journey.

I also must say that the majority of the people using that Sturt Highway, local South Australians, are Riverlanders. The majority of them who travel from the Riverland to Adelaide make up most of the 1,000 vehicles that use that road every day, so I am pleased that the government has agreed for this petition and this project to be referred to the Economic and Finance Committee.

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (11:27): I move:

That this house refers the eligible petition presented to the House of Assembly on 28 August 2024 from 10,561 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to establish a committee inquiry into the South Australian Museum, including the proposed restructure of research and collections, strategic direction, budget for scientific research, reporting relationship to government and other related matters to the Social Development Committee.

The petition that I have brought to the house from 10,561 South Australians calls for a referral to a select committee, although my motion accords with the request of the government and the standing orders for it to go to the Social Development Committee, a standing committee of the parliament, to inquire into a number of matters relating to the South Australian Museum.

This is really important, and I want to provide a little bit of background to the situation. I will then go through what is now expected of the Social Development Committee as they undertake this inquiry, which I understand the government is supporting—although I am sure they will speak for themselves shortly.

The South Australian Museum is a beloved and cherished institution. It is tremendously important in terms of both South Australia's cultural firmament but also in terms of ongoing and advancing scientific research. It is something that draws school students every day of the year—except for Christmas Day, of course, when it is closed. It draws tourists, it provides inspiration, elevation and education to thousands upon thousands of South Australians.

There would not be a member of this house who does not have a memory of visiting the Museum as a child, or with a child, as an adult, as a student, or in some context where they have lifted their eyes above what they knew, have been introduced to a new concept, a new piece of anthropology, a new piece of history, a new understanding of Australian Aboriginal culture, a new appreciation of the extraordinary geological natural history of this country.

Whether it is the native megafauna, the opalised remains of dinosaurs found in the desert, whether it is the Andy Thomas Collection, whether it is the opportunity to see exotic animals through the stuffed animal gallery or, indeed, the lion twitching its tail—or not, as the case may be—the Museum's collections are to be cherished and valued.

Unfortunately, the presentation of them could be improved. Some of the galleries are worthy of improvement, but a lot of what goes on in the Museum is, of course, behind the scenes: the dozens of researchers who between them have collectively more than 400 years of experience serving the state. Some of the research is at the cutting edge of climate science in Australia. Some of the work done through, for example, the tissue lab, through the ultra-freezers that were threatened to be closed down, is extraordinarily valuable for understanding South Australia and Australia's place in the world and the way in which diseases can be tracked and the way in which species are operating.

A lot of this was in jeopardy through twin challenges to the Museum, ultimately, I think, caused by successive budget cuts—successive governments to be sure, but most cruelly the first budget of the Malinauskas Labor government, which ripped hundreds of thousands of dollars per year out of a museum budget that was already straining under pressure.

The board, led by the former chair and the former CE of the Museum, had a couple of approaches to how they were going to do this. There was a strategic plan that involved transferring the responsibilities for scientific research from the Museum to the universities. Those responsibilities are not just the accidental whims of successive Museum leaders or governments in terms of what the Museum did. That scientific research work is required of the Museum as one of the functions in its act. It is not an optional extra. It is critical to the work of the Museum.

Of course, while most South Australians will engage with the Museum through looking at the displays, looking at the exhibitions and looking at the occasional special exhibitions, much of that work is informed by the scientific research going on behind the scenes and much of the engagement, whether it is for Aboriginal communities seeking repatriation of remains of cherished loved ones or

whether it is indeed scientific researchers seeking to engage with the collections of the exhibition, that is done behind the scenes by those scientific researchers.

So for the Museum leadership to seek to address their budget challenges through cutting that research, it wasn't really an option. I acknowledge they were dealing with profound budget challenges, exacerbated especially by the first budget of this government, but that was not the solution.

The second aspect of what the petition was seeking to address was what was called the reimagining of the Museum. It was a proposal denied by the government for a long time that it was existent, until ultimately leaked documents proved that it was a clear proposal, endorsed by the board, signed off by the minister, a proposal of this government to reimagine the Museum.

What did that mean? It meant that there was a hope that they would get some financial support in the way of capital improvements to the Museum. It was suggested, although denied and remains denied to this time, that the idea was that, with the likely cancellation by this government of Tarrkarri, the Aboriginal arts and culture centre, that would free up money to enable them to invest in the Museum and the proposal—the clear plan—suggested basically removing anything from the Museum that was not South Australian-specifically focused and replacing it with new galleries.

I am all in favour of capital investment in the Museum to enhance the galleries, and indeed there are opportunities to do so as there is low-hanging fruit, but there must be a clear intention to retain those collections for public display that are so beloved by so many generations of South Australians.

The situation that we were in early last year was that, when these plans were revealed, firstly there was the announcement of the proposal to remove the jobs of the scientists and then the suggestion alongside, which was ultimately shown to be true, of this reimagining proposal for the capital infrastructure at the Museum. This caused enormous disquiet in the community. We saw about 1,000 people rallying on the steps of Parliament House. It has been cited before and I again remind the house that the late, wonderful Hon. Jennifer Cashmore's last visit to this Parliament prior to her passing was to participate in that rally opposing the restructure and the reimagining of the Museum, and it was reflected at her funeral and it was reflected in the condolence motion in this house.

But of course, at that rally, it was also acknowledged by the former leader of the Liberal Party and me, as the Liberal Party's representatives, that ultimately more funding was required. The government needed to commit to more funding. The Liberal Party committed a future Liberal government to increasing the funding at the Museum. We needed a cancellation of the restructure and a cancellation of the strategic direction that had those researchers losing their jobs.

This petition that we are considering today was launched on that day and over the subsequent three or four months more than 10,000 signatures were collected. They were collected on the steps of the Museum by members of parliament such as myself, the member for Unley, the member for Frome and the member for Bragg—a range of members of the opposition, including the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—talking to everyday South Australians on the lawns of the Museum who were lining up to sign. They were collected in suburbs. They were collected by citizen scientists and people involved in all of the groups that engage with the Museum.

I particularly commend the advocacy and the work of the group of volunteers and donors. I highlight Mary Lou Simpson and her consistent public advocacy for the role of that work. Of course, her family, Antony Simpson and the broader Simpson family, are among the many donors who have contributed so much to the South Australian public good through their support for the Museum.

Ultimately the collection of 10,000 signatures triggering a parliamentary inquiry is no small thing. This is not the only parliamentary inquiry, of course. The Budget and Finance Committee has brought in the former chair and the former CE to ask them questions. A review by the Statutory Authorities Review Committee of the Legislative Council has been underway and that brought forward a lot of the evidence that was highlighting last year why the government needed to rethink what they were doing. Those have been important bodies of work.

In August last year I tabled this petition and in September last year the Premier announced that, indeed, there was going to be a rethink. The government backflipped on their proposals. They spent some time trying to deny any responsibility for them, but they did at least acknowledge that the proposals needed to cease. They let go the chair of the board and replaced him with a new chair of the board. Ultimately the chief executive was moved on at the end of last year as well, so the government has indicated that they got it wrong and the new approach needed to be taken.

There was a modest time-limited budget boost to enable decisions around the work of the researchers or whatever else might be done going forward to be worked out over the next period of time. I think it is not bad timing that it has taken us from August last year until now to have this formal referral to the committee take place, because the new chair of the board has been undertaking a significant body of work within the Museum community itself, assessing the views of the community, the views of donors, the views of staff about how they can make ends meet going forward within their act and indeed what new strategic approach the Museum will take. All of that is worthy, but as that is coming to a conclusion it is now time for the parliament to get engaged again.

My message to the government more than anything else today, as we refer this petition signed by 10,600 South Australians to a committee inquiry of the parliament, is that the Museum needs new investment. The Museum needs new investment in improving its capital infrastructure and it needs new investment to ensure that it can fulfil its charter to South Australia's public, our school students, our tourists and our interested passers-by who go and engage with the exhibitions and, critically, with its mission for scientific, anthropological and other research that must continue. It does not have enough money to fulfil those ambitions at the moment, and the money that the government put in as a short-term measure when they backflipped on their reimagining and their restructure is insufficient going forward. It was time-limited money.

Today is budget day. I would love to see a significant boost in funds for the Museum in today's budget. If that does not happen, then we really will be coming up to it by the end of this year for the Museum to have the future that we want it to have. This parliamentary committee inquiry will hopefully keep the pressure on the government to put it in their budget investment; it will hopefully support the work of the Chair of the Museum Board and their board and, indeed, all of those passionate South Australians who are doing their best for the Museum to ensure that future generations can continue to have the same wonderful experiences that I have had and that so many members of this chamber have no doubt had over the course of their lifetimes.

I certainly commend to the house this committee inquiry looking at the restructures, which is less relevant now than it was, and the remainder of the petition: the strategic direction for the South Australian Museum, the budget for the South Australian Museum, and the reporting relationship, whether it should be in the arts, environment or education portfolios and, indeed, how the Museum can best maintain and enhance its reputation, collections and scientific credibility going forward.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:40): I rise to indicate that the government supports the referral of this petition to the Social Development Committee.

Motion carried.

LIMESTONE COAST RADIATION TREATMENT

Ms PRATT (Frome) (11:41): I move:

That this house refers the eligible petition presented to the House of Assembly on 4 May 2023 from 16,159 residents of the Limestone Coast requesting the house to urge the government to commit the necessary funding to deliver radiation treatment services in the Limestone Coast and to ensure that the radiation treatment service is available in the way that ensures regional patients are able to access this service on the same basis as comparable services available in Adelaide or Warrnambool to the Social Development Committee.

As members of this chamber will be very familiar with, we have spent over the last couple of years many minutes adding up to hours, I am sure, debating the virtues of the need for radiation therapy services to be funded and to be implemented in regional South Australia.

The petition tells an extraordinary story. This has been a community-led campaign with a working group really made up of the most fabulous people from Mount Gambier and the Limestone Coast. Most of them are cancer survivors. Many of them are men who have been living with and

continue to live with prostate cancer who found that the absence of radiation therapy services in the Limestone Coast was the perfect opportunity to bring that plea and that call to the government.

Leading up to the last election in 2022, the first part of this process had been achieved by the federal member for Barker, Tony Pasin, in securing from the federal Coalition government at the time \$4 million in federal funding that was meant to partner and complement the next stage required by the state government of the day. We have put to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing an open invitation to put South Australia, to put the Limestone Coast forward for a radiation oncology health program grant. By putting a region forward for consideration by the federal health department, we would like to think that would then be approved and unlock the Limestone Coast as a designated area for this service.

As I said, the campaign to bring attention to this requirement, to this gap in services, has been ably led by a number of residents and cancer survivors in the Limestone Coast. They formed a working group and it was through their advocacy, their passion, their leadership and their persistence that they sought to collect as many signatures as they did. While the motion before the house formally recognises that 16,159 residents in person signed the petition, we know that collectively with the online petition the swell of support went up, with over 20,000 South Australians calling for this.

South Australia remains the only state or territory without regional services offering radiation therapy treatment. South Australia remains the only state or territory without a regional radiotherapy service. That is why the opposition and residents of the Limestone Coast remain committed to the opportunity that is before the minister to put any region forward, but let it be the Limestone Coast for the Radiation Oncology Health Program Grant (ROHPG).

I think the reluctance to do that opens up deeper questions about the government's commitment to investing in regional health services and the regional health workforce. Whether there is any money left in the health budget will remain to be seen when it is handed down today.

Part of the journey of the working group in the Limestone Coast, once the petitions had been tabled with the house, was then to unlock further attention from the Legislative Review Committee. What was triggered was a feasibility study undertaken in part by the Limestone Coast Local Health Network. I want to speak to that briefly today because I am optimistic that this motion will receive some support to be referred to a committee. I read from page 104 of the final conclusion summary of the feasibility study:

It is in principle possible to establish a safe and quality radiation therapy service in Mount Gambier in association with a service provider operating at another site, provided it is adequately resourced and risks effectively managed. The benefits to the local community include social, financial, physical, and mental health, including improved cancer outcomes.

The document, on page 5 as part of an executive summary, concluded that moving forward there were opportunities for a radiation treatment centre and services to be appropriately established in the South-East. It says:

If a centre were to be established at this time, or in the future (within the next ten years), it would require political support, significant top-up funding and a well-executed staff recruitment and retention strategy...In addition, the region will need to be declared a priority area (by the State government) for the purposes of the ROHPGS. There is evidence of this political support and top-up funding in comparable regional locations in Australia.

Population modelling completed by the Study indicates that the population levels of the Limestone Coast, in isolation, will not be sufficient to adequately support a linac—

a linear accelerator—

until the turn of the century. To generate sufficient demand in the short term other populations would be required to travel to Mount Gambier for RT services.

That spoke volumes to me for a number of reasons. The reference to the requirement for political support can only be pointing to the current government, because the political support from the opposition has been there from day one. It exists within the community at the local political level and it certainly exists in here from the parliamentary team today. So it can only be that the report is referring to a lack of political will by the government and a lack of political will by the Minister for Health and Wellbeing to just put something on the table: just put us forward.

If it is not going to be the Limestone Coast, then let the government make an argument for another regional area of South Australia, because it cannot be that we continue to be leapfrogged by every other state and territory that, in this time of two years of dithering, have continued to attract support from service providers like Icon and GenesisCare, who do speak to the positive opportunities for retaining a workforce, recruiting, being competitive and for it being sustainable.

Communities like Wagga Wagga, Griffith and Alice Springs have these services, and currently online for the HPG now we see Cairns and Tamworth approved. This document is saying that other comparable regions across the nation can support a service like this. Why should the residents of Mount Gambier and Limestone Coast be penalised for the total of the population being the reason why our government is not prepared to fight for any region in the state? This is the biggest city that we have. We do not have a Wagga. We do not have a Cairns. Really what this document is saying is, based on population tallies, we are going to have to wait another 10 years before a government should consider applying for the Health Program Grant, and I find that totally unacceptable.

There is before the house a motion that the work of the volunteers and cancer survivors in Mount Gambier be honoured through the petition of 16,000 signatures, and we put the motion to the house today that it be received by the Social Development Committee.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:51): I rise to make a brief contribution to this motion and really pay my gratitude to the 16,000 people who took the time to sign the petition for radiation therapy services to be increased in Mount Gambier. It has been a very complicated journey in terms of part funding coming from the federal government and then obviously the request from the state government to fund the implementation of the machine, with Icon putting their hand up to say they can effectively provide this service and provide it well to the residents not just of Mount Gambier but the Limestone Coast as a catchment area and, of course, into western Victoria.

Funding was available. It had a provider, and still has a provider, who was willing and able to staff and had the expertise to provide radiation therapy for our residents. Really, this is one of those topics that, when you sit around the table talking to the committee members who have been driving this at a grassroots level and hearing the stories of either a son or a daughter or a loved one, or in fact themselves, having to undertake radiation therapy in Adelaide, the time away from their support networks, from work, the costs involved, you really start getting an understanding of the impact of cancer and the need for this service in our region. Mount Gambier, being the largest city outside of Adelaide, is ideally located.

We have traversed this for a long time. That funding was quarantined, and I do thank the state health minister at the time for quarantining that funding that came from the federal government for a period of time. I share the disappointment of many residents that that funding has been reallocated into the hospital and not used for this specific purpose. I do want to thank the committee members who have given their time to keep pushing this. It is something that we will keep alive. Certainly, 16,000 signatures signals a very strong commitment from our community for this cause.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:54): I move to amend the motion as follows:

- (a) Replace 'Social Development Committee' with 'Economic and Finance Committee'.
- (b) Following 'Economic and Finance Committee' insert 'incorporating prior hearings held and evidence received by the Legislative Review Committee in regard to this petition'.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT ADELAIDE GRAND TRUNKWAY RISING MAIN REPLACEMENT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:56): I move:

That the 139th report of the committee, entitled Port Adelaide Grand Trunkway Rising Main Replacement, be noted.

The existing Port Adelaide Grand Trunkway rising main was constructed in 1975 and allows wastewater to be pumped from an industrial precinct into SA Water's wastewater network. It is a

four-kilometre asbestos cement pipeline that begins at a pump station near the Cargill malt plant located between Ocean Steamers Road and Grand Trunkway in Port Adelaide. Wastewater collected at this pump station is transferred to the main sewer system in Wingfield via the pipeline in question, which over time has deteriorated, resulting in five breaks in the last four years, leading to uncontrolled wastewater discharges.

SA Water, hereon referred to as 'the agency', has investigated several options to address the ageing pipeline, considering risks, technical elements and financial concerns. Options assessed included:

- replacement of the full length of pipe without additional mitigations, which would leave it exposed to sudden operational pressure changes and gas build-up;
- replacement of some sections of the pipe, as well as the installation of additional ancillary infrastructure, which would require further capital intervention in the future as the unreplaced sections of pipe would continue to degrade; or
- replacement of the full length of pipe, as well as the installation of ancillary infrastructure, which would mitigate all risks and ensure the longest operating life without further future capital intervention.

Ultimately, SA Water decided that replacing the full length of pipe, with additional ancillary infrastructure, was the only feasible solution as it addresses all identified risks, improves and renews the pipeline's performance and prevents future gas build-up. The scope of works includes a new 4,000-metre sewer rising main, new infrastructure to minimise surge effects during operation, a new water seal to prevent gas build-up and a new manhole at the end of the pipeline.

The project is expected to cost approximately \$6 million, and the agency states there will be no ongoing operational costs incurred by the works. Construction is anticipated to commence in the third quarter of this year, with the expectation to be practically complete in early 2027. The project is included within the delivery of SA Water's wastewater major framework program, and procurement has been conducted in accordance with SA Water's policy and procedures, conforming to all applicable Treasury and government policies.

The agency uses procurement frameworks to enable the sequential award of work, incentivising suppliers to perform well to ensure continuity of work, and states this delivers significant efficiency benefits through collaboration, innovation, consistency, planning and programming. In June last year, SA Water extended major framework partner agreements for the suite of its system-based programs. Option analysis and concept design was completed by SA Water engineering and the award of the design and construct package shall be in accordance with SA Water's delegation of financial and procurement authority and applicable Treasury and government policies.

The project is being 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 development and delivery of the overall project, including seeking the necessary approvals and management of the selected contractor.

SA Water utilises a business management policy and framework to identify risks, determine related impacts and develop mitigation strategies, and the agency has identified potential delays arising from the pipeline's depth in some areas which may require more complex repairs. Design and construction risk evaluation will continue over the course of the project.

Debate adjourned.

Bills

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION (COMMENCEMENT OF ACT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (12:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Social Workers Registration Act 2021. Read a first time.

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (12:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the bill to be taken through all stages without delay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (12:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today I introduce the Social Workers Registration (Commencement of Act) Amendment Bill 2025. As I do so, I again thank the many exceptional social workers and people providing social work services. They are skilled, dedicated and compassionate, and they walk alongside people when they face difficult times, empowering them to traverse new paths.

Social workers in the child protection and family support system, for example, encounter some of the most challenging circumstances that families experience. They are there for children and their families at their hardest moments. These resilient workers offer empathy and support and empower people to have agency about all that impacts their lives. They go about their work at the coalface of need with deep commitment and not always with acknowledgement, nor broader community understanding of their role.

This bill seeks to amend the Social Workers Registration Act 2021 so that the scheme commences on a day fixed by proclamation. We take this step following the Social Workers Registration Board's lengthy consultation with unions, the AASW, government agencies and community sector organisations, consultation which has highlighted the complexity of social work and workforce issues, the need for multiple registration pathways to recognise qualifications, experience, associated fees and timeframes.

Paramount in our thinking around the scheme's later commencement is our desire not to impose a new fee on hardworking South Australians. Following the passage of this bill, our work on this groundbreaking scheme will continue. I acknowledge the intensive and remarkable work already undertaken.

Professor Sarah Wendt and her team have worked hard, diligently and with such wisdom on this very unique and very complicated piece of work. It is the government's intention for Professor Wendt to continue to lead this work. She will continue to refine the specifics of the scheme until its implementation, particularly around the need for diverse pathways for registration, how best to recognise experience and how best to ensure the work of Aboriginal people who provide social work services is recognised.

The office of the Social Work Registration Board is in the process of forming an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander committee to provide advice. Again, the office of the Social Work Registration Board has consulted with the sector at length about the scheme. I am advised that around 1,845 people have been engaged. What we have learned during this very comprehensive consultation period is that this extra time will allow the board to refine some of the concerns that have been raised about such a complex scheme, the first in the nation.

The government will continue to advance this scheme in a thoughtful way that takes account of the complexity of the work and also takes account of the registration fees that will be required in due course. Thank you again to all who have been part of this process so far, including Women's Safety Services, Anglicare, Life Without Barriers, Connecting Foster and Kinship Care, Child and Family Focus, Embolden, Wakwakurna Kanyini, the PSA, the ASU, Flinders University and the University of South Australia.

I extend, again, my sincere gratitude to Professor Sarah Wendt, whose leadership in this space has been exemplary. I also acknowledge her team who have worked so hard. I especially mention the Australian Association of Social Workers, who are fierce advocates for social workers and the scheme. I acknowledge Mr Spiro Karanikos-Mimis in my office who has been diligent and patient and wise in progressing the scheme's deliberations to date and this bill today. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Social Workers Registration Act 2021*

3—Amendment of section 2—Commencement

This clause amends the commencement provision of the measure so as to provide for commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

4—Amendment of section 68—Regulations and fee notices

This amendment is consequential.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:07): I rise just briefly to address this bill that the government sought leave to introduce late yesterday and then successfully moved to suspend standing orders to move it through the parliament today. I understand the circumstances of that are that it is necessary to regularise a further extension of time before the commencement of the social workers' registration arrangements that were to have commenced according to the date specified in the act as it presently stands.

In recognising that that is what has been necessary to occur, I think in the interests of all of those who are following the progress of this introduction that the minister has described as the first in the country and therefore something that we want to get right, I will just note that we can take the opportunity to talk about the importance of social workers and the work that they do. All of that is true, of course, as is the importance of those experts engaged in the process of ensuring that the Social Workers Registration Scheme, when it does commence, is working in the interests of the profession and the individual workers and all of those that they serve. I do not cavil with any of that. What I do flag is that it may be convenient, just briefly in the committee process, to inquire into some particulars as to the challenges that have been faced along the way and the reason why we are now moving through this bill from a fixed date for the commencement to commencement on proclamation—which will occur before too long, one hopes.

We see, on the face of it now, that this is amending the 2021 act to amend the date that was provided for in the 2023 amendment act, and here we are in 2025. There is no doubt that significant time has passed, and so I will just flag, for the benefit of the house and all those taking a keen interest, that if the government is able to put some particulars on the record in the course of a short committee process I think that would assist all of us.

Obviously, in the time available—and I appreciate the provision of a copy of the bill overnight—it is not practical for my party to have a position on the bill as such, noting both the inevitability of its passage in this place, with the government's support, and also the short time the opposition has been provided with the bill. I make nothing more of that than just to indicate that the bill will, I expect, pass through this place fairly shortly, and will therefore serve its notice period between the houses.

I expect there might be more said in another place in a little while but, with those words, I look forward to a brief committee process.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (12:12): I would just like to simply

say thank you to the deputy leader for his conversation last night, and place on record, as I said to him last night, that I am very happy to organise a more fulsome briefing, in that time between the houses, from the Social Workers Registration Board, myself and my office about the very comprehensive process that has been taken today.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr TEAGUE: As I have just indicated in my second reading contribution, this is an amendment that will change commencement from the date fixed by the 2023 act to now a date to be fixed by proclamation. I might just perhaps first ask the minister: is there a date in mind? Is there now a fairly fixed pathway and timeline towards commencement?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: The short answer is that there is not a fixed date in mind quite deliberately because, in the course of the extensive consultation, it was very, very clear that there is a great complexity in the work, both in social work and in the provision of social work services. There is a great spread of workers providing social work services in a very, very diverse set of industries. There is absolutely a need to very carefully consider pathways to registration for both qualified workers and for those workers with significant experience. There is a need to very carefully consider the particular experience of Aboriginal workers in that process. There is also a need, which has come back very strongly from the community sector, to consider workforce issues more generally.

We are very committed to continuing to progress this scheme as soon as possible, but what is very clear is that we must adequately and fulsomely take account of that very diverse set of issues that we contemplate and make sure we get it right and that is what this bill is about ensuring that we can do.

Mr TEAGUE: Can the minister give any indication as to when the act might be expected to come into operation?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I am not going to commit to a particular date, but I can say that we want to do this as soon as we possibly can in a way that takes account of that diversity of issues. When we provide that briefing to the deputy leader, including the social workers' registration board itself, I think that will assist in terms of conveying the breadth and depth of issues that do need to be properly considered.

Mr TEAGUE: I will look forward to that briefing. I was going to say in due course. It is somewhat after the event, at least as far as this house is concerned, but nonetheless I will look forward to that briefing. In those circumstances, with all of the issues, matters, complexities and factors now known, are we within a frame in which we are not going to have another return to, say, 'Well, we have discovered more factors, complexities, etc.?' Do we know the universe that is being worked in and therefore there is a pathway towards commencement?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: The short answer is that I am advised, yes, we are aware of that complexity of issues.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (4) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (12:19): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY AND SUPPORT) BILL*Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I am really pleased and indeed very proud that today this bill, a long time in the making, has made progress and will now become an act. On Tuesday night, actually in the very early hours of Wednesday morning, following months and months and months of listening, discussion around contesting ideas and a number of draft and final amendments, the Legislative Council passed this bill.

There are many people to thank who have strongly inputted over the past couple of years to help to get to this moment, a moment that takes us forward, that takes forward the foundation of how children and young people in this state are supported, a bill that fundamentally reforms. I take this opportunity to thank the Hon. Rob Simms and the Hon. Frank Pangallo for their important support of the government's amendments on the bill and thank the other crossbench members who suggested and championed amendments, some of which are included in this final bill we consider today.

I will offer my gratitude to a number of others in a moment, but first I will summarise the far-reaching reforms this new legislation progresses. These landmark reforms follow extensive input from the sector, broader community, birth and carer families, peak bodies, Aboriginal community-controlled organisations, workers, unions and, crucially, the remarkably wise and strong children and young people themselves for whom this legislation has been shaped through the review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 and through multiple other opportunities to contribute.

I sincerely appreciate the time, energy and effort that was put into submissions and feedback that was received as part of the review, and since, and which has helped to shape this legislation. This collective effort reflects a genuine and shared commitment to significantly reform and transform the system, strengthen the existing framework and retain parts of the current act we know work well.

This bill progresses extensive reform work already underway in ways that help improve the lives of children, young people and their families. The bill provides a whole-of-government, whole-of-community and whole-of-sector approach to child protection and family support. It rightly elevates the voices of children in decisions about their lives and puts maximum effort into reunifying them with their families where that is right for them and helps ensure they are well cared for and able to thrive when that is not possible. It includes a progressive and much needed emphasis on Aboriginal-led decision-making and the requirement to convene family group conferences for Aboriginal families. We want Aboriginal families to be empowered to lead decisions about their children's lives and we want to progressively delegate authority to Aboriginal communities and Aboriginal community-controlled organisations.

After much discussion, this bill enshrines the safety principle which ensures that the safety of the child or young person must always be the priority in determining whether or not to remove a child from their family. This safety-first approach provides utter clarity to the remarkable workers entrusted to make these difficult, heartbreaking decisions. This bill is progressive in its introduction of a new strengthened best interest principle, which means every decision relating to a child is focused on, among other things, keeping them safe, protecting their rights, considering their need for love and attachment and promoting their development.

The bill embeds the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander principle to the standard of active efforts and introduces a statement of commitment to children and young people in contact with the system and to birth families. Amendments that have now been moved through committee include:

- new clauses to build on the government's amplification of the child's voice in decision-making;
- changes to family group conferencing provisions to ensure public reporting on statistics, and further strengthening how a conference will be convened;

- a new complaints management/feedback process;
- recognition of the peak bodies that represent the sector, children and young people, their families, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and their families and carers;
- a new provision that introduces a scheme to establish by regulation for cultural support to be provided to Aboriginal children and young people;
- specific quality of care guidelines, replacing care concerns and assessing reports of harm to children;
- insertion of a timeframe of 60 days within which an internal review must be completed; and
- doubling the time for referring complaints to the Ombudsman to two years.

This Children and Young People (Safety and Support) Bill delivers on the government's promise to help improve the lives of children and their families and to reform the child protection and family support system. We have worked hard to reach an agreed position on some important elements of the legislation and I am really grateful to everyone in both houses of parliament who have contributed to this process.

Reform is really hard. I am so proud that we have stayed the course and through this bill that we advance far-reaching reform. It is time now to get on with the hard work of implementing changes in partnership with the community and care providers, the people with direct experience of the system, the government agencies who support families in need and with children, young people and their families.

We would not be at this point without the diligence, tireless work and shared commitment to advancing change through legislation, change that really will help to make a difference in the lives of those who most need us. I thank Mark Herbst from parliamentary counsel for his important work on this and forever wise counsel. I thank Elizabeth Boxall and Alex Boardman and our whole DCP legal team whose wisdom and capacity to work to get the best possible outcomes have always been on full display and steadfast. I thank DCP Chief Executive Jackie Bray and Deputy CE Darian Shephard-Bayly. Their steadfast leadership, guidance and support have been so very valuable.

I again broadly thank the whole sector, and in particular I wholeheartedly thank Connecting Foster and Kinship Carers SA, The Reily Foundation, CREATE Foundation, and Child and Family Focus SA. Their collective, fierce, robust and at times quiet advocacy has helped to reshape this bill. I very much look forward to working with them on how we implement this legislation to ensure the sector and the workforce have the best possible procedures, practice and policy in place and to ensure that children and young people continue to be at the heart of all that we do.

I speak directly to the great number of children and young people in contact with the system who have influenced this bill. These children and young people have often been referred to as vulnerable, and they are, but they are also wise, strong, intuitive and clear about what they need for their lives. My promise to them is that I will never stop listening to them and for them I will never stop trying, striving to make the best possible decisions and changes that are required to help their lives to be improved. This bill is for them and as it now progresses I note again, as I have done in many fora, that it is our love and care for them that will and does bring us together and unify our efforts.

Finally, I thank my ministerial office team. They are extraordinary and, as I do, they care so very deeply about why we do what we do and for whom. This commitment has seen them work relentlessly toward this moment, and always with respect through listening and considering the many diverse views in this space: views that are diverse and deeply held and felt because this area of public policy is life-changing.

I am blessed to be supported every day and throughout this process by Senior Adviser Matthew Pearce and Chief of Staff Ruth Sibley. Matthew Pearce is so very clever and so very committed. His knowledge of this legislation and of the system is exemplary and, so importantly, his knowledge of how it impacts people's lives is remarkable. At every step and in every conversation he has understood this and worked so hard to help ensure that this impact on people's lives is taken

account of and that people are heard, and that how things can work best for the diverse range of groups and people is reflected in this complex piece of work.

I have no doubt whatsoever that, as it has in relation to this bill, his contribution to everything he does will make a profound difference. I also have no doubt that Mr Pearce's intelligence and capacity will see him continue to lead and make a difference at senior levels across government and, in fact, in whatever he turns his mind to into the future. His personal support of me strengthens me every single day. I thank him for this.

I honour the beautiful support I receive from Chief of Staff Ruth Sibley. She is the most excellent woman. She leads our team and she leads in whatever sphere she is in. She is generous in that leadership, always looking out for and empowering others in their leadership journey. She is also so clever and so strategic. She has a unique ability to quickly see different places from which people are coming to help ensure outcomes reflect that diversity. She knows instinctively when to move forward, and to keep bringing people together as we do.

Mr TEAGUE: I rise, noting the return of the bill to this house after what has been a lengthy debate in the Legislative Council, one that I have respected from this distance and continued to participate in as the shadow minister for child protection.

Can I say at the outset that the efforts that we all undertake in this space are necessarily towards the state's most important responsibility; that is, attending to the needs of our state's most vulnerable children. If there is one thing I share with the minister in this regard, it is towards their flourishing and thriving, albeit in circumstances of having faced, in many cases, the greatest challenges that children might face. That they are in need of the supports that are provided by the department is something that we all need to address in our day-to-day lives.

The opposition does not share the government's view about how child protection is best structured and directed in this state. I find myself referring to my second reading contribution when the bill was last in this house. I reflected at that time that my expectation was that the principles guiding child protection in this state would remain controversial. If the last months have proved anything, it is that that is certainly true.

What surprised me in about January, perhaps as a result of the select committee process in the Legislative Council, was that what emerged over those weeks and into the early stages of this year was that, as well as that existence of a controversy about how best to proceed in child protection, there emerged a solidarity, including, importantly, in what might be described as 'the sector', among key and credible and sincere stakeholders that participate in the process of legislative reform outside this place.

Having indicated an expectation that core areas would remain controversial, I think that was proved up, to the extent of that expression of solidarity, by the sector. It is one thing to have a debate about the best direction to proceed—circumstances where the government has both the initiative and the control of the process—it is another to then see emerging the kind of consensus that emerged in the course of the process in the other place.

So I just reiterate that the result of what has occurred in the Legislative Council is that these matters of paramount principle indeed remain controversial. We will now see a very clear difference of approach as between the government on the one hand and the opposition on the other. What the government has determined to do—and I do not mean this in any other than a factual observation—is to continue to chart the course that was established back in 2016 ahead of the 2017 act: the continuation of the adoption as key principle of child protection, safety as the driving paramount principle.

It is an approach that remains novel and, increasingly, it is an approach that runs contrary to what the rest of the country, indeed the rest of the world, including the UN, tells us is the better pathway, which is the adoption of a paramount principle that the best interests of the child ought to be determinative in guiding all that is done in this space.

It might sound simplistic to hear the debate described in terms of safety and best interests, but in many ways, whether one turns to the scholarly contributions that have been led by South Australian of the Year Professor Leah Bromfield, all the way through to those who are involved in the

day-to-day work of caring for those vulnerable children, advocating for reunification of children with their family, advocating for greater supports for those involved in out-of-home care, better complaints mechanisms and so on and so forth, there is a clear unity of view that I have observed about the importance of adopting the best interests of the child as the paramount principle, embracing as it does the great complexity of life that leads to the best possible outcomes for those most vulnerable children, indeed towards their thriving.

I do not say all of this in some sort of theoretical context either. We are here on budget day and we have seen now, over the course of the period since 2016, the establishment of the Department for Child Protection, the establishment of the paramount principle of safety and all that has followed. Particularly over these last four years, we have seen a consistent pattern of increasing numbers of children in care, and particularly in state care. It is an area that we all agree is not where children ought to be. However, on budget day we see each year that that has come at an ever-increasing cost and indeed at a cost that is greater than even the ever-increased provision for child protection.

As the shadow minister for child protection, I have never come at the budget for child protection with a view to whether or not we are spending more money than is warranted. However, I have asked the question from day one at each turn whether the money we spend in child protection, as it increases, and really quite dramatically to transform the size of that department—is more money into child protection a sign of success or of failure? I expect I will be asking that question again in the next short while.

It is not as though the process to date has led us to a place where fewer resources are required because fewer children are engaged in these most acute circumstances, quite to the contrary. What has been described as an ongoing crisis, and what has been described by me and by others as an ongoing controversy about where the paramount principles in child protection ought to be articulated and how, will continue. That is a matter that I think is going to continue to be of keen interest to all South Australians.

I want to pay tribute to several leaders in the sector in particular, as well as to those members of the Legislative Council who have engaged in the process that has led to the bill coming back to us today. Throughout that period there has been a solidarity within the sector. As the minister has said, participants in the sector speak sometimes quietly, carefully and thoughtfully; sometimes they speak up and speak loudly. In all their ways, I have found that the advocacy of those who are engaged in the sector has been characterised by its sincerity and its commitment, and I am humbled by what I have seen in that regard.

I single out in particular the chief executive of Uniting Communities, Simon Schrapel AM, who over these last months has been a leading member of a group that have described themselves as the Leadership Coalition for Child Protection Reform. Back in February, published in InDaily, Simon, writing on behalf of the other members of that coalition, wrote a very thoughtful piece about where we were then at in the debate—and remember, that was at a relatively early stage of the Legislative Council debate that has since ensued. Just to quote part of Simon Schrapel's observations then, he said:

Generally speaking, South Australia's child protection system is often seen as a wicked and, ultimately, unsolvable problem.

It's not.

Many of us also believe that it's something that affects someone else—other people's children, other parents and other families.

Wrong again.

One in three South Australian children will have some interaction, sometimes unknown to them or their families, with our child protection department during their childhood.

Simon then goes on to talk about the reasons why child protection is something that affects so many South Australians directly and that there is cause for hope in improving how we address child protection challenges in this state, but that we must do so by adopting a different approach than what has been adopted over the better part now of a decade. It was for that reason that the coalition members, among others, determined that it was necessary and worthwhile to move from a position

of doing what could be done with the amendment bill as it was proposed and, rather, taking an approach of insisting on changes of a core nature before supporting the passage of the bill.

I reiterate again for the committee the four key principles that were articulated by the coalition for child protection at that time and they have maintained consistently ever since: first, elevating the best interests of the child as the paramount principle; second, the consistent application of the 'significant harm' threshold throughout the bill; third, the expanding and amplifying of what is described in the bill as 'active efforts', and I appreciate that there is some discussion about the particular description there; and fourth, the strengthening of provisions that support family reunification.

So those four key principles have been articulated throughout the course of this year. They remain key principles that will remain controversial and, I am sure, will continue to be the subject of advocacy in the time ahead. The fact is that the coalition has not been satisfied that it has heard a credible response from the government on those four matters of principle; neither has the opposition, and more work will need to be done. I just note for the record those other participants, members of the leadership coalition. I have recognised Simon Schrapel AM, the CE of Uniting Communities. I also recognise and appreciate the input and engagement of Rohan Feegrade, Lutheran Care; Craig Rigney, KWH; Alisa Willis, Junction Australia; Sue Raw, Baptist Care SA; and Shelley Wall, Infinity Community Solutions.

I look forward to continuing to engage productively in this space, including with a view, ultimately, to reforms that more fully reflect those principles, as we all do, with a view to moving child protection away from a conversation that is presently far too often conducted in circumstances of crisis and of difficulty and into one that is characterised by the kind of success that Simon Schrapel has so well articulated, including in that contribution back in February that I have noted.

The opposition, as I have indicated to the government, will not be taking a step by step, amendment by amendment approach. That process has already taken some time. It is all very well documented, and those who have been following the process in the other place have plenty on the record already, including what has transpired just earlier this week. I make that contribution and look forward to continuing to debate further reforms in this area.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the minister wish to make any other closing remarks?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I just want to say thank you to the deputy leader for his contribution.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DEFENCES—INTOXICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (12:52): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today I introduce the Criminal Law Consolidation (Defences—Intoxication) Amendment Bill 2025 to this house following its passage through the other place. I do so with a heavy heart and, like the many who have dedicated themselves to preventing and eradicating the scourge of domestic, family and sexual violence, with anger and frustration that it continues.

On 12 March 2022, Mr Cody James Edwards brutally killed his partner Ms Synamin Bell. Mr Edwards was charged with Ms Bell's murder, but was able to plead guilty to manslaughter and was sentenced on the basis that he had acted in excessive self-defence due to his belief that Ms Bell intended to kill him, a drug-induced delusion caused by his consumption of illicit drugs.

I introduce this bill also with the offering of love and wholehearted condolences to all who loved and knew Ms Bell. I am sure her family and her friends must be absolutely bereft and my heart aches for them. In the face of their grief, Ms Bell's family have so generously and so courageously called for legislative change. I carry them in my heart today as we debate this bill, and I will continue to do so. There is never an excuse for violence, and a self-induced delusion is absolutely not one.

On 6 September 2024 Mr Edwards was sentenced to 11 years' imprisonment with a non-parole period of eight years and 10 months. This case has so very tragically highlighted that the law in our state, as it now stands, enables a person who has been charged with murder to rely on the partial defence of excessive self-defence, a partial defence which can reduce a person's criminal liability from murder to manslaughter based on their genuinely held belief that their conduct was necessary and reasonable to defend themselves, even if that belief was formed on the basis of delusions or hallucinations, and even if those delusions or hallucinations were caused by self-induced intoxication.

This is, frankly, absolutely not good enough. It is clear from our community's justifiable outrage about the outcome of this horrific case that this reduction in liability is utterly inconsistent with community expectation. It is clear from that outrage, and also from the feedback received through YourSAy, that a person should not be able to rely on their self-induced intoxication to reduce their murder charge to manslaughter.

I am angry about, and utterly devastated by, the ongoing deaths of women at the hands of those who are supposed to love them, and frustrated by the gender inequality and harmful attitudes towards women that drive this scourge. We need this violence to stop, and we need every person and every organisation to use every lever possible until this violence is no more. Our government is determined to use everything within our power and our every lever to drive change across prevention, intervention, response, recovery and healing—and we are.

We take seriously our responsibility to play our part and to lead work across the state that helps to prevent and eradicate domestic, family and sexual violence. The state government has progressed comprehensive policy, investment and legislative reform to combat domestic, family and sexual violence, including introducing legislation to criminalise coercive control (which has now passed this house), mandating electronic monitoring and bail conditions for those who violently breach domestic violence-related intervention orders, enshrining 15 days' paid domestic, family and sexual violence leave in the South Australian Fair Work Act, including the experience of domestic, family and sexual violence as a ground of discrimination in the Equal Opportunity Act, whilst also establishing crucial support systems through funding new and existing DV prevention hubs, supporting perpetrator intervention programs and court assistance services, and addressing housing insecurity.

This bill is another concrete action focused on helping to prevent and eradicate the horrific and deeply unacceptable prevalence of violence against women. Through this bill, we seek again to tackle this prevalence by amending the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to exclude the availability of excessive self-defence where a person's genuine belief that their conduct was necessary and reasonable to defend themselves has arisen from the voluntary and non-therapeutic consumption of a drug.

Part 2 of the bill makes the following amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Clauses 3 and 4 insert new sections 15(2a) and 15A(2a) to exclude the availability of excessive self-defence in relation to a charge of murder if the prosecution proves, beyond reasonable doubt, that the defendant's genuine belief that their actions were necessary and reasonable for a defensive purpose was substantially affected by the voluntary and non-therapeutic consumption of a drug.

The exclusion of the partial defence of excessive self-defence in these circumstances will apply to both defence of persons and property to ensure a consistent application of the partial defence. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2025

Message from Governor

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

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Budget 2025-26—Estimates Committee Schedule 2025

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome to parliament today students from two schools in the electorate of the member for Elizabeth. We have students from Blakes Crossing Christian College—welcome to parliament—and we have students from King's Baptist Grammar School as well. I hope you enjoy your time at parliament today, particularly question time. Again, on behalf of the member for Elizabeth, I would like to welcome you to parliament.

*Question Time***METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Is the government in breach of its legal obligations? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the member is seeking a legal opinion, which is out of order.

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader, did you want to rephrase the question, perhaps?

Mr TEAGUE: I will. A question to the Premier: what does the Premier have to say to the house about remarks by the United Firefighters Union recently? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: On FIVEaa radio yesterday, the United Firefighters Union Secretary, Max Adlam, revealed that some 800-odd claims have not yet been processed after the South Australian Employment Tribunal ordered the state government to pay unpaid travel allowances within 28 days with interest. She said:

First of all the Government as employer broke the law, now they've breached the orders that the court gave us.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:04): I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his question. We have made it very clear at the executive level of the government, within cabinet, what our expectations are of the public sector in terms of the payment of wages and what is owed to all of our public servants. That is a pretty clear principle for a Labor government, I think it's fair to say. There are a number of us who are rather alarmed at the underpayment that was allowed to manifest within the MFS. Obviously, that wasn't a function of any decision that was made around the cabinet table, nor was it a deliberate decision of any senior officer in the MFS. Nonetheless, it represents an act of neglect, which is not satisfactory—and we have made that very clear to all concerned regarding this situation.

Of course, the government is committed to make sure that all people within the MFS who missed out on the travel allowance, who should have received it, get that money. It's their money, plain and simple. When a worker earns an entitlement, whether it be wages or an allowance or a penalty, that is their money and they should be paid it. They should be paid it quickly. That is the clear instruction coming from us around the cabinet table.

I have been advised by the Treasurer who, I understand, met with the UFU secretary Max Adlam. I think there may have been a discussion with Emily Bourke as well, but I have certainly spoken to the Treasurer about this matter, as the minister responsible for Shared Services, and made it clear that there needs to be a redoubling of efforts within Shared Services and the MFS to make sure that any legal obligation they have is complied with forthwith. On behalf of the government, I am

more than happy to apologise to our fireys who have missed out on this allowance; that shouldn't happen, and we have made that clear.

With respect to the MFS executive, I will say this—and this is in no way to diminish the shortcomings of this process—I don't think there is any suggestion that there is any sort of deliberate act on behalf of anyone within the MFS executive here. I think this is just a case of poor process, which should not happen, plain and simple, but these things regrettably do happen from time to time, particularly when you employ over 100,000 people. It doesn't make it okay. I am in no way defending it, just simply acknowledging the fact that this is an incident that has occurred due to process rather than any sort of deliberate conscious decision-making with nefarious intent on behalf of anyone within the government. But it does need to be sorted out; it needs to be sorted out quickly in accordance with the order that has been handed down by SAET.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

Mr TEAGUE (Heyesen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is again to the Premier and in those circumstances. Have all MFS firefighters been paid their unpaid travel allowances and, if not, what is the total present amount owed, what is the amount paid, and how much of that is interest?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:07): Given the specifics of the deputy leader's question, I would hate to have the circumstance where we are not speaking accurately, so I am more than happy to take that question on notice.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

Mr TEAGUE (Heyesen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is again to the Premier. Is the MFS understaffed and, if so, how many staff have been or should be allocated to now resolve the backlogs? There is an explanation if it might help, with leave.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: This might provide some assistance. On 14 May SAET found that the MFS had unlawfully withheld travel payments to MFS firefighters. During the case, MFS Executive Director Ms Prema Osborne testified, and I quote:

...two ex-staff members were responsible for processing payments...

However, and I quote:

...their replacements were not given additional resources to fix the backlog because of budget constraints.

Ms Osborne has since left the MFS.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:09): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. Again, I might take some of those questions on notice, except to say this: the government is committed to making sure that the MFS is resourced adequately. In fact, I had the great privilege of being the Minister for Emergency Services in a former government and I am conscious of the fact that within the enterprise agreement that the government has with the MFS—and I understand this has been sustained over a period of time—there are very clear requirements on the government in terms of how we staff trucks and stations and resources. There are clear requirements around how many people are on each shift and so forth. I understand they are being complied with as best as possible.

In fact, I was very pleased to play a role when the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport was Treasurer to boost staffing levels at the MFS. One thing that we are conscious of as a government more broadly is that there is a very large overtime budget within the MFS. In many ways it has represented in the past opportunities for increased staffing because that often makes better sense than paying overtime.

As a government, we are looking to make sure there are ways that the MFS budget is brought under control so there is not a risk of unnecessary budget overruns, and staffing levels is one of the considerations that is always considered in that context.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:10): Supplementary: Premier, was Ms Osborne asked to resign from the MFS as a result of the employment tribunal finding?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:11): I am not across Ms Osborne's reasons for her departure. I haven't spoken to the chief officer about that. Again, I am more than happy to take that question on notice.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:11): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What actions, if any, will the government be taking to ensure residents in Tailem Bend have access to healthcare services? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PEDERICK: It was reported in *The Advertiser* today that patients of a regional clinic have been left shocked by the abrupt closure of a medical centre set to rob a region of access to GP services. The Murraylands Medical Centre at Tailem Bend is set to close this week, leaving regular patients confused after the shock announcement just before the doors are due to shut.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:12): Thank you very much to the member for his question. I think it was yesterday during question time that I became aware that there was a message sent out to patients at Tailem Bend from their GP clinic announcing that it would be closing and services transferred to Murray Bridge.

Obviously, the first thing to say of course is that, as people would know, in Australia GP services are run by private businesses, but obviously we want to see them as prolific across the state as much as possible to ensure primary health care is available and we obviously work with the federal government that has primary responsibility for GP services across the country.

Upon learning of that information yesterday, immediately after question time I spoke to Mr Wayne Champion who is the CEO of the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network. I know Wayne is similarly passionate about making sure primary healthcare services are available because we have just done a huge amount of work to restore those services in Karoonda. Where those services were no longer being provided, we are now restoring those services to the community. We have sought an exemption from the federal government to allow us to receive the Medicare funding for us to now provide those services. So obviously we were concerned to hear that news out of Tailem Bend.

I also had contact from the member for MacKillop who has obviously been very concerned about this and has reached out in a very quick manner to express the concerns on behalf of his community about this.

I spoke to Mr Wayne Champion about this. He was not aware that this had occurred. He was also concerned to hear this and has undertaken to have urgent discussions with the clinic to see what can be done in terms of making sure that we can restore those services to the Tailem Bend community, working between the local health network and, if necessary, obviously the federal government as well, because we don't want to have those services not be there and more pressure put on the acute services, which is obviously the primary responsibility of the state government.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:14): A supplementary: did the local health network order the closure of the clinic?

The SPEAKER: I will take that as a separate question.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:14): As I said, I spoke to Wayne Champion yesterday. He wasn't aware that this had come to pass. I know there had been discussions between officers in the local health network and the network around the rents that had been unpaid for some many years. Obviously, as I said, it is the desire of both myself and

the CEO of that local health network that we work constructively with the GP practice to see if we can get these services restored as soon as possible.

ROAD GAZETTAL

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:15): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the government consider gazetting recently completed sections of the Upper Yorke Road for 30-metre A-double road trains? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: YP Council has recently announced it will gazette local government roads for 30-metre road trains. Farmers and truckies around the region would like the government to do the same for the state government roads.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:15): This is something the member for Narungga has been onto me about for a while now. He is pretty keen to see this gazettal on government roads. I am giving it active consideration. I have asked the department to go away and do a body of work.

Obviously, if you give a mouse a cookie it is going to want a glass of milk, so if we go one distance you are going to want to go further—my instincts are you are going to want to go all the way to Maitland. We will have a look at the entire network and see if it is capable.

I applaud the YP Council allowing that level of access on all its roads. I think that is a very good move. What I have asked the department to do is not just the section that you have talked about but the entire section all the way to Maitland. If it is possible I would be very keen to do it, because I think it is a good idea. It is a good initiative by the member.

The member understands the needs of farming communities in Yorke Peninsula. He understands that they need to move freight, and the larger the vehicles the more efficient it is to move that freight and the less traffic we have on our roads. It is a good suggestion. Thank you for bringing it up. I will do my homework and get back to the member as soon as possible.

SOUTHERN SUBURBS HEALTH SERVICES

Mr DIGHTON (Black) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house on new health services in the southern suburbs?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:17): I thank the member for Black for his question and for his passion about health services in the southern suburbs. Even before his election to this place, I know the member for Black has been passionate about improving access to health services in his local community.

One of the things that he came to us—to the Premier, to the Treasurer and to myself—about during his election campaign was about how we can improve access, particularly to those primary care services, in the Hallett Cove and broader community. That is why we have made a commitment, based on that advocacy from the member for Black, to a 24/7 pharmacy in the Hallett Cove/Sheidow Park/Trott Park area.

I am delighted to report to the house that we have now signed the contract to deliver that 24-hour pharmacy, which will be the fourth 24-hour pharmacy in our state. Only a year and a half ago there were zero, and now in August this year there will be our fourth available in the community. This will be delivered at the Hallett Cove shopping centre, at the TerryWhite Chemmart. We thank the TerryWhite team at Hallett Cove for their cooperation on this project. It means that people will be able to go to that pharmacy 24 hours a day to get that support.

What we can see from the first three 24/7 pharmacies that we have delivered is that it has vastly exceeded our expectations in terms of the number of services that have been able to be delivered. Whether it is in the member for King's electorate, whether it is in the member for Elder's electorate or whether it is in the member for Dunstan's electorate, at those three existing pharmacies that we have opened 270,000 services have already been provided and over 100,000 scripts have been provided after hours—hours in which those pharmacies previously were closed.

That is a huge help to people when they need it, like getting baby Panadol in the middle of the night, but also, importantly, if people can utilise virtual care services they can be sent the script immediately—any time, day or night—and then they can go and fill that script any time, day or night. That means they get that more timely health care, and obviously it is less pressure on our hospitals as well.

There have also been some 10,000 phone calls to those services after hours as well. Surveys that have been undertaken of these patients show that some 20 per cent of those people who visited after hours said that they would have visited an emergency department if that had not been available. So we are very excited to see that fourth one being delivered in August this year.

The other announcement that we have made very recently, which is exciting for the southern suburbs as well, is that we are expanding what has been a successful pilot, firstly in the northern suburbs of Adelaide, then extending to the central suburbs of Adelaide and now to the southern suburbs of Adelaide, which is a co-responder mental health model between SAPOL and our mental health nurses. Police will respond to mental health call-outs that SAPOL get with qualified mental health nurses to better respond to those people who need assistance and, in many cases, be able to get people help, other than having to go to an emergency department.

I was there with the member for Elder, who of course is the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention and who has been a strong advocate for this service, when we announced this with the Treasurer at the Urgent Mental Health Care Centre, which is of course now one of a number of these different centres and pathways that we have available for people to get mental health care other than at an emergency department. Both SAPOL and our hospital teams speak very highly of the service that this has delivered. Now we will be able to see that extended to the southern suburbs as well and see this service become a permanent part of our healthcare system, which is good for the healthcare system, it's good for SAPOL and, ultimately, it's a very good outcome for those people involved in avoiding emergency departments or our corrections and justice system if they don't need to.

PUBLIC SECTOR PSYCHOLOGISTS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Will the government reach an agreement with public sector psychologists and, if so, when? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: On 4 June, the president of the South Australian Psychologists Association told FIVEaa radio that 'psychologists across the public sector will take action to disrupt bureaucratic processes'. She continued, 'At the core of our issues are pay and conditions for psychologists.' Further, she stated:

This is the last opportunity we're going to have to do this, my fear is that if the Government doesn't take action at this point in time when we come to negotiate an agreement again in four years' time there simply won't be a psychologist at the table because there simply won't be any left.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:22): Thank you, Deputy Leader of the Opposition. For reasons that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will appreciate, during the course of any industrial negotiation, they all occur on a without-prejudice basis and there is a lot of back and forth. In that climate, one tends not to reveal their position on particular issues in the public realm. That's best done through the negotiating parties in an industrial negotiation.

However, in general terms, I would say this, which goes directly to the deputy leader's question. As a government, we don't just value the work of our psychologists; we are investing in them. We are investing in them by increasing their number, both in terms of psychiatrists but also psychologists, because we see both of them playing a really important role, but not just psychologists—a lot of people in the allied health sector.

We frequently—and the government is guilty of this ourselves—talk about the big investments in nurses and doctors, because it's well understood in the public the need but also the work that they do. We don't talk about allied health nearly as frequently, which is regrettable given they are just as an important part of the system as nurses and doctors, or even orderlies in a hospital for that matter.

We are aware that there have been particular issues in regard to psychologist pay. We are aware of the advocacy to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition refers. When I say 'we', I am not just talking about myself and the health minister, but this is something that we have discussed quite thoroughly around the Budget Cabinet Committee subcommittee of the government, as all our IR matters get discussed in the context of EBAs.

So this is something that we are working to seek a resolution on. The government does have a number of industrial agreements up for negotiation at the moment—SASMOA, general public sector, nurses, fireys, doctors; the ambos are coming up—so there's a lot on our plate in this regard, and that is the responsibility of government. I have said publicly, and I am happy to reiterate in this forum, in a way that won't surprise anybody that, as a Labor government, we have abandoned the policy of the past. We have seen previous iterations of governments having hard caps on pay rises; that is out the window. We have seen refusals to negotiate around back pay; I have taken that off the table too. We think that everything should be put on the table.

We have abandoned the policy of real wage decreases. We will not support real wage decreases, which means, of course, we are in favour of real wage increases. We are alive to the fact, both for the general public sector and doctors, the former government imposed upon them 1½ per cent wage increases that manifested in very substantial real wage cuts; that is regrettable. My commitment to them is that this government is committed to real wage increases, whether you be a psychologist, a nurse, a doctor or anybody else in the public sector that we have got negotiations on with at the moment.

In regard to psychologists, we are alive to the challenges and we want to see if we can find a resolution. We believe that's best achieved through good faith bargaining, to which we remain absolutely committed.

HEALTH SECTOR INDUSTRIAL ACTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Okay, we will see if it's a supplementary.

Mr TEAGUE: It is a question to the Premier. In light of the Premier's answer, having referred to nurses, doctors and allied health workers, including psychologists—indeed, the industrial process generally—why is there such significant industrial action across the South Australian health sector under this government?

The SPEAKER: That's a separate question.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:26): I am happy to answer it. I am not too sure if there is widespread industrial disputation across the public health sector at all. That's not to say there might not be disputation in the future. I can't predict the future, clearly. But I think it's fair to say—because the implication of the deputy leader's question is that somehow the government has dropped the ball with respect to IR and health. Well, let me speak a bit more plainly about this.

If I was a healthcare professional in the public sector and I had been subjected to real wage cuts because of the policy of a former government, I might be a little bit grumpy about it. I mean, imagine having a government of this state during a pandemic going to our healthcare workers and saying, 'Sorry, real wage cut for you.' Or saying to our ambulance officers, 'Sorry, no pay rise,' I think for years. I think they went for four years or something without a pay rise. I mean, they would be forgiven for being a little bit frustrated at policies that have been imposed upon them. This government has an opportunity to rectify that.

Mr Teague: Why so much industrial action?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The deputy leader says, 'Why so much industrial action?' I am not too sure which action he is talking about. What we are committed to is very, very different to the policy that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was very happy to be party to when he sat around the cabinet table, albeit in a separate construct. When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition sat around the cabinet table and supported policies of the past, that was his prerogative.

I want to assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that this government's policy in respect of wages and conditions in the healthcare sector and industrial relations more broadly could not be more different to yours—could not be more different. We don't just sit around and talk about good faith negotiations, we act upon it, and we have delivered a number of new enterprise agreements.

There is always argy-bargy and occasionally there will be disputation, and this government might not be immune from that either, but our starting position is a whole lot better than your finishing position. That will always be true for a Labor government that genuinely values the work of people within our public sector.

ADELAIDE HILLS PEST SPECIES

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water, the Deputy Premier. Is the minister taking additional steps to address pest species in the Adelaide Hills, particularly rabbits? With your leave, sir, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Agricultural businesses in my community are facing additional pressure from overabundant species. It has been birds and other pest species invading orchards and other horticultural crops.

An honourable member: And bats.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: And bats. Now, of course, we are facing significant numbers of rabbits putting pressure on those businesses as well.

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) (14:29): I appreciate the question. I know it comes from concerns that are raised probably regularly and frequently with the member, and probably several other members here, about the impact of rabbits on the local community.

The way that rabbits are managed legally in South Australia is that they are the responsibility of the landholder, as are other pest animals; that's how it's characterised under the landscapes act as it was updated most recently in 2019. That said, we recognise through the landscapes approach that individual landholders can find it challenging to manage pests without any guidance or assistance and, particularly, that they are keen to see that other landholders are doing the same because if you look after your own bit you just get the rabbits from elsewhere.

Work has been done to assist landholders, first of all, in guidance on what kind of baiting is available and desirable and what kind of fencing can be used appropriately, but also there are periods of time when the landscape board through the Hills and Fleurieu offers collection days and distribution days for the pindone baited carrots, which are the ones that are particularly effectively lethal for rabbits.

My understanding is that that occurs, really, in the first quarter of the year and that coincides with the breeding cycle—so January to March—so we have now missed that time for this year, but naturally we will make sure that the member and other relevant members are informed the next time that is made available. For those who are particularly under stress with rabbits, I would suggest that they simply get in touch with their local landscape board and see what the latest advice is and whether there is any capacity to link up with other landholders nearby in order to attempt to suppress collectively.

Obviously, rabbits were not a welcome addition to the Australian landscape and have caused enormous harm. The calicivirus was effective to a degree and certainly has helped reduce the numbers, but they remain a persistent and ongoing problem. Many pest animals—and overabundant native animals, in fact—have become problematic in these times of drought because as the landscape becomes more hostile further out, they are drawn into places where there are more water sources, either because there is a bit more rain through the Hills, although there hasn't been sufficient recently, or because water is put out and there is access to feed and water.

We recognise that it is a challenge. We don't want to leave landholders feeling that they are entirely alone in dealing with that, although recognising that legally they do have an obligation to manage what is on their land, and through the landscape boards we are attempting to provide the kind of support that might be effective. As I say, I urge them to get in touch with their local landscape board to raise any particular questions that they have.

CURTIS ROAD

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister inform the house of progress and challenges in relation to the upgrade of Curtis Road?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:33): A very clear, concise question: it needed no explanation. From my regular conversations with the member for Light, as well as the members for Taylor and Elizabeth, about the crucial importance of Curtis Road to Adelaide's rapidly growing northern suburbs, it's an important piece of infrastructure.

Curtis Road is a critical thoroughfare both now and into the future. Suburbs such as Munno Para, Angle Vale, Riverlea, Kudla, Concordia and Roseworthy are predicted to see significant population growth with the government's expansions of housing to deal with the housing crisis. The Northern Adelaide Transport Study recently undertaken by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport reinforces what we are hearing about Curtis Road's importance as an east-west link, providing access to the north-south corridor through the Northern Connector.

Fortunately, the first stage of a quicker, safer drive for commuters will be delivered with a quarter of a billion dollars investment by the Malinauskas Labor government and the Albanese Labor government to remove an important crossing. It is our piece of infrastructure and we are dealing with our infrastructure because approximately 21,000 vehicles pass through this level crossing each day. During peak periods the boom gates can be down for up to 15 minutes every hour. When there is a piece of our infrastructure that is causing congestion, we want to fix it.

The removal of the rail level crossing and the grade separation will improve safety, travel time and reliability on the road and rail network. These works support significant growth areas, access from residential areas to the Northern Expressway and Main North Road, which is essential for people to access employment, education and recreational services.

We will employ 425 FTE's (full-time) over the construction period, with major works to commence by 2027 with completion by 2030. It follows our investment on the intersection of Heaslip and Curtis Road in Angle Vale. The member also asked about challenges. This is a road—which is entirely owned by the council—that over the last decade has not seen any significant investment by them at all. Indeed, when I first got sworn in as minister one of the first meetings the member for Taylor asked me to have was with that council.

I met with that council and I asked them to develop plans for stormwater and footpaths. If this road was duplicated, where would the stormwater be? How would the footpaths integrate? What infrastructure do we need to build? What would it look like? They said they would go away and do the work. I met with them at the instigation of the member for Light and I asked about the work. That work had not been completed—three years. Curtis Road and the City of Playford have only spent on that road \$268,000 over the last 10 years. We are spending a quarter of a billion. They spent \$268,000 over 10 years.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are talking about Curtis Road, not anything else. Given the council's public statements on the ownership of Curtis Road, I think it is about time some of the councillors who are in the City of Playford actually focus on doing their jobs and their job is not making Facebook posts and complaints: their job is about being in the chamber, allocating ratepayers' money to a road. If they can't do it or won't do, let us know. If they are that indifferent to the needs of their constituents, let us know, because this road needs to be fixed and it's time the council got on with fixing it, and if they are not going to fix it, say so. Say so, because we want it fixed. We are going to

fix Curtis Road, so we are doing our bit on our infrastructure, and it is time for the council to do its bit on its infrastructure.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, surprisingly. Have any elective surgeries been cancelled this week and, if so, how many? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: On 4 June *The Advertiser* reported that a memo had been issued to Central Adelaide Local Health Network staff that, quote:

...orders them to cancel category three and non-urgent surgery due to pressure on EDs, which also notes intensive care units at the RAH and QEH are at capacity.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37): I thank the member for her question. Obviously, as we have discussed in the house many times before, each of our hospitals will make local decisions looking at their capacity in terms of what capacity they have for beds to make sure that they can manage the load of a particular surgery. The key thing also, of course, is when we know we have winter demand to schedule that surgery around that demand as well. So there will be other times of the year where they will increase the amount of surgery that they do.

So just as an example, in terms of how that is managed, last year was a year of very significant demand on our healthcare system and there were many, many reports in terms of elective surgery cancellations in the media, etc. But, despite that, the actual numbers of elective surgery operations that we performed in SA Health increased and increased quite substantially. We had 5,200 more operations that we conducted last year than the year before, so that is a 10 per cent increase in the number of those operations that we conducted for public patients, completely covered through the state government in our public hospitals and utilising private hospitals where there's capacity as well.

Individual hospitals will make day-to-day decisions about their capacity. This is another reason why the government is investing so much in opening additional beds across our healthcare system. It is not just so that we can look after emergency patients but also to make sure that we can manage that elective surgery load that we need to handle as well. We can see the delivery in terms of what happened last year, that despite the pressures, we saw a 10 per cent uplift in terms of the number of procedures that were carried out.

BAROSSA HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:39): My question is again to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has land been purchased for a new Barossa hospital; if not, when will it be? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: The former Liberal government set aside \$5 million in the budget for the purchase of a parcel of land for a Barossa hospital.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:40): As I have said previously in commentary here in this house, and publicly and in correspondence with the member for Schubert, we are continuing with what was in the budget in terms of that land purchase. We have been out to the market, and SA Health is considering the responses we have had to that land purchase. In due course the government will get advice on that.

Suffice to say the member for Schubert likes talking about this new Barossa hospital, but she is the shadow minister for health, and we have not seen a policy from the opposition that they would actually do this. There is no—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: You are committed to it, are you? You are committed? You have hundreds of millions that you have committed in your—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That's right. Well, the breaking news here is that the Liberal Party is committing hundreds of millions of dollars. Where are they going to get the money from to do that? What are they going to cut to put that money into a new Barossa hospital?

The SPEAKER: Minister, it has been—

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will come order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on both sides! Premier! I ask you to come to order. It has been very quiet in here today and I was about to maybe reflect on the presence of some members, who may or may not be with us, but that would be unparliamentary. However, it has been really quiet and I think we would like to keep it that way for the next 22 minutes. Minister, resume your answer.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Thank you very much, sir. You can't have it both ways. Either you are committed to it and you are setting aside hundreds of millions of dollars in your election policies and you are going to outline where that money is coming from—in the midst of you saying that you are worried about spiralling debt and all that other stuff, where is the money coming from for this hundreds of millions dollars commitment—or there is no commitment, there is no money, it is not worth the paper it's written on, and you are just trying to have it both ways for your local community.

I think people in the Barossa can see through this. I think they can see that as the shadow health minister you would actually be in a position to be able to say, 'We would commit to this, and here's the money.' You are not doing that. There is no commitment from the opposition, and it is just a fantasy you are floating out there to talk to your local community without actually backing it up.

BAROSSA HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the government publicly release the final business case for the Barossa hospital? If so, when?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): That goes through the appropriate cabinet and Infrastructure Australia processes, and I will seek advice as to whether it is appropriate for us to do so.

GLADSTONE GAOL

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for the Environment and Deputy Premier. Can the minister update the community of Gladstone and the Gladstone Community Development and Tourism Association of the progress of the works that have been undertaken since late 2022 at the Gladstone Gaol to enable the facility to be opened to the public? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: This facility has been non-accessible to the general public for many years. It is a great tourism opportunity, with priority works advised to me back in May 2023 and negotiation being finalised with a contract to ensure further priority works to commence early in the 2022-24 budget and completed as soon as possible. However, the site is still currently closed to the general public.

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) (14:44): I am very pleased to speak about the Gladstone Gaol. I know there was an open day in March, I think, almost three months ago, with some 1,500 people attending, including the honourable member. What a terrific day that was. I myself went there a couple of years ago and had a tour with the people who had been the caretakers and were on their way out. They

were mediums, so it was quite an interesting experience because at times the two women showing us around were talking to people whom I could not see. It was a very interesting experience and no doubt when the tours were officially occurring it would have added a degree of interest for many people.

The honourable member will be well aware, but to bring the chamber up to date, the completion of the building was in something like 1881 and it functioned as a jail for both men and women and was regarded as a fairly light-touch jail with not very heavy sentences. It was closed as a jail in 1939, turned into an internment camp for a little while, then into military storage and military barracks, and then in about 1952 became a jail again, where it was used in a much, I think, tougher way with male-only prisoners and it was a pretty harsh existence. Then it was closed as a jail altogether in the 1970s.

The jail itself is, of course, a heritage place but has fallen into a state of disrepair in parts and I saw that when I went on the tour. The member, although very politely, rightly expresses a degree of frustration that since 2022 it has been closed in part in order to do the repairs, and they are still in progress. I understand they are almost complete or at least substantially they are. There are just some small amounts still to be done and there has been a bit of a delay, partly around the availability of contractors, but that is almost done.

The other reason it closed, of course, is trying to make a business proposition out of the jail. The fact that 1,500 people showed up to the open day indicates a degree of interest and enthusiasm even for the jail, but we do need to have someone come in and operate it. The department is working right now on an expression of interest process and I must say I share a little bit of the, perhaps, frustration that is expressed by the member that really this should be going out to see what kinds of operators are available. So I will take this question as a mark that we need to really accelerate that process, get an expression of interest out and really find out whether there are some operators who would be prepared to come in and run it and what it would take for that to work.

I think we all would like to see this jail be a successful tourism destination. Certainly, the local community would, but actually it is one of those little hidden assets in South Australia that I think would really benefit from being available for people to come in and have a look, so I will commit to escalating getting that out very soon.

The other element, of course, is there is a community garden and I believe there are some final steps being undertaken right now to make sure that that is appropriately licensed and able to be used freely by the community. So, again, I will take this as a mark that I really need to make sure that the department is paying attention. It is an excellent department, there is just a lot going on, but let's make sure that that becomes more of a priority.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. How is the Malinauskas government ensuring that South Australian families have access to quality public education?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:48): I thank the member for Newland for her excellent question and, of course, for her very strong advocacy for the schools in her electorate as well. Last week, it was my pleasure to join the Premier and the Treasurer at Henley Beach Primary School, where we announced a couple of pretty significant parts of the budget, particularly in terms of new and existing infrastructure in public education.

Of course, I think the most prominent part of the announcement that we made was a new primary school and a new preschool in the northern suburbs. Everyone in this chamber and, of course, you, Mr Speaker, know all too well that we have seen incredible population growth in those areas and I do not think we have always done a great job of keeping up in terms of making sure that we have an excellent offering in terms of public schools for the people who live there now and who are seeking to move into the homes that are being built there as well.

One of the first pieces of work that I did as Minister for Education was to get the department to do a piece of work, an analysis, on where the most growth was. It showed very clearly, and it will

not be a surprise to anyone in here, that the northern suburbs was number 1—and it was a fair distance between number 1 and number 2—followed by Mount Barker.

We have already previously announced that we will be building a new primary school with a co-located preschool in Mount Barker. Previously we have also announced, the Minister for Planning and the Premier and myself, a new high school in the suburb of Eyre, which I think will be open for 2028 and will have 1,300 enrolments. At Henley Beach Primary School, we announced what will be a new primary school for 400 students and a new preschool for 60 students as well. I want to perhaps just point out that we have been quite considered in terms of the size of that primary school.

Some members of this place will remember that there has been public debate about issues around some of the unsavoury behaviour that we can sometimes see at schools coming to the fore around whether or not in the past we might have built schools that were too big. I have been quite frank and honest in my response to that, as the minister, by saying that, yes, I think in some cases we have built schools that were so large that when behaviour gets a bit unruly it becomes very hard for the staff there to get it back under control and that we should take a more considered approach when building stock in the future to make sure they are perhaps of a smaller size that is more appropriate. I would point to this announcement here, of the new primary school with 400 students in the northern suburbs, as an example that we are delivering on that commitment that I made.

The other announcement we made on that day was an additional \$40 million across the next four years, \$10 million each year, for some urgent school upgrades right across the state. We know in public education it's a big system. We have 900 public sites and we have almost 6,000 buildings across those 900 sites. The average age of one of those buildings now in the system I think is probably 46 years—I have been saying that for couple of years—which means that we are spending more money than we used to on upgrades for things that might break down. This extra \$40 million announced in the budget is going to be put to very good use.

I can tell the house the projects that were announced as part of it. Of course, in the member for Newland's own seat, there are new heating, ventilation and cooling systems for Banksia Park R-6, but also Mitcham Girls High, East Torrens Primary, Kilkenny Primary, Hewett Primary, Flagstaff Hill R-7, Underdale High School. On Eyre Peninsula, the Karcultaby Area School's design and tech facilities, which are currently housed in a shed, will be replaced with more modern infrastructure. Although it might not be the most pleasant of topics to talk about, people in here will know there's a lot of work to do in terms of upgrading toilets that are needing a bit of TLC. We also announced at Renmark West Primary School in the seat of Chaffey, Coromandel Valley Primary in the seat of Waite and Goodwood Primary in the seat of Unley, upgrades to those schools as well.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, MAGILL CAMPUS LAND TRANSFER

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Planning. When will Renewal SA complete its work on recommendations for the Magill UniSA site and will their report be released publicly, including details of the community consultation?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:52): Renewal is currently working on the master plan, which Oxigen have been doing. We extended out the time, the honourable member would recall, for public consultation because we thought that was important. Renewal are currently obviously analysing that and working with Oxigen about the future of the Magill campus, bearing in mind there are two sections of the campus, east and west of St Bernards Road. Obviously, the community is understandably interested and has many opinions. Of course, I don't think we have—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Yes, well, and lots of worthy ideas for the campus's future, bearing in mind that the university will continue to operate there for some time. We are working. We have brought forward the master plan. We have extended community consultation. We are committed to working with the community. I do not think there's any issue with making the community consultation element of it public, like the results and likelihood, although we would have to be careful of people's personal addresses and the like, personal details. I don't think there will be many

surprises in there for the honourable member or for the community because many of those issues have been well aired at community meetings, on Facebook and in various other places.

Of course, we have to be mindful. This is a very important site for the state, and we do in this case have the luxury of time, so we want to do the master plan properly. It's one of the reasons why we appointed Oxigen, because they have, if you like, a good record of doing master planning of this nature. We will continue to work with the community and the local council and, of course, the individual local MPs in the area.

MORPHETT ROAD TRAM OVERPASS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister inform the house how many trees will be removed from the tram corridor adjacent to both Maxwell Terrace and Dunbar Terrace in Glengowrie? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: A local resident, Ms Marsden, has contacted my office concerned that as of January this year, 16 trees were identified as having to be removed with only two listed as significant, but she was alarmed that the latest project update now lists 21 significant and 64 regulated trees for removal, going on to say, 'I understand trees need to be removed, but this seems excessive,' and also that removing 85 trees is a devastating outcome for Glenelg and Glengowrie residents, local fauna and the environment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:55): Building infrastructure is difficult and probably why the member for Morphett was unable or deliberately didn't attempt to grade separate Morphett Road when they were in government and left the hard heavy lifting to us, which is probably why—

Members interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order: it's 127(2) and 127(3), digression and personal reflections. I draw a distinction from 125. The minister can't do that. It is not for the member to raise it.

The SPEAKER: I will pay close attention to the minister as he resumes his answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note that the member is asking this question on behalf of his constituent, which is the right thing to do. When constituents are upset about progress and the impact on the surrounds when you are building infrastructure it can be quite difficult. We have had a number of these cases where we have had to go in and build infrastructure that the previous members refused to. I give you an example: Majors Road. The Majors Road on/off ramps were something they talked about in opposition and refused to do in government. The moment we did it, the moment we began to do it, there was a lot of talk about the destruction of trees and the like.

Of course, the government knows and understands that we have to remove some trees and we have to make some destruction but we are building something for the future. What we always intend to do, at the very best, is minimise our footprint and our impact on trees, especially mature trees, regulated trees and significant trees because they are hard to replace and they are part of the local community make-up and we want to keep them, but we also want to get rid of the intersection that is down for nearly 20 minutes at a time in an hour during peak-hour traffic.

We are making some tough decisions in getting it done right the first time. I would say to the constituent of the member for Morphett: it's one thing to receive a complaint and agree with the complaint and then raise it in the parliament; it's another thing to get on and say, 'I understand the complaint but this project needs to be built.'

I would say a majority of the constituents that the member for Morphett currently represents would be a little bit surprised at the question today by the member for Morphett because this question implies somehow that the project may not be worthy, may not be important enough—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on! This is the part he cuts out of the Facebook video. This is the part he cuts out. He only puts the question up.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you might return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, thank you very much for your wise judgement, sir, I will return.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am deeply hurt. It's always difficult when your peers have a go at you. When your peers have a crack at you it's always difficult, it's always the hardest. It is always the hardest. When your peers have a crack, it cuts deep. But I say to the member for Morphett: we are doing our very best to minimise it. We won't take a single tree more than is needed and we will replace trees and we will make sure that it is better than ever before. I can assure your constituent we are doing what you refused to do for the entire time you were in office and that is getting rid of that grade separation.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. What steps has the state government taken to call for a national review of the tomato brown rugose virus's impact on South Australian growers? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: On 19 March 2025 the government amended a motion to state that a national review will occur once the ToBRFV response in South Australia has been completed and eradication is achieved, but last week the National Management Group declared it is not feasible to eradicate the virus from Australia.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:59): Thank you very much to the shadow minister for her question. As the member for Frome foreshadowed in her question last week, there was a significant movement with respect to the national position in regard to the virus affecting our tomatoes not just in South Australia but around the country, particularly given that the virus has been identified in other jurisdictions outside of our own.

The movement and consideration more nationally away from an approach of eradication towards active management does bring good news in some instances. PIRSA and the state government more broadly continue to advocate for a greater relaxation of some of the restrictions that are placed upon South Australian growers into other key markets. Although there has been substantial progress in this regard with a number of jurisdictions, there still remains a number of other jurisdictions that aren't as far advanced as we would like in respect of their capacity to be able to deal with South Australian growers. Of course, the virus had a very substantial impact on our state. Although that impact was ameliorated for many people, the ones who were affected were affected rather adversely.

We will continue to engage with other jurisdictions but also at a commonwealth level. We think it would be virtuous to actively consider how we can have a nationally consistent approach in terms of the management of the virus, provided that everyone is playing by the same rules. I guess part of the frustration we have had in South Australia as the first state to be subjected to this menace, through nobody's fault, is there hasn't been a consistent rulebook across jurisdictions. As the member for Frome would appreciate, that makes it even harder for those people who are growers.

We will continue to advocate accordingly. This has been particularly difficult given that this is the first time that this has occurred. To use probably a pretty poor analogy, it has felt like in many respects officials have been flying the plane and putting it together at the same time on this one. But that does present an opportunity to respond and get it right.

We also continue to engage with growers on other practical ways PIRSA can contemplate challenges like this into the future. Biosecurity isn't immune to the horticultural sector, again as I know the member for Frome is well aware. We have a number of biosecurity risks that the state is confronting at the moment, including with livestock. Looking at capacity around testing and looking

at capacity around notifications and communications is a responsibility that we hold pretty seriously and will do our best to tackle.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of Government Business, I would like to welcome to parliament today the family of the Treasurer of South Australia and put on the record our thanks for sharing your husband and dad with the people of South Australia so he can get on with a very important job for the people of South Australia. Thank you.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:03): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 17 June 2025 at 11am.

Motion carried.

BUDGET PAPERS

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:03): I lay on the table the following budget papers:

Budget 2025-26—

Paper 1—Budget Overview

Paper 2—Budget Speech

Paper 3—Budget Statement

Paper 4—Agency Statements—Volume 1

Paper 4—Agency Statements—Volume 2

Paper 4—Agency Statements—Volume 3

Paper 4—Agency Statements—Volume 4

Paper 5—Budget Measures Statement

I move:

That the Budget Statement, Agency Statements and Budget Measures Statement be published.

Motion carried.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2025

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:04): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the year ending 30 June 2026 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It gives me great pleasure to present to the house the 2025-26 state budget, the fourth budget of the Malinauskas government. Three years ago, this government came to office with a clear mandate. We set out a plan to reinvigorate our state, to restore a clear sense of direction and leadership for our community.

We committed to rebuilding our health system, building more beds and stopping the cuts to frontline staff, and to tackling ramping at our emergency departments. We committed to reforming our education system, ensuring it can give our kids the best start to life and also give them the skills

they need to succeed in the future economy. We committed to tackle the crisis in housing supply and affordability and to get more young South Australians into their own homes, and we committed to supporting families and small business through the cost-of-living pressures caused by spiking inflation and interest rates.

From day one, we have set out to be a government that would deliver nation-leading reforms so that once again our state could be leading the nation. We set out to use the authority of government, the power of the parliament and the capacity of the state's finances to deliver the reforms and make the investments necessary to succeed in these ambitions, and in just three short years, look at the progress we have made.

Our economy has gone from laggard to leader. We have the lowest unemployment rate in the state's history in recent months, and we regularly lead the nation. We are ranked the best place in the nation to do business. We have the best planning system, the best-performing housing market and increasing numbers of first-home buyers moving into their own homes.

We have expanded capacity in our hospitals. We have increased the number of doctors, nurses and ambulance officers to record levels. We are introducing preschool for three year olds. We have reintroduced technical colleges into our high schools. We are supporting the merger of the state's two largest universities. We are delivering a historic boost to skills and training funding. We are finally finishing the north-south corridor. We are building a new Women's and Children's Hospital that is actually big enough for future generations.

We returned the Adelaide 500, introduced Gather Round and brought LIV Golf to Australia. We have proven to the country that no-one does major events better than South Australia. We have led the nation in reforming social media laws, demanding and achieving a ban on social media accounts for children under 16. We have led the nation, if not the world, in banning political donations. We are the lowest taxing state on the mainland, and we have kept our promise not to introduce new taxes or increase existing ones. We have done all this while returning the budget to surplus and improving the state's credit rating outlook.

The 2025-26 state budget proudly builds on the progress we have made. It is a budget that once again supports our economy, stepping in to protect steelmaking in Whyalla and supporting our farmers during drought. It is a budget that puts more police back on our streets and invests in prisons and in our criminal justice system. It is a budget that boosts our health system and supports families and businesses with cost-of-living pressures. It is a budget that accelerates our reform to deliver preschool for three year olds. It is a budget that will help South Australians buy their own home sooner. It is a budget of sound financial management that forecasts the delivery of another surplus and ensures debt levels remain sustainable.

We have consistently shown that this is a government that responds quickly to challenges. Over the past 12 months, we became increasingly alarmed at the reports that the steelworks in Whyalla were under threat, reports of businesses not being paid, workers being laid off, maintenance work not being done, safety being put at risk and investments being delayed. Enough was enough.

Our unprecedented intervention to place the Whyalla Steelworks into administration has protected thousands of jobs, hundreds of businesses and ensured Australia remains a country that manufactures critical steel products. Under this government, South Australians will not be taken for fools by fast-talking businessmen who continually break their promises to our state. That is why, together with the commonwealth, we financed a \$2.4 billion rescue package, not only to save Whyalla and its steelworks but to rebuild it, to remake it and to give it a future.

The budget outlines how South Australia's contribution of \$650 million over six years is accommodated. The funding is for administration costs, investment in the plant to support the sale, and for a comprehensive rescue package that safeguards the Whyalla community. The budget still forecasts a surplus for the current 2024-25 financial year even after the impact of the Whyalla rescue package is taken into account.

In addition, the government has limited the impact of the rescue package on the state's debt position by deferring the Hydrogen Jobs Plan. Not only has the government's intervention restored

confidence in Whyalla and the steelworks, we have already financially supported more than 100 businesses in Whyalla that were so badly let down by GFG.

The government has taken the same approach to the unprecedented drought conditions afflicting our state. We are stepping up to assist farmers and regional communities when they need help the most. The budget provides a further \$55.4 million in a comprehensive drought support package, on top of the \$18 million already committed in November last year. We did not wait until today to announce this funding; instead it is already being rolled out to farmers and across communities. It follows the example set in previous budgets when the government supported regional communities through the River Murray flood event.

While the nature of primary production is that there will be good seasons and there will be bad, when nature intervenes so harshly, as it has over the last 12 months, then it is imperative governments lend a hand, to make sure that when it rains again the farmers are still there to grow their crops, raise their livestock and continue as the heartbeat of regional communities. That is why the budget also provides \$3 million to fund the state's dairy farmers who have been left stranded by the collapse of Beston Global Food group.

In the same way, this government is helping South Australian families with further cost-of-living relief. Thankfully, some of the pressures faced by families are beginning to ease as the rate of inflation returns to the target band, allowing the Reserve Bank to twice cut interest rates this year. Most economists are now predicting there will be more cuts before the end of this year, but it does not mean that the financial pain felt by so many over the last three years has disappeared. We know that many families, many businesses, are still trying to recover, which is why the government is providing additional cost-of-living assistance in this budget.

While the federal government is delivering its energy bill rebates and introducing its \$1,000 instant tax deduction for workers, this budget is complementing this with relief for families and small and medium businesses. The budget extends the \$200 reduction of the government school materials and services charge for another four years, saving the parents of more than 120,000 schoolchildren \$96 million over this period.

We are also slashing the cost of public transport for students. Parents of school-age children well understand the daily pressure of organising the school drop-off and pick-up and the interruption it causes to the work day and other commitments. To further support families, the budget introduces a new low-cost public transport ticket for school students, costing only \$10 for a 28-day pass from 1 July this year. This will give four full school weeks of public transport for an equivalent of only 25¢ per trip.

By dropping the price of public transport for school students, we hope to encourage more children to catch public transport to and from school. It will also make it easier for parents and caregivers to get to work and stay at work rather than be interrupted by the school run. Even better, the ticket can be used for unlimited trips, including on weekends and public holidays.

At the same time, the government is spending \$9.6 million to improve security on public transport, including upgrading CCTV at key interchanges. Together, the extension of the government school materials and services charge and the \$10, 28-day pass will save a family with two school-age children up to \$884 a year. This brings the total cost-of-living assistance delivered by this government to almost \$1 billion over four budgets.

Protecting the community is a government's primary responsibility. While crime rates have fallen over the course of this government, we continue to toughen laws, expand our prisons and equip our police and criminal justice system with the resources needed to combat crime. This budget provides the largest boost to police funding in the state's history. More than \$170 million will be spent over the next six years to build South Australia's largest ever police force. The budget funds an increase in sworn police officers of 243 full-time equivalents by 2028-29 and a further 83 by 2030-31. The additional 326 sworn officers will give our state a record total of 5,000 police, reaffirming South Australia as having the highest number of sworn police per capita of any state.

The budget also continues the government's efforts to get more sworn officers out of support roles and back onto the frontline. A further \$29.6 million will enable 98 police security officers to be

recruited by 2028-29, building on the 189 extra officers funded in the 2023-24 budget. The police security officers will be deployed to regional areas, meaning there will be more sworn police out on the beat in regional communities. The budget also funds a further \$9.7 million to continue the civilianisation of administrative roles within South Australia Police, releasing a further 20 sworn officers back to operational duties.

Together, these measures will see a significant increase to the number of police on the frontline, bolstered by a total of more than 630 by 2030-31. People like to see police on our streets and in the community; it makes them feel safer and it deters criminals from acting. We have the best police force in the nation: the most highly respected, capable and successfully combating crime in our community. I want to take this opportunity to thank the police commissioner for advocating for these measures and working with the government to develop this record funding package.

Keeping the community safe also means keeping criminals off our streets. Over the next five years, the state government will spend \$72.4 million to increase prison capacity by a further 116 beds across the system. This brings the total number of extra beds to 468 funded over the last two budgets. There will also be \$6.8 million allocated to boost security in our prisons to make it more difficult to smuggle in contraband, including drugs and weapons. But we also believe it is important to invest in places where people can turn their lives around if they so choose, and to that end, the budget provides \$8.1 million to establish an additional 30-bed bail accommodation support program to create a remand-to-bail pathway and help support Closing the Gap targets.

The government is also committed to a more efficient and well-resourced criminal justice system. The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions will receive an extra \$9.4 million, while for forensic science a further \$5.5 million will improve the capacity for those charged to be brought before the courts more quickly. There will be \$20 million invested in critical upgrades of court infrastructure and \$4.8 million to enhance security at courts across the state.

Improving community safety also extends to our roads. It is shocking how one moment on our roads can end a life and change others so profoundly. The impact on families is crippling, and the distress for emergency services, police and our health system just as powerful. Before the Easter long weekend, I stood with Sergeant John Hong to plead with motorists and road users to be safe on our roads over that long weekend. Sergeant Hong has not only lost a loved one from road trauma but has spent most of his policing career with the task of informing families their loved one has lost their life on our roads. None of us can imagine the gravity of that task. This budget again invests to improve safety on our roads, in the hope that those knocks on the front door become less frequent.

A \$17.8 million investment will see the number of motorcycle police patrolling our roads double, with a further 33 officers to be recruited. The budget also provides \$46.8 million to install new mobile phone detection, red-light and point-to-point cameras at high-risk locations. Revenue raised through these cameras will be ploughed straight back into improving road safety across the state, with an extra \$7.5 million for regional road safety infrastructure and \$20 million for road safety maintenance and, to reinforce the message that the road toll must come down, there will be \$4.5 million dedicated to new targeted road safety campaigns.

The budget also invests heavily to improve our road infrastructure. The budget commits \$125 million to match the commonwealth government's \$525 million on an 80:20 basis to build the High Productivity Vehicle Network, together funding a \$650 million project to improve freight efficiency and reduce trucks on the South Eastern Freeway and already busy suburban arterial roads.

Curtis Road will be upgraded with \$125 million to match the commonwealth's contribution to remove the level crossing, improving travel times for 21,000 vehicles each day and to support future housing development. On Main South Road between Myponga and Yankalilla, \$80 million will be directed to building overtaking lanes and widening bridges, also co-funded with the commonwealth.

Our health system will once again receive a major boost in this budget, with a further \$1.9 billion to meet increasing demand. This brings our total extra investment in health to \$9 billion over four budgets. The investment to date has allowed us to recruit record numbers of doctors, nurses and ambulance officers, as well as allied health workers, and we will have built an extra 330 beds by the end of this calendar year.

The government's investment has drastically improved ambulance response times, so sick people receive the critical care they need as soon as possible. But there is still much more work to be done. There will be \$117 million of new investment in mental health services, with more than 130 new mental health beds being brought online, and \$13.9 million is allocated to expand the mental health—South Australia Police co-responder program to manage mental health crises outside of hospital emergency departments. Also, \$2.2 million over three years is provided to expand the scope of services pharmacists can provide, helping keep South Australians out of emergency departments.

The budget also builds on the government's efforts to tackle the housing supply and affordability crisis confronting our nation. We have been alarmed that for many South Australians, the dream of home ownership has never felt more out of reach. Well, this government is committed to putting it back within their grasp. Since coming to government, we have committed almost \$3.2 billion to boost public and social housing, release land, build infrastructure and cut taxes—all with the aim of increasing supply and improving affordability.

Through the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, we have identified where 315,000 new homes will be built over the next 30 years and the government's Housing Roadmap will speed up the development and approval process to ensure more houses can be built more quickly. South Australia is now ranked the best performing state for housing by the Housing Industry Association, so this budget ensures we continue the progress we have already made, with a further \$552 million to build more homes for South Australians, including:

- \$270 million to increase development of new housing at Playford Alive;
- \$104.7 million to deliver the Southwark Master Plan, on the site of the former West End Brewery; and
- \$30 million towards preparing the Onkaparinga Heights site for new homes.

Together, these developments will support the construction of at least 2,935 additional homes.

The budget also introduces the rent-to-buy affordable housing initiative which will allow long-term renters to buy one of 100 homes currently under construction by the South Australian Housing Trust.

While our housing policies have meant a huge boost to the construction industry, we have also ensured the conditions to allow other sectors of the economy to continue to flourish. It is why we have kept our promise to not increase or introduce any new taxes. Our payroll tax system has been recognised as the most competitive in Australia and we are also, as I said before, the lowest taxing state on the mainland.

But this government knows there are times local businesses need an extra boost. In this budget, we are announcing the new \$20 million Powering Business Grants program. Grants ranging from \$2,500 to \$75,000 will be offered to encourage small and medium-sized businesses and not-for-profit organisations, including community and sporting clubs, to invest in energy-efficient equipment. This will help businesses cut power bills not just as a once-off, but on an ongoing basis.

Our government will also contribute \$50 million towards a new venture capital fund to encourage our best and brightest entrepreneurs to take their business ideas to the world. This budget also includes a new \$5 million program over two years to help guide exporters through the current global trade uncertainty and new tariff environment.

The budget supports our reputation as the defence state, investing another \$13.5 million in the Defence Innovation Partnership and \$3.3 million in the Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Uplift program. The Defence Teaming Centre is funded to help more South Australian companies become involved in critical supply chains as we commence the construction of the most complex machines ever made: nuclear-powered, conventionally-armed submarines at Osborne.

The budget includes funding for the Department of Energy and Mining and the Copper Taskforce, assisting BHP develop its expansion of the state's copper deposits and cementing South Australia's critical role in the decarbonisation and electrification of global industry.

When the government was elected in 2022 the Gather Round did not exist, LIV Golf wasn't an event in our country and the Adelaide 500 had been scrapped. Now all three are among the biggest events across Australia, drawing tens of thousands of people to our state. Gather Round alone creates around \$100 million in economic activity. These events fill hotel rooms, pack flights, add energy to our bars and restaurants and signal to the rest of the nation that South Australia is open for business.

To build on this success, the budget also includes \$10.9 million in additional funding for Business Events Adelaide to attract more events and conventions. The funding arrives just as Adelaide Airport welcomes further international routes, with Qantas, Cathay Pacific and United Airlines introducing direct international flights to Adelaide in the coming months.

The last three years has seen remarkable progress in our state's employment figures. We have added almost 65,000 jobs since the 2022 election, most of them full-time, and we have recorded record low rates of unemployment. The challenge now is to increase the number of higher-skilled, higher-paying jobs across our economy and to make sure workers have the skills to perform them.

To achieve this, the government is investing in every stage of education from preschool to trade schools to universities. Last budget, the government set out our \$1.9 billion commitment to introduce preschool for three year olds. This year, in response to overwhelming demand from the long day care sector, the government is spending \$27.7 million to accelerate the roll out of preschool for three year olds. This will provide an extra 2,000 places for South Australian families from January 2026.

We also continue to expand our schools; in addition to the two new schools announced as part of last year's budget, today's budget also provides \$70 million for a new birth-to-year-6 primary school in the northern suburbs. Treasury will work with the education department to put these three schools to market through a public private partnership, given how successful the last round of PPPs for schools has been.

The budget also continues the government's commitment to the environment. It includes \$109.7 million funded by the commonwealth for a range of measures to support and improve the health of the River Murray, and \$8.3 million to begin planning and preparations for the 31st Conference of the Parties, the largest environmental and climate change conference in the world.

As recent storms have eroded beaches along the metropolitan coast, the budget commits a further \$14 million to sand replenishment. With the emergence of the toxic microalgae along South Australia's waters, the budget provides \$44.4 million to replace the coastal research vessel, and a further \$45 million is provided to continue the fight against fruit fly.

On coming to government we committed to return the budget to surplus, to end the run of deficits recorded under the previous government. Returning budget surpluses means the government has the capacity to respond to community needs such as cost of living, flood and drought response, and economic issues like Whyalla.

Surpluses are also vital to ensure that we have the capacity to take on the additional debt necessary to build the South Road tunnels and the new Women's and Children's Hospital. Today, the government is forecast to deliver its third consecutive surplus. A surplus of \$18 million is forecast in the 2024-25 financial year, increasing to \$179 million in 2025-26. The budget also forecasts surpluses across the next four years.

While debt rises across the forward estimates, it will fund productive infrastructure that will benefit successive generations of South Australians. More than \$27 billion will be spent on infrastructure over the next four years, including the new Women's and Children's Hospital and the South Road tunnels project, the two largest projects in the state's history.

Our debt projections remain manageable and South Australia compares very favourably against other states and territories in our budget settings. Indeed, the budget's strong position means that in the current financial year, net debt is actually \$2 billion lower than what was forecast in the last budget of the previous Liberal government and the key debt to revenue ratio is improved by a full 30 percentage points.

Among all states, South Australia has the second-strongest credit rating and outlook, trailing only a Western Australian economy fuelled by an unfair GST distribution. The state's credit rating outlook has improved under this government, moving to a stable outlook from the negative watch under the previous government.

Before I finish, I would like to thank those who have been instrumental in delivering this year's budget and helping me prepare it and supporting me through the process. First, to my wife, Antonia, and our children, Ben, Isaac and Olivia—it is an enormous pleasure and privilege to be a member of parliament and to be a minister and Treasurer. But it is a privilege that also comes at the cost of a far greater privilege and that is the privilege of being a father and a husband in my family. Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to do this job and for being so patient and supportive and loving the whole way through. I cannot tell you how much I appreciate it.

To the Premier and his office and also my ministerial colleagues, I am grateful for the input and collaboration throughout the budget process, and I also thank my caucus colleagues for their ongoing support.

Under Treasurer Tammie Pribanic is one of the finest public servants in this state, and her sound advice, work ethic and unfailing commitment have been absolutely vital in putting this budget together. As to her exceptional team at the Department of Treasury and Finance including Sandy Burness, Phoung Chau, Scott Bayliss, Greg Raymond, Ben Ryan, Mark Beveridge and many others, thank you for your tireless efforts and attention to detail.

To my ministerial staff, including Chief of Staff John Atkinson, Tara Yoon, Michael McGuire, Grace Nankivell, Emma De Favari, Sam Chapman, Kate Wheeler, Elicea Tomlinson, Alanah Vernocchi, Sarah Sharpe and Jack Berketa—who has done an outstanding job stepping up to the plate in the place of Andrea Nicolas while she takes maternity leave—thank you all for the extraordinarily hard work that you put in on a consistent basis.

In a global environment of increasing volatility, the last three years and this budget demonstrates what a strong, united, experienced government can deliver. It is a budget that responds to the economic challenges of Whyalla and drought. It is a budget that backs the people who keep our community safe, with record investments in police, in prisons and the criminal justice system. It builds on the capacity we have built in our health system, and delivers more housing for South Australians.

This budget continues our proud record of providing cost-of-living relief, while backing South Australian businesses. It keeps our taxes low and our budget in surplus. It is also a budget that recognises the business of government is never complete. There is a sense of energy and optimism about our state that we have not seen for a long time. This budget builds on the foundations of the last three years and sets our state on a path to a more prosperous, productive and inclusive future. I commend the budget to the house. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2025. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act*.

3—Interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

4—Issue and application of money

This clause provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in Schedule 1 to the Bill. Subclause (2) makes it clear that the appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act* is superseded by this Bill.

5—Application of money if functions or duties of agency are transferred

This clause is designed to ensure that where Parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency, the funds may be used by the responsible agency in accordance with Parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

6—Expenditure from Hospitals Fund

This clause provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the Hospitals Fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

7—Additional appropriation under other Acts

This clause makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this Bill is additional to authority provided in other Acts of Parliament, except, of course, in the *Supply Act*.

8—Overdraft limit

This clause sets a limit of \$150 million on the amount which the Government may borrow by way of overdraft.

Schedule 1—Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 2026

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Teague.

SUPPLY BILL 2025

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

Adjournment Debate

STATE BUDGET

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:36): What a disappointment. The headline for tomorrow no doubt is going to be, 'Treasurer claims tiny surplus and meanwhile towering debt for South Australians'. Many of us will have up on the pinboard one round of Treasurer presiding over towering debt in South Australia, when it was just at \$44 billion. We have just heard from the Treasurer that the state is now going to be burdened with just about \$50 billion by the time we next look at it. We are at 48.5, based on what we have just been told and against the background of what appears to be a complete lack of vision from this government nearly four years in.

Who would have thought that Malinauskas Labor would at this stage be such a tired government lacking in any vision whatsoever for South Australians and yet burdening them with more debt than this state has ever seen by far. If it was not enough to see that lack of vision on display, it is compounded by yet another display of incompetence across the board simply to manage the executive responsibilities of government.

We only need to turn to the Budget Statement at page 23 to see yet again what South Australians have become used to looking at as the table of despair for this Malinauskas Labor government. We go down in alphabetical order and, as I feared this morning, we see Child Protection expenditure over budget by a full \$156 million. What does the government have to show for that but ongoing crisis in Child Protection? We do not have anything to show for it, but we have not only generous provision but \$156 million in blown budget in Child Protection.

Just to take another example, we do not have to go much further down the list to see Health and Wellbeing blown out by \$739 million to budget, Human Services blown by \$148 million to budget, Infrastructure and Transport \$300 million, and the list goes on. Compounding what we have now become used to is this combination of a lack of vision and year-on-year incompetence.

What it leads to is a budget measures process that announces that, to take that first example of Child Protection, we are going to have more measures, we are going to have provision for out-of-home care in Child Protection. That is just mopping up the over expense that has just occurred, and it has happened year on year on year. My colleagues and I will be unpacking that in the estimates process shortly to come, but it is a tale of woe.

As I have indicated, a tiny surplus. The Treasurer has just stood up and said that there will be this tiny surplus and an even more towering, unprecedented debt for all South Australians. The key issue for South Australians today is that Labor has proved to South Australians that it is completely out of touch with our needs, with the needs of all of us here in South Australia. Instead what it has committed to is frivolously whittling away what few taxpayer dollars are now available on ongoing vanity projects. It is not delivering the relief that South Australians need, and meanwhile South Australians are continuing to face sky-high energy prices and sky-high water bills, with more to come, and the ongoing housing crisis.

We have heard the Premier endeavour to spin his way out of the housing crisis. When he is presented with the opportunity to provide relief for first-home buyers, what does he do? He spins that as 'Nothing more to see here' and defends his Treasurer, who said just a couple of days ago, 'Oh well, actually, there's nothing more for the government to do,' and how dare we, on the opposition, come along and propose more.

No, that would disrupt the sort of benign situation of a super minister over here who is presiding over not one slab, despite all of these announced releases of land that are supposed to answer the Premier's supply-side problem but with no measures to provide relief, particularly for young South Australians looking to build or buy their first home. You will hear more from this opposition about that because we care about young South Australians who are wanting to find their first home. So Labor provides no vision for South Australians, and it compounds that by the incompetence that is on display right on the face of the budget statement.

As I have indicated, what we have heard today from the Treasurer and what South Australians will read about tomorrow in the paper is this towering debt iceberg. Normally you talk about an iceberg and there is just that bit above the surface; this is a towering debt iceberg. It is more than we have ever seen, at \$48.5 billion by 2028-29. It is the biggest debt in our history. We belled the cat on it last year, and South Australians will now be saying, 'When does the debt end? When do you stop spending our money, and when is this going to turn into some sort of engagement with the real issues that affect South Australians?'

In case that number is just too mind-boggling to get to grips with, I think we have heard the Treasurer concede that what that is going to do is present to South Australians a staggering \$7 million a day in interest alone. I know what \$7 million could do this year for my constituents in Heysen. I know what \$7 million could do next month and next year for those constituents in Morphett or in Hammond or, indeed, for those constituents of members of the backbench on the other side, government members who must be now looking on to their Treasurer with dismay and saying, 'While South Australians are going to be bearing this multimillion-dollar daily interest cost, where are the opportunities for real relief and real achievement for South Australians locally and throughout our state?'

We know that this is a time when hardworking South Australians are being crushed by the rising cost of living. At this time, South Australians will have been approaching this budget about as soberly as one could ever. Far from looking for more bells and whistles, more vanity projects, more bread and circuses, South Australians will have been approaching this budget time soberly indeed. What they have heard is that Labor is not for them, Labor is not for providing the relief to this cost-of-living crisis because there is no meaningful relief.

While we know that Labor is entirely out of touch with South Australians' needs, we are now going to see that should, heaven forbid, there be some economic shock that comes along, dare I say some further shock to a regional town in South Australia, some shock that affects us throughout the country, what Labor has done is render us vulnerable. There is nothing left in the stores. We have this \$48.5 billion debt hanging over us.

What we are going to see when that day comes is what the Labor Party always does when it runs out of your money to spend and that is we are going to start to see desperate measures, we are going to start to see more of the bill increases just like they have started down the track with those water bill increases.

There is no vision, no competence and no relief for South Australians suffering under this crisis overseen by Malinauskas Labor. It is a disgrace and South Australians will be hearing from us.

PEAK BODY FORUM

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:46): I would like to take a few minutes to provide an example of where the government sector, in this case the local government sector, works with community groups and harnesses the talents of volunteers to get a better outcome for the whole community. It is a better outcome because a whole range of things are done, but also a better outcome because it comes at a lower cost to ratepayers.

On Monday night I had the pleasure to attend the 2025 Peak Body Forum held by the Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council. In addition to myself and a whole range of other volunteers, the member for Frome was also present.

The Peak Body Forum is an annual forum when all the various town committees get together and give a report on the things they have done in the preceding 12 months. In this case, the peak bodies that currently exist within the Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council are the Auburn Community Development Committee, the Mintaro Progress Association, the Manoora Community Association, the Marrabel Districts Community Association, the Saddleworth District Community Association, the Sevenhill (Richardson Park Inc.), the Stanley Flat Soldiers Memorial Hall, the Tarlee Hall and Community Services, the Riverton Community Management Committee, the Waterloo Soldiers Memorial Hall, the Watervale Community Association and the Stockport Community Association.

Of those groups and community organisations, several provided reports on the night. Andy Theobald from the Tarlee Hall and Community Services group spoke about the things they have done over the past 12 months and particularly the importance of the Tarlee Hall to that community. John Glistak from the Riverton Community Management Committee provided a report on the various things that committee has undertaken over the past 12 months. Rhonda Seymour from the Auburn Community Development Committee spoke about their vision for their community and particularly how they are harnessing volunteers for great work in that town.

Daryn Quick spoke about the Manoora Community Committee and also raised the issue of water security, which I will be raising with him. Terry Savage provided a very detailed report for the Stockport Community Association.

These associations and committee groups are actually powered by over 100 volunteers and they are partly funded by council and the rest of the funding is raised by these committees for community projects. The Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council provides \$6,000 per annum for each peak body. In addition to that, they are also able to apply for a portion of some additional funding.

These groups act as a very important conduit between the community and the council, but more importantly work alongside council to make the ratepayer dollar go further. They also, importantly, engage with their communities to provide the best possible services. I would like to commend both the peak body members and also the council for their work in making our communities better.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr DIGHTON (Black) (15:49): I rise to continue my series of grievance speeches on the national parks in my electorate and, in particular, the work of the Friends Group, but before I do I just want to commend the work of our Treasurer in delivering the budget today. I particularly want to highlight the vision of the Treasurer and the vision of the government, particularly around law and order and the work that he has done in the announcements around the police and the \$172 million for additional sworn police officers, \$31 million for infrastructure, and \$29 million for police security officers. The fact that we are going to have an extra 326 sworn officers over the next five years, I think, is something that our community will absolutely benefit from and they will appreciate the vision the government has in that regard.

I do want to just quickly talk about O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park. It is 250 hectares that offers scenic beauty as well as ecological refuge and a variety of recreational uses. In fact, many mountain bikers enjoy this particular space. There are over 20 different mountain bike trails ranging from easy to advanced.

European settlement significantly altered the landscape of O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park. There were a number of farms, grazing and there is even a bluestone quarry that is located and still visible in the park today. The park was proclaimed a recreation park in 1989 and the aim was to preserve that remnant vegetation and open space whilst allowing for low-impact recreation close to the city.

O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park has now become part of the broader Glenithorne National Park and this initiative connects multiple green spaces to create a wildlife corridor and a community resource that will benefit many generations. The park's beauty and biodiversity are not maintained by chance. They are supported by the tireless efforts of volunteers, particularly Friends of O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, which was formed in 1992. This dedicated group has been working for over 30 years to restore and protect the area's native ecosystems.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with Wayne Turner, the President of Friends of O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park. Wayne took me on a tour of the park and showed me the work that the Friends Group has been and is currently doing to preserve the park. In particular, it was interesting to gain a better appreciation of the systematic process needed to remove olive trees from the park. It is a significant exercise that involves a disciplined and organised approach.

It was also special to see a mob of around 15 kangaroos bounding through the park on the morning I visited with Wayne; a demonstration of the work that the Friends Group has done to return this environment park to the natural habitat, especially considering how close it is to the city. I want to give thanks to the work of Friends of O'Halloran Hill Conservation Recreation Park. Through their dedication they are protecting the biodiversity of our environment, ensuring that these spaces are protected for current and future generations.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:53): We all know how hard our police work, but that work has become increasingly more difficult and more complex as time has gone on. Police are often called to complex mental health call-outs and an increased response in terms of the investigation and prosecution of domestic violence and family violence issues, which is entirely understandable. What this has done is put extra pressure on our police and that is why I am very, very pleased that in today's state budget the Treasurer and, indeed, the Minister for Police have seen fit to provide a record budget boost to the funding for SAPOL in our state.

By the year 2031 we will have 5,000 sworn police officers on the beat, and that maintains our state's position as having the highest number of police officers per capita anywhere in the country. This is on top of other measures in the budget in terms of mental health co-responders, more motorcycles and a complete upgrade to the firearms that our SAPOL officers carry.

I want to commend the Treasurer for this budget. This budget proves, if proof were needed, that the Malinauskas government takes community safety very seriously.

At 15:55 the house adjourned until Tuesday 17 June 2025 at 11:00.