

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Thursday, 4 September 2025

**The SPEAKER (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)** took the chair at 11:01.

**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*

### DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:04):** By leave, I move my motion in an amended form:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report on domestic violence in South Australia, with particular reference to—

- (a) the roles of the police, child protection and domestic violence services when cases arise;
- (b) the effectiveness and communication between relevant agencies;
- (c) whether systemic or cultural bias play any part in determining what action should be taken;
- (d) what reforms, if any, are needed to improve domestic violence services; and any other related matters.

A recent death has shocked South Australia. It has seen waves of grief throughout the victim's family and community, and all who have read her story in the media. It has raised serious questions about the adequacy of the state's response to domestic violence and family violence, particularly when cultural background, language and systemic barriers intersect to leave women and children at a heightened risk.

The purpose of this committee is not simply to reflect on what has gone wrong, but to ensure that these deaths are not in vain. We must use this tragedy, and these tragedies, as a catalyst for reform, accountability and urgent action. A coronial inquest is an important process, and it will consider the cause and circumstances of the victim's death, but an inquest on its own is not enough, so we ask the parliament to act, and that is a fair question, as this question deserves clear answers.

Firstly, coronial inquests are slow—they often take 12 months or so to commence, and they can take even longer to conclude. Women and children at risk cannot wait years for lessons to be learned. Secondly, coronial inquests are narrow in scope, and they are focused on the medical cause of death, and the specific event surrounding it. They are not designed to examine broad policy frameworks, cultural competency, systematic failures or any interagency accountability.

Thirdly, coronial findings do not compel governments to act. While recommendations are valuable, they often sit on the shelf while risk continues in our community. By contrast, a parliamentary select committee can begin its work immediately and can hear evidence from frontline workers, victims, advocates, cultural leaders, agency officials and service providers. It can shine a light on systemic issues that contribute to this tragedy, and it can deliver timely recommendations to parliament ensuring that protective reforms are not delayed. This is not duplication; this is an urgency.

There is a relationship between a parliamentary committee and the recently concluded Royal Commission into Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence led by Natasha Stott Despoja AO. The royal commission made 136 wideranging recommendations. These include reforms to policing, child protection, cultural competency, housing, bail laws and support for victims and survivors and has provided the state with a blueprint for reform. However, every member in this house knows translating a blueprint into real change on the ground is often where governments can stumble.

The commission has provided the 'what'. What we need now is to quickly act. The select committee that is proposed will complement the commission's work and exhilarate it. It will test the commission's recommendations against real cases. It will ask that had the royal commission's recommendations already been in place, would deaths like this still be happening? Are there systemic failures in how police, child protection, housing and support services respond? Are cultural factors, including women who were teenage brides, with a background in a culturally and linguistic diverse community, properly understood and appropriately addressed?

The committee would act as a bridge between the high-level recommendations of the royal commission and the lived experience of South Australian women whose lives were tragically lost due to their murder by their partners. The terms of reference I will table will enable the committee to examine:

- the nature, frequency and severity of domestic violence;
- the actions of South Australia Police, including responses to domestic violence calls;
- the role of child protection;
- housing and domestic violence services;
- mental health support;
- failures in information-sharing and interagency coordination and whether a systemic or cultural bias can contribute to inaction, or minimisation in the assessment of risk;
- the adequacy of cultural competency frameworks across agencies, particularly in protecting women and children from CALD backgrounds;
- the impact on children and whether they are to be safeguarded; and
- the broader reforms needed to prevent such tragedies from happening again.

For the avoidance of doubt, the committee will not be determining medical causes of death or any other matters that are before coroners for this purpose. The focus will squarely be on systemic failures, cultural challenges and opportunities for reform.

There is a strong case for urgency. Domestic violence and the murders of women by their partners are not isolated. It is part of a disturbing systemic system across the nation. Australia has seen too many women killed at the hands of current and former partners this year and previous years. We know that domestic and family violence is a leading cause of ill health, injury and death for women under 45. We know that CALD women face additional barriers: language, fear of authorities, lack of culturally appropriate services and sometimes the minimisation of abuse as cultural practice.

In some cases the media has reported a long history of escalating violence, where there were police reports, where there were child protection concerns and where community members feared for women's safety, yet somehow, despite all of these warnings, women still end up as murder victims of their husbands and their children are orphaned. This is the very definition of a systemic failure, and when systemic failure leads to loss of life the parliament has a duty to act.

The community is watching how we respond. They are asking, 'Will this parliament try to learn from these tragedies, or will it allow them to fade into another statistic?' By establishing this committee we will send a clear message that we will not look away, we will not accept the unacceptable, we will hold agencies to account and we will deliver reforms that honour the memory of these women.

A select committee with the power to call on persons, papers and records will provide the transparency and accountability that our community demands. It will give voice to those who have been silenced. It will ensure that evidence is heard in the public forum and in the parliament. I propose that the committee be conventional, comprising three government members and two opposition members, chaired by a government member. This ensures the government can lead the reform process while still benefiting from scrutiny and collaboration from the opposition and the community. This is not a partisan issue. Domestic violence is a matter of life and death. Every member of this

house, regardless of affiliation, shares responsibility for ensuring women and children in South Australia are safe.

I know that some members may raise concerns of sub judice or duplication, and let me address this. This committee will not interfere with the Coroner, nor can it influence a jury, as there are no juries in Coroner investigations. It will not make findings as to the cause of death. It will focus on systemic and policy issues, matters that are squarely within the parliament's jurisdiction. Far from duplicating the royal commission, the committee will operationalise its findings, test their adequacy and accelerate the implementation. This is not theory; it is practice. It is our parliament ensuring that recommendations translate to real action and change.

At its heart, this motion is about preventing further tragedies. It is about ensuring that when women come forward to report violence, they are heard, believed and protected. It is about ensuring that children in violent homes are safeguarded, not left in harm's way. It is about ensuring that our systems work for all South Australians, regardless of culture, language or background. The committee will not bring up individual cases that are still to be inquired into, but can help make sure that other women and children in such situations grow up in a safer South Australia.

Too many women's deaths by their partners have left a scar in our community, reminding us of what must never happen again. By supporting this motion, members of this house can ensure that these deaths are not just more women murdered by their abusive husbands. We can ensure it becomes a turning point, a moment when parliament says, 'Enough is enough.' I ask every member in this house to join me in supporting the establishment of this select committee. Let us act with urgency, with compassion and with determination. Let us honour these women by ensuring that their deaths lead to change, accountability and a safer future for South Australian women. I recommend this motion to the house.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (11:17):** I rise today to indicate that the government will not be supporting this motion. Every woman deserves to feel and to absolutely be safe in every aspect of their lives: at work, when studying, when they are out in the community and at home, a place that should always be their sanctuary. The death of any woman is an utterly unacceptable tragedy. My heart—and I know the hearts of everyone in this place—goes out to the children, the family, the friends and the community of any woman we have lost.

When awful, abhorrent incidents of violence occur in our community, we all ask ourselves: 'How can this happen? What more can we do?' In contemplating these questions, it is right for us to consider what processes may or may not be happening, or may be imminent, and ensure we do not ever in any way compromise the important deliberations of any of those processes.

The Malinauskas government is absolutely committed to progressing far-reaching reform to tackle the complex and distressing drivers of domestic, family and sexual violence and its prevalence. We have set about doing so throughout our time in government and, indeed, during our time in opposition, with the moving of a number of legislative measures to drive far-reaching change. Our journey of reform continues and will now, rightly, be guided by the detailed recommendations of the Royal Commission into Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence, which present a once-in-a-generation opportunity to our state for change.

The release of the historic report of the Royal Commission into Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence was deeply moving. Its 654 pages are now being contemplated, as is the harrowing Voices report that accompanied that report. This Voices report compels all of us, in the voices of survivors, to be very, very careful about how we approach their experiences and to be careful that we never ever retraumatise them as we contemplate what they have told us.

As we do contemplate that far-reaching report—and always, I honour the courage of survivors—I hold in my heart those we have lost, including the four women who tragically died in the space of just one week in November 2023. This royal commission was established following that horrific, heartbreaking week, a week that demands action. The report 'With Courage: South Australia's vision beyond violence' provides our government, and indeed our whole state, with a road map for real, tangible, lasting reform. In fact, the royal commission's report includes discussion of the need for a dedicated death review function where there is a context of domestic, family and

sexual violence, and it calls for government to give that matter further consideration amongst many, many others.

This and every recommendation in the report presents our state with a generational opportunity to build a system that protects, supports and heals, and empowers our whole community, every agency of government and the whole sector to collaboratively drive change. The report also makes it very clear that addressing domestic, family and sexual violence is our shared responsibility. The causes of domestic, family and sexual violence are multiple and complex, with impacts across all areas of society and with not just one single solution. As we go about this opportunity for reform, I honour all the women whom we have lost to domestic, family and sexual violence. It is for them that our work will and must continue.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:22):** I rise in support of the motion. I am afraid I was momentarily distracted, and I am not clear on whether the government is supporting the motion or not.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr TEAGUE:** No, the government is not supporting the motion.

**The Hon. K.A. Hildyard:** Is that when you were laughing?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I am sorry? No, it was when I was clarifying the—there has been an interjection from the minister just now, asking whether I was distracted because I was laughing.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TEAGUE:** No, at the moment that I was distracted and did not hear whether the government was supporting the motion or not, I was engaged in discussion with the mover about amendments to the motion that had been made at a moment or two's notice to alter the terms of the motion to make it acceptable to be heard this morning in the parliament. That is the reason I was distracted, to be very clear. I did not hear at the outset what the government's attitude to the motion is. It is now clear that the government is opposed to the motion. The reason for addressing the particulars—

*The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:*

**Mr TEAGUE:** Excuse me?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister—both ministers: while the minister was having her say, the people on my left listened in silence, and I would ask everyone on my right to afford the deputy leader that same courtesy. It is a very important matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TEAGUE:** Fun and games? Is that what I overheard the minister say just then?

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, you have the call.

**The Hon. K.A. Hildyard:** Absolutely not. And don't misrepresent me.

**Mr TEAGUE:** What did I overhear?

**The SPEAKER:** Both sides, interjections are out of order and I will not stand for any of them.

**Mr TEAGUE:** The reason I rise is on a matter of process in relation to the motion in the form that it has been put. The motion on the *Notice Paper* that has then been amended while the mover has been on his feet, and that is on the record, I appreciate the circumstances in which all members have endeavoured to deal with process. What I need to make clear, and I think the house ought to make clear, are the circumstances in which the house considers investigating particular matters, and that is in circumstances where a sub judice point has been aired or at least raised as a reason for being particular about the terms of a motion that is put.

The circumstances of this case, let's be clear, are such that there has been a death and there has been a death in which the perpetrator has also died, and there is no criminal trial in prospect, as far as I am aware—there is no criminal trial in prospect. There is a coronial inquest that is in prospect

and underway. In those circumstances, there is no relevant sub judice point—in the circumstances of the inquiry that has been put—and in my view, it would be perfectly appropriate for the house to set out its objective to inquire into the particular circumstances of a particular case.

I am glad to hear it has been broadened because of the prospect of that inquiry covering circumstances more generally. But it is important for the purposes of the house's capacity to conduct its business that where there is a coronial inquest that is ongoing in circumstances where there is no realistic prospect of impacting a subsequent jury in a criminal trial, then the sub judice point ought not be a matter of concern to the house.

I have heard no-one on the other side participating in the debate point to any prospect of a criminal trial in this case. I will say it again: quite often, a coronial inquest will occur in circumstances where a criminal trial is in prospect. That is—

**The Hon. A. MICHAELS:** Point of order: I understand that you ruled it was sub judice and the member is debating whether it is a question of sub judice.

**The SPEAKER:** No, I have not ruled that at all. I would like the deputy leader to continue with his remarks. If we can stop, as I have asked before, the interjections so that we can actually hear this out.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I will not stay. I am glad that this is not occurring, frankly, in circumstances where there has been a ruling and any necessary dissent in it. The reason—

*The Hon. J.K. Szakacs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Trade, you are on your final warning. This is a subject that I am taking quite seriously, as I know we all do. I have some sympathy for the deputy leader because I was made aware of things as I was walking in here today, things that normally we might have sorted out before we got in here. Everyone is thinking on their feet. Everyone is trying to react to things that have just happened. Perhaps we should have had a little bit more notice, but that is the fault of none of the 47 members in here. I invite everyone to remain calm and allow the deputy leader to have his say.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I thank you again, Mr Speaker, and I might put on the record that I appreciate the opportunity to have had a word with you about this very matter and I appreciate that we have done so in the circumstances that you have just described. Far from being some endeavour to take some partisan point or to differ with anything that the Speaker has indicated so far in the course of this debate, the important purpose of putting the matter on the record at this time is that—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TEAGUE:** Members are interjecting for some unknown reason. You are welcome to contribute to the debate when I sit down, and I will do so in a minute. The point that I am wanting to put clearly on the record is that where matters of sub judice are raised, regardless of the circumstances in which they are raised, the relevant principle upon which the question turns for the purposes of this house is whether or not a subsequent jury is likely to be influenced in a way that might prejudice the criminal trial at which that jury is required to determine a relevant matter of fact. That is the test.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TEAGUE:** That is the test.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Again, I ask members on my right to listen in silence. Minister for Trade?

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** I rise on relevance. The member asserts that the question before the house is one to adjudicate or arbitrate on the question of sub judice. The motion itself has been amended by the mover. There is no question before the house to adjudicate on sub judice. I ask for you to rule that the matter is now irrelevant to the member's contribution.

**The SPEAKER:** I think the deputy leader has made his point. There were some discussions about whether sub judice was in play or not, so I do not think I want to rule that out entirely for the

deputy leader to reference that. I might even make my own reference to that in response when the deputy leader has finished his remarks. It may not be exactly relevant to the motion that is before the house, but I think it is in terms of the discussion that is being held.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I will not say more. As I said, I have stressed that it is happily not something that is raised in circumstances in which there is any need to reflect on a ruling. There is on the *Hansard* record at the commencement of the debate a reference to that point, so I raise the circumstances of the bounds of sub judice, in my humble view, in the circumstances in which the motion as amended has been moved and debated.

It is in that context in particular that I speak up in support of the motion: the motion as printed on the *Notice Paper* and the motion as it has been amended and moved by the member for Unley. That is for the reason that this house is perfectly capable of inquiring in the public interest into matters that may also be the subject of coronial inquiry. It is well known that coronial inquiry processes are extraordinarily thorough, they serve particular purposes, and the results of their work are known for practical reasons—often many years subsequent to the events that they are considering.

The inquiry work that the house can do in the public interest is for a different public purpose that may have overlapping usefulness, but it is important that this house is not held up for what might reasonably be expected to be years and years waiting to hear about the outcome of a particular discrete coronial process before it then embarks on important work that it might need to do in the public interest to ensure improvement in the interests of all South Australians. I support the motion.

**The SPEAKER:** I might just make some comments because the motion has been amended and we never had to make a ruling on it, but it has brought up an interesting matter for discussion. I want to read from Erskine May, which is something I rarely do, paragraph 25.74, where it states:

...it is recognised that Parliament should not generally intervene in matters where the decision has been delegated to others by Parliament itself.

I then refer you to section 21 of the Coroners Act 2003, where it says that the Coroner's Court must hold an inquest to ascertain the cause of circumstances of all violent deaths and make recommendations to the relevant authorities.

I further note that the Minister for Police has publicly confirmed that the case will be subject to a coronial inquest and in cases in which proceedings are active in the United Kingdom courts, including courts-martial, Coroner's courts and fatal accident inquiries, they may not be referred to in any motion, debate, question or supplementary question. So, we did not have to get there and make any rulings on it, but it is an interesting discussion, nonetheless.

**The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (11:36):** I want to place on record that my reasons for opposing this motion are many, but the two primary reasons are, firstly, because we have already had an inquiry in this parliament into domestic violence that was led and moved by the Minister for Child Protection in another government and, secondly, we have had a royal commission. Now we do the work.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:36):** I thank members for their contributions. I know that everybody in this house is as concerned as we all are collectively about the surge in domestic violence and how it is becoming still a very difficult nut to crack.

I think one of the recent events that shocked me the most was when a member of this place was charged with domestic violence charges. The only statement was that he was not making a statement because it was a private matter and it was not challenged anywhere in the media. Are we still in the 1950s where people believe that domestic violence is a private matter? I certainly do not believe it is a private matter, like I do not believe that rape is a private matter. I do not believe that burglary is a private matter. I do not believe that any other crime is a private matter. Yet, to this day, I have not seen any published response to that member's disgraceful response to the domestic violence charges against them.

The debate today has been disappointing. I think it is an opportunity for the government to introduce a new avenue for expanding options for dealing with domestic violence because there is no doubt that lived experiences are the best experiences from which to learn. In the olden days, the crown inquest may have been influenced by what was going on in parliament, particularly when there

were no charges pending, and maybe that is something that the parliament can look at for the future. In many of these instances, there is no risk of prejudicing any trial because there is not one and you cannot influence the jury because there is not one.

Coronial inquiries are inquisitorial: they are not adversarial. Their purpose is to establish cause of death and, where relevant, make recommendations to prevent similar deaths. They are conducted by a judicial officer without a jury, and findings are made on the balance of probabilities, not to determine guilt or innocence.

Parliament retains a duty to address systematic failures. If that means we have to look at the way we are doing things currently—and sometimes that may mean moving or updating convention or tradition—then maybe it is time we looked at that. Matters such as intervention orders, police resourcing and domestic violence prevention are squarely within the purview of parliament. To silence debate until a coronial inquiry is conducted could delay reform for many years. This is the real cost to public safety. Precedents recognise flexibility in applying sub judice.

In closing, I dream of the day when everybody believes it is their business, when they identify a victim of domestic violence, to intervene in whichever way they feel comfortable—calling it out, reporting it, supporting the victims of domestic violence. The only way we can do that is to talk about it, to raise it time and again and to act on what we learn, whether it be through a royal commission, whether it be through a select committee, whether it be through a series of interviews and investigations.

I am hopeful that the royal commission will be acted upon quickly and will see those recommendations implemented, but in the meantime we cannot stop learning, from experience, how we can make women safer.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....11  
Noes .....25  
Majority .....14

#### AYES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Pisoni, D.G. (teller)  
Telfer, S.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.  
Hurn, A.M.  
Pratt, P.K.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Ellis, F.J.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Teague, J.B.

#### NOES

Andrews, S.E.  
Brown, M.E.  
Close, S.E.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Hutchesson, C.L.  
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)  
Piccolo, A.  
Stinson, J.M.  
Wortley, D.J.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Champion, N.D.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hood, L.P.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
O'Hanlon, C.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Szakacs, J.K.

Boyer, B.I.  
Clancy, N.P.  
Fulbrook, J.P.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Michaels, A.  
Pearce, R.K.  
Savvas, O.M.  
Thompson, E.L.

#### PAIRS

Tarzia, V.A.  
Patterson, S.J.R.  
Batty, J.A.

Dighton, A.E.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Malinauskas, P.B.

Motion thus negatived.

*Parliamentary Committees***PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HAPPY VALLEY WATER TREATMENT PLANT POWDER  
ACTIVATED CARBON DOSING SYSTEM**

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:47):** I move:

That the 147<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, titled Happy Valley Water Treatment Plant Powder Activated Carbon Dosing System, be noted.

The Happy Valley Water Treatment Plant, hereon referred to as 'the treatment plant', plays a pivotal role in Adelaide metro's water distribution and serves approximately 450,000 SA Water customers. The Happy Valley Reservoir, which supplies the treatment plant, is prone to algal blooms that can affect the taste and odour of the water. To ensure the delivery of high-quality service to customers, powder activated carbon (PAC) is utilised in the treatment process to remove these compounds.

Installed in the late 1990s, the current powder activated carbon dosing system no longer meets operational demands and, due to its manual nature, it is unable to meet the productivity required during peak periods. Additionally, the significant volume of manual handling involved in storing and moving PAC around the site creates unsatisfactory work conditions and safety risks.

The new system will streamline the storage and handling of PAC materials within a purpose-designed all-weather storage facility. It will utilise automated processes, specialised material handling equipment and extraction fans to ensure safer work conditions as well as increase efficiency. This will also lead to an overall reduction in operational disruptions related to PAC handling and dosing, leading to more reliable water treatment processes.

An optioneering assessment investigated multiple solutions to manage the existing issues against a base case in which no upgrades were made to the system:

- option 1 involved PAC bulk loading, which was ruled out due to the introduction of additional high-process risks;
- option 2, which provided installation of a new hopper only, and did not satisfy project safety objectives; and
- option 3, the preferred option, which involves the installation of new unloading equipment within a dedicated storage and material handling facility.

The preferred option was selected after considering technical and financial components, risk management and net present value and because it resolves safety concerns regarding excessive manual handling, unsafe bag access, chemical storage risks and dust and ventilation issues. The project works will include: site preparation, including the removal of existing equipment; the construction of a storage and materials handling building; the installation of unloading and materials handling equipment; and all utilities and ancillary works. Works are expected to commence in the first quarter of next year, with the anticipation that it will be complete by early 2027.

The project is expected to cost approximately \$6.6 million. The agency does not anticipate additional operational costs. Funds are available for the project within the capital budget submitted by SA Water to the Essential Services Commission of South Australia for the 2024 regulatory determination budget and will therefore have no impact on SA Water's overall borrowing or contributions to government.

Project procurement has been conducted in accordance with SA Water's policies and procedures and conforms to all applicable Treasury and government policies. The agency uses procurement frameworks that enable the sequential award of work, incentivizing suppliers to perform well to ensure further contracts. The agency states this delivers significant efficiency benefits through collaboration, innovation, consistency planning and programming.

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 as well as management of the selected contractor.



SA Water utilises a business management policy framework to manage risk throughout the delivery of the project. Facilitated risk assessment workshops were held with relevant stakeholders, engineers and construction leads to identify business, operational and project risks. Key risks include:

- any contaminated soil encountered during construction, for which a soil testing contractor has been engaged;
- unknown or unexpected services encountered, for which relevant potholing has been undertaken; and
- any groundwater encountered during construction, for which the project has undertaken geotechnical investigation.

Design and construction risks will continue to be evaluated during the detailed design process.

SA Water is committed to operating sustainably to support viability now and into the future. The selected contractors will be encouraged to develop processes with regard to short and long-term, local and global, social, economic and environmental influences, including conservation and efficient use of resources and raw materials, engaging local subcontractors where possible, reducing carbon emissions, developing flexible processes and products, and implementing recycling and reuse where possible.

The agency has prepared an environmental control plan to ensure the project is delivered in accordance with relevant regulations, and a site environmental management plan will be developed to address site-specific environmental management requirements and associated environmental approval conditions. SA Water will monitor the execution of both plans via site inspections and environmental audits.

SA Water has reviewed native title status at the work locations, and states there are no implications for the project. Assessments have identified there is medium risk of encountering Aboriginal heritage. Should this occur, works will cease and an environmental and heritage expertise representative will be contacted. The agency states no local or state heritage is listed within the vicinity of the proposed works alignment.

Construction will occur within SA Water-owned land and requires no public consultation as it has no direct public access. Internal stakeholders and partner organisations will be involved and kept informed throughout the project life cycle. The submission has been circulated amongst relevant government departments that have indicated support for the project.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Happy Valley water treatment plant powder activated carbon dosing system project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Michael O'Sullivan, Senior Project Manager, Program Delivery, SA Water; and Emma Goldsworthy, Senior Manager, Capital Delivery, SA Water. I thank the witnesses for their time. Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BOLIVAR WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT BIOSOLIDS STORAGE CAPACITY UPGRADES**

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:54):** I move:

That the 148<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant Biosolids Storage Capacity Upgrades, be noted.

The proposed works at the Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant will address required improvements to Bolivar sludge and biosolids management, including resolving capacity risk due to peak wet weather events and catchment growth. The treatment plant is the largest wastewater treatment plant in the Adelaide region and processes almost 70 per cent of Adelaide's metropolitan wastewater. The solid material that is separated from raw sewage in the wastewater treatment process is referred to

as sludge. Additional sludge from locations across the state is transported to the Bolivar site, where hardstand space is used to convert it into a biosolid product via agitated air drying.

Stockpile space is available at the site to store the product until farmers collect it to use as fertiliser, providing a low-cost and environmentally sustainable way for SA Water to dispose of sludge that also benefits the state's farmers. A sludge management review has determined that additional hardstand and stockpile capacity will be required to cater for future growth in the sludge treatment over the next 15 years. Increasing biosolids storage areas will ensure SA Water is able to dispose of sludge ethically and responsibly without the need to consider landfill or other alternative disposal methods.

Option analysis during project planning determined that an additional stockpile area is best achieved by expanding into a new site location at Bolivar, and the additional hardstand area is best achieved by converting existing temporary stockpile and hardstand areas into permanent hardstand storage. The works will also include the construction of necessary supporting infrastructure.

Five different locations were shortlisted for the additional stockpile area, and the preferred 4.2 hectares was selected based upon a multicriteria analysis and evaluation of net present value. The project will also provide a new hardstand area of 3.9 hectares through the conversion of existing temporary hardstand and stockpile areas. The works will also include:

- the erection of fencing and screening around the new stockpile area;
- construction of a new drainage pump station to account for discharge into existing stormwater swale;
- construction of an access road around the new stockpile area and pump station;
- construction of a new weighbridge facility, with an associated operations building; and
- construction of a new potable water supply as well as wastewater drainage from the new operations building.

Works are expected to commence this quarter with the anticipation to be complete by early 2027. The agency does not expect the works to disrupt existing operations. The project is expected to cost \$22.2 million, with ongoing operational costs of approximately \$3.3 million over a 30-year period. Funds are available for the project within the capital budget submitted by SA Water to the Essential Services Commission of South Australia for the 2024 regulatory determination budget and therefore have no impact on SA Water's overall borrowing or contributions to government.

SA Water has included the delivery of the project within the agency's wastewater major framework program, and procurement has been conducted in accordance with SA Water's policies and procedures and conforms to all applicable Treasury and government policies.

The agency uses procurement frameworks that enable the sequential award of work, incentivising suppliers to perform well to ensure continuity of work. The agency states that this delivers significant efficiency benefits through collaboration, innovation, consistency planning and programming. In June last year, SA Water extended major framework partner agreements. 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 a selected contractor.

SA Water has a business management policy and framework that is used to identify risks, determine related impacts and develop mitigation strategies. Potential risks include appropriate disposal of biosolids to landfill as well as construction impacts, including clearance of native vegetation. Design and construction risk evaluation will continue over the course of the project.

SA Water's corporate-wide policies reinforce its commitment to operating sustainably to support viability now and into the future. The selected contractor will be encouraged to develop

processes with due regard for short and long-term local and global environmental, social and economic considerations. This includes conservation and efficient use of resources and raw materials, engaging local subcontractors where expertise is available, reducing carbon emissions, developing flexible processes and products, and implementing recycling and reuse to reduce waste.

An environmental control plan has been prepared to ensure the project is delivered in compliance with relevant regulations, and the selected contractor will be required to establish a construction environmental management plan outlining the general environmental controls and mitigation measures that will be implemented during project delivery. A site environmental plan will also be developed to address site-specific environmental management requirements and associated approval conditions. SA Water will monitor the execution of both plans throughout site inspections and audits.

The project has been assessed by SA Water's Aboriginal heritage adviser, who has identified an elevated risk of impacting or encountering Aboriginal heritage. The design and construct contractor will be required to comply with SA Water's standard operating procedure for the discovery of Aboriginal heritage during construction work.

Debate adjourned.

### *Bills*

## **CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (COERCIVE CONTROL) AMENDMENT 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.

In rising to speak to these amendments and the final passage of this bill, I honour the courageous survivors amongst us, many of whom have told their stories, informed the very development of this bill and our consultation processes for it and, indeed, the bill I introduced into this place as shadow minister in 2020. To each of these survivors in the gallery today, and the many others, please know this: it is your bravery, your voices, your experiences and your insights that have shaped every step of this journey to this moment we rightly mark today.

I honour the precious women we have lost and those who mourn them—women including Hannah Clarke and her three beautiful children. Hannah's story, and the integrity and bravery of her utterly inspiring parents, Sue and Lloyd, whom we are so honoured to have join us today, have helped to drive awareness and change through these and other similar laws across our country. Sue and Lloyd, your bravery in the face of horrific brutality, and the heartbreaking years that have followed, are etched in our collective psyche. We hold you in our hearts. You are the very essence of inspiration.

What we know about the pattern of vile abuse that Hannah endured prior to her murder demanded that we act, as do the voices and the experiences of those courageous survivors who, after experiencing the most disturbing instances of this terrible behaviour—behaviour designed to diminish, belittle and strip away their agency—have shared their experiences with such a clear focus on empowering others who traverse a similar path. This bill is for them, and it is for all in our community currently suffering and surviving.

This bill, I hope, gives comfort and hope that we can, indeed, make lasting change. At its heart is our clear commitment to honour their experiences, to respond to their calls for change, to hold perpetrators to account and to ensure that everyone in our community knows what coercive control is and that we utterly reject it and will punish it. I indicate and confirm the government's support for the amendment which inserts 'or animal belonging to' into the examples section of coercive controlling behaviours to read:

a person may restrict another person's freedom of action by—

- making threats against the person or a child of, or animal belonging to, the person in order to influence the other person to take a certain action;

During the government's public consultation process on coercive control, concern was raised by key stakeholders that having a list of example behaviours within the offence provision itself may risk authorities interpreting the list as an exhaustive checklist of behaviours and have the unintended effect of excluding other coercively controlling behaviours.

The 2024 bill as introduced, therefore instead included an examples section separate to the new offence provision, with limited behaviours listed to emphasise the point that these are examples only and any type of behaviour that could restrict a partner from various fundamental freedoms as outlined in the offence provision could be captured.

The definition of 'restrict' in the bill includes psychological restriction, which could include controlling a person through fear for the welfare of an animal. This is now included as an example. This is so important. We do not ever want to exclude a particular coercive controlling behaviour because it is not specifically detailed in the offence provision.

I say this in the context of those who use violence, finding new ways that we cannot even currently contemplate to demean, to belittle, to isolate, to wear down the person on whom they inflict terrible coercive control. We heard reports of new and previously un contemplated examples emerging during COVID-19: people being restricted from being tested, or those who use violence telling others falsely that their partner had COVID as a means of further isolating them. We do not want to prescribe a list of behaviours in the offence and inadvertently exclude some horrible form of abuse, but we do want to include one of the sadly too common examples of coercive control in the example list.

As I mentioned earlier, I first moved in this place to criminalise coercive control through a bill I introduced in 2020, which sadly did not progress. This bill, rightly and clearly, now creates a new offence of harmful controlling behaviour toward a current or former intimate partner, following our government's clear commitment made to criminalise coercive control. This reform marks the culmination of extensive consultation with the legal profession with peak DFSV prevention and advocacy groups, survivors and our broader community.

It sits alongside our highly successful See the Signs awareness campaign, which reached almost 1.8 million people and particularly targeted young people to help them identify what coercive controlling behaviours look like and what they can do to help shift them. This bill creates a new offence in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 of the coercive control of a person with whom the defendant is in or has been in a relationship with. This offence will have a maximum penalty of seven years' imprisonment.

Coercive control is a deliberate and abusive effort to control another person. Perpetrators of coercive control do not want an equal partnership. They are not interested in resolving conflicts through a healthy process of discussion and negotiation. Perpetrators of coercive control are only interested in imposing their will on others, and to achieve this they will hurt, humiliate, intimidate, exploit, isolate, dominate and terrify over time the person they are meant to love.

Many kinds of abusive behaviours are threaded together into a web that relentlessly entraps the subject who, at the hands of an abusive partner or former partner, find themselves isolated, scared, psychologically harmed, stripped of their self-worth and restricted from making autonomous decisions about every single aspect of their life—from day-to-day decisions about what to wear or where to go to utterly life-changing decisions about their health, their housing, their finances and who they spend time with.

This web of control that is behind so many abusive relationships has been, until now, invisible to our criminal law. But no longer—no longer. We have acted and we will continue to do so. Even as this bill passes, the work is starting to ensure that everyone who interacts with a person experiencing or perpetrating coercive control understands the offence and can effectively support and empower survivors. Together with survivors, with the sector, with police and the courts, we will work to ensure that this offence is brought to life in a way that absolutely makes a difference.

I offer my wholehearted, deepest appreciation to all who have invaluable contributed to developing this bill, the many, many brave survivors who attended session after session, and particularly those who attended sessions with me way back in 2019 and 2020 as we prepared our

first bill. I thank the Attorney-General, the Attorney-General's Department, and particularly Laura Krieg, the Office for Women, the incredible staff in my ministerial office—Mandy Nicholls, Hilary Wigg and Ruth Sibley in particular—and, in the Attorney's office, Elliette Kirkbride.

I thank the domestic, family and sexual violence sector. Every single one of you is extraordinary, with compassion, with care, and a steadfast and relentless desire to empower women and to advance profound change across our community that helps to prevent violence in all its forms. You are there day after day, year after year, decade after decade, alongside women at their hardest points, holding them as they take steps forward—sometimes a few back—until they find their power and never look back.

I also thank those other allies to the sector and long-term advocates for women and the prevention of domestic, family and sexual violence. Finally, I again pay tribute to those many brave survivors, many of whom are here and have been here throughout this long journey, and I honour again those women we have lost. This bill is for them.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Minister, the first of the amendments includes now a definition of 'physical harm'; that is in section 21. The consequential amendment is to amend what was a reference to 'physical injury' to 'physical harm'. I would like to refer to the explanation of clauses, which I do not have just presently. We had already a novel definition of 'psychological harm' for the purposes of this division. I am interested in what might particularly turn on the change from the standalone reference to 'physical injury', to the adoption of the existing definition in section 21, and perhaps, at the same time, why the definition of 'psychological harm' is not otherwise more broadly applicable and included in section 21 as well?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** First of all, in relation to 'psychological injury', what this definition now includes is an explanation that is tailored to the circumstances of coercive control. One of the things that survivors told us over and over again is that when they experience a pattern of coercive controlling behaviour, it is ongoing fear that does cause that psychological harm. So this definition is about ensuring that we articulate psychological harm in the context of coercive control, the experience of fear of survivors, and that we contemplate how a pattern of coercive controlling behaviours generates that fear.

**Mr TEAGUE:** To be clear, psychological harm is the existing definition that is in the bill. No change. It was a bookend aspect of the question to ask why that might not have found itself in the broader definitions in section 21. The substance of the question is, and it is amendment No. 1 and amendment No. 3, in that amendment No. 3 alters what was previously a reference to 'physical injury' undefined—the ordinary meaning, therefore—to a now defined 'physical harm' by reference to the existing definition of 'physical harm' in the broader Criminal Law Consolidation Act. I am sure there is a perfectly good reason for it, but there has obviously been a supportable case made for it in another place for that now to be so described and to be defined by reference to the existing definition. I am just interested to know the reasons why.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** In relation to the issue about physical harm, it was seen that it was really important for that definition to be contemplated and made consistent with the rest of the act.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Clause 20B(1) states that persons are considered to be in a relationship if they are married, engaged to be married, domestic partners or in some other form of intimate personal relationship in which their lives are interrelated and the actions of one affect the other. Would that also apply to an elderly pair of sisters, for example, who may live together? They decided not to get married. They have lived together for many, many years. They share a home and the ownership of a home. There is no sexual intimacy, but it is a very intimate relationship on every other ground.

**The CHAIR:** Before I invite the minister—

*The Hon. K.A. Hildyard interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** That is the point I am going to make. The point I am trying to make is that I am not sure how that relates to any of the amendments. Which amendment are you referring to?

Amendment No. 1 refers to physical harm having the same meaning as in section 21. Any discussion about that is fine, but for the other thing I am not sure how that relates to the amendment.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** I am specifically speaking to the clause as amended, sir.

**The CHAIR:** No, the clause which you referred to was in the original bill and has not been amended by the upper house. You are not referring to the actual amendment itself. That has been discussed by this parliament twice already. You need to relate your question to the actual amendment itself.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Okay, would the physical harm element that you have added in the amendment also be relevant to a couple of sisters, as I described earlier?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** I will just answer that broadly. What survivors and the sector told us repeatedly is that they wanted this legislation to focus absolutely on those relationships that are intimate partner relationships, as you have just described in going through the definition. That is what we have responded to, so the short answer to your question is no.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** What about the adult children or broader family members? Are they exempt from the coercive control laws? Are they protected by them? For example, is physical harm coming to an 18-year-old woman living at home, who has been told who she can or cannot socialise with, what she must study at university, when she can go out and when she has to stay at home, captured by this amendment?

**The CHAIR:** You have just answered this question, minister. You made it very clear that the purpose of this bill is intimate relationships. What you just described would not include those and therefore does not pertain to this bill nor this amendment, so I am not going to allow the question. Next question. I think we need to make sure—

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** So you have answered the question on behalf of the minister?

**The CHAIR:** Member for Unley, resume your seat. I have not finished. I am really loath for the very purpose and focus of this bill to be changed. The minister has made it very clear what the whole process has been to write this bill. You are now speaking about other things which are unrelated to this bill. If you wish to raise those, feel free to do so in other places. You will not raise them in this context. Next question.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** I do not think you are authorised to answer a question for the minister.

**The CHAIR:** Okay, I am actually authorised to rule it out of order, and I have ruled it out of order. I have actually ruled it out of order.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** You have actually attempted to answer the question.

**The CHAIR:** No, I have not.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** You said it does not relate to—

**The CHAIR:** It does not; that is right.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** And I am asking the minister to confirm that.

**The CHAIR:** The member for Unley will resume his seat and move to the next question—or any other member.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I now have the explanation of clauses from the original bill in my hand, so I am going to make particular reference therefore to it. This is really what I am then meaning to ask, as a hopefully final question on the discrete point and in light of the minister's answer. There has been a view to make the definition coherent with the section 21 definition. I do not know if the minister has the explanation of clauses, but the explanation of clauses refers—this is not a trick question or anything, but it may be that it is convenient to make reference to it—to a test by reference to physical injury.

In making the definition coherent with the section 21 definition, which is, as we see, still a reference to the ordinary meaning—that is, it does not seek to prescribe the definition exhaustively;

that section 21 definition is a definition that says what it includes but is not exhaustive—is the minister satisfied that, by moving at this point to make the relevant reference to, now, physical harm, it is not in any way, inadvertently or otherwise, narrowing what was otherwise the test of physical injury by its ordinary meaning? We have gone from one ordinary meaning to another ordinary meaning, supplemented by certain particular references to what is included. Is the minister satisfied that it is not narrowing the meaning?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** Yes, I am very comfortable that the definition is actually expanding the meaning rather than narrowing it.

**The CHAIR:** Are there any other questions? I am allowing questions on any clause, and I will allow you more than three because of that.

**Mr TEAGUE:** That is alright. I will just make some general observations in relation to where we have got to in terms of coming to this point of legislating. I appreciate the contribution of the minister just now in that regard as well, and I acknowledge that there are present, here in the house, many people who have been so terribly and in such a devastating way impacted by this scourge of coercive control and its violent consequences.

The opposition has supported this bill and the process of the debate, leading to this point of now legislating in South Australia. This is not novel to Australia. There are other examples of legislation of this kind in Australia, but it is relatively new territory that we are in. It is not lost on me, and I am sure it is not lost on anyone in the house, that the implementation and the capacity of all of those who will be now responsible for administering the new offences that are the subject of this bill will now tell the story over the time ahead.

I think we ought to fully expect that—just like in other areas where there is an attempt by a parliament to, by legislation, improve in an area of such terrible human consequence—that will not be perfect and we will continue to work and will continue to consider and examine the means by which, through legislation, improvement can be made, just as we ought to continue the work to scrutinise the circumstances of terrible events that continue to occur day by day.

This legislation, I hope, will be put to work towards improvement and, as others have said in the course of this debate, will contribute, at some final stage eventually, to a community and a world in which we are no longer needing to talk about a scourge of coercive control because it is something that no longer exists. I commend the bill and look forward to continuing the work towards the eradication of this terrible scourge.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** I, too, would like to close by commending the bill and congratulating the minister on bringing it to this place. Coercive control has been ignored for far too long. In every culture in the world, it was seen as a way of life. Places like Australia, for example, and other Western countries, were the first to realise that it is wrong, despite the fact it might be part of a culture, for a male to be the dominating member of an intimate relationship. I know that this bill will save lives and will protect women and I am very pleased to be in this place supporting this bill.

At some stage, I would like the bill to be amended to include other members of the family. I think that there are still things that are excused because of cultural practices, or we have always done things that way, that severely disadvantage particularly adult women who may still be living at home or still be reliant on support from their family, and that support is used as a controlling mechanism as to whom they may socialise with, what job they may do, what they might study at university, what they might do outside their working hours or where they might live. That is wrong. That should not be the case.

It is the role of every parent to bring their child up to be independent, self-sufficient and able to make their own choices. It is not the role of a parent to use coercive control for them to live the life that they wish they had lived or the life that they think they should live.

I congratulate the minister and the government on this work, but I think there is still more work to do, because even outside an intimate relationship it is often the female who is the victim of coercive control.

**Ms PRATT:** I want to make some brief remarks as well as we conclude the committee process. I remember, when this legislation was introduced, remarking to the member for Unley about opportunities we saw for future work. The member for Unley says that there is still more to do, and I think that is right, but, to the minister, I hope there is a day when there is nothing left to do because in fact this scourge, as the member for Heysen talks about, is eradicated because as a community we do better.

For those who have come in to participate in this process today, for all members on both sides of the house, men and women, who have participated in internal party room conversations and in the chamber, it is important that we honour the lived experience that South Australians have, relating to their experience with coercive control, and also honour the work that has been done here today.

As a country member of parliament, I want to reflect on those in my community who have been waiting for this bill with these amendments to be concluded. I say that because it has been a refrain over four years from particular women in my community seeking updates from me about the status of this bill: what progress is being made; when will it be concluded; and my interpretation, when will we see this being implemented; and when will we feel the change?

So, very briefly, thank you to the minister for bringing this through and thank you to all of our public servants who have contributed to making this the best it can be. I look forward to us not needing to talk about coercive control, because it will not exist in our community one day.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** Just for the information of the gallery, the bill has now been passed in that format.

### **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

**The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (12:36):** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

**Mrs PEARCE:** Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

### **RETURN TO WORK CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (CONSTITUTION OF BOARD OF MANAGEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (12:39):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today I introduce the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia (Constitution of Board of Management) Amendment Bill 2023. The workers compensation scheme in this state is administered by ReturnToWorkSA, a statutory corporation established under the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994.

Under that act, ReturnToWorkSA is governed by a board of seven members appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector. The board fixes the average premium levy rate which applies to employers covered by the Return to Work scheme, and board decisions regarding claims management and litigation can have a significant effect on workers' entitlements.



The board is fundamentally skills based and the Return to Work scheme involves complex medical, legal, insurance and regulatory issues which means a wide range of technical skills are desirable on the board, rather than simply splitting the board membership between different stakeholder groups.

While the board is not, strictly speaking, a representative board, under the former Weatherill government it was custom and practice to ensure that the voices of both the business community and workers were represented amongst the board membership. This is because we understand that the decision-making of the board can only be improved by ensuring that the voices of these key stakeholder groups who are most affected by the operations of the Return to Work scheme are included.

That is a practice which ceased under the Marshall Liberal government, which refused to appoint representatives from the union movement following the expiry of board members' terms. What this meant was that at a time of critical decision-making for the board during the Summerfield litigation, which of course led to significant legislative amendments in 2022, the voices of working people were absent from the board's deliberations. Thankfully, we have corrected the Marshall government's mistake and returned worker representatives to the board, while also maintaining important representation from the business community.

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that the same mistake cannot be made again. The bill seeks to amend the constitution of the board of management to ensure there is a minimum level of stakeholder representation amongst the board membership. This bill provides that, of the seven board members, at least one must be a person who the minister is satisfied is suitable to represent the interests of employees and one at least must be a person who is suitable to represent the interests of employers.

The bill requires the minister to consult with the peak stakeholder organisations, Business SA and SA Unions, on persons who are suitable to represent those interests before making those appointments. These requirements do not derogate from the importance of appointing high-quality candidates. Under section 6, all persons appointed to the board must still have the qualifications, skills, knowledge and experience to ensure that the board carries out its functions effectively. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

##### 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

##### 2—Commencement

This clause provides for the commencement of the provision and disapplies section 27(6) of the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021*.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994*

##### 3—Amendment of section 5—Constitution of board of management

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act to provide that—

at least 1 member of the board must be a person who the Minister, after consulting with the United Trades and Labor Council (trading as SA Unions) considers is suitable to represent the interests of employees; and

at least 1 must be a person who the Minister, after consulting with the South Australian Employers' Chamber of Commerce and Industry Inc (trading as Business SA), and with other associations representing the interests of employers determined to be appropriate by the Minister, considers is suitable to represent the interests of employers.

**Mrs PEARCE (King) (12:43):** I rise today to speak on the importance of genuine worker representation on the board of management of ReturnToWorkSA. This is a body that plays a critical role in shaping the lives and futures of injured workers across our state. ReturnToWorkSA is not just

another statutory body; it oversees a scheme that steps in at some of the most difficult moments in a person's life when they have been hurt on the job, when they cannot work and when their livelihoods, health and families are all suddenly on the line. That is why the make-up of the board matters deeply, and that is why I say clearly that the voices of working people must be at the table, not in tokenistic roles, not as observers, but as full and equal participants in the decisions that shape the very system designed to protect them.

It is not just about fairness, although it is a big part of it. It is about better decision-making because when you have people in the room who understand what it is like to be on a job site, in a hospital ward or on the factory floor who know the risks, the pressures and the reality of what happens when a worker is injured, you get policy that is more grounded, more balanced and more effective. We know exactly what happens when those voices are missing.

We saw it during the Summerfield litigation, one of the most significant cases to affect injured workers in recent years. During that process, while decisions were being made that had enormous implications for injured workers right across South Australia, there were no voices of working people on the board. Why? Because the Marshall government failed to appoint representatives from the union movement to the ReturnToWork board. This was just not just an oversight; it was a deliberate decision. The result was that the perspective of those who speak for working people was completely absent from the top table during a critical moment in time.

Let me be clear: workers compensation is not just a financial or legal issue. It is about people's lives. It is about whether someone who has been injured through no fault of their own can recover with dignity, stay connected to their community and provide for their family. When the board that governs the system lacks that perspective—the perspective of workers, of unions, of people who know what it means to rely on the safety net—the system becomes unbalanced. That imbalance was felt by the working people affected by the outcome of the Summerfield case and by countless others watching the system, wondering if it still works for them.

A board without worker voices risks becoming focused solely on cost containment, on return-to-work metrics and the expense of care and support. We must not let that happen again. That is why worker representation matters: not as a box to be ticked but as a pillar of good governance. Workers fund this scheme through their labour. They rely on it when they are hurt. They deserve to have a say on how it is run.

When union voices are at the table, they bring decades of experience supporting injured workers, navigating claims, advocating for fair treatment and helping people get their lives back on track. They bring that real-world insight to complex issues, and they help ensure that the decisions made at board level do not just make sense on paper; they work for the people the system was built to serve.

So today I say this clearly: we need to guarantee that working people have a voice on the ReturnToWork board not just in theory but in practice, not just during quiet times but especially during moments of legal or policy change. The consequences of leaving those voices out are too great. I am so proud to be a part of a government who has corrected the Marshall government's mistake and returned worker representation to the board during the most recent round of appointments, and I am even prouder to know that we are taking active steps to ensure that what happened under the previous government never happens again.

Let's restore balance, fairness, and common sense. Let's also ensure that the minister consults with peak stakeholder organisations such as Business SA and SA Unions to ensure the most suitable persons are appointed to represent those interests before making those appointments, and let's build a system of workers compensation that South Australia can trust because it includes and respects the voices of those it is meant to protect.

We owe this to the workers who have been hurt on the job. Their voices matter, their experiences matter and we should be doing all we can to help workers get back up on their feet again. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

**S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (12:47):** I rise to speak on this bill, which is about fairness, balance and making sure workers always have a voice in the Return To Work scheme. As members

here know, the Return To Work scheme is administered by ReturnToWorkSA, established under the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Act 1994. It is governed by a board of seven members appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the minister.

This board is not just another committee. Its decisions have real, far-reaching consequences. They affect whether an injured worker is treated with dignity, whether a business can keep its doors open and how fairly the cost of the scheme is shared. The board even sets the average premium levy rate that applies across employers. They are weighty responsibilities.

The board is skills based. Workers compensation is complex, involving legal, medical and insurance expertise, but we also need to ensure the voices of the people most affected—employers and employees—are never shut out, as they are key stakeholders. Under the Weatherill government, that was the custom and practice. The board always included both business and worker perspectives. But when the Marshall Liberal government came to office, they broke that tradition. They refused to appoint any representatives from the union movement, and the result, at a crucial time of decision-making during the Summerfield litigation, was that the voices of working people were missing entirely.

This was not just a bad decision, it was an injustice. It silenced the very people whose livelihoods the scheme is meant to protect. Our government is putting that right. We restored worker representation to the board and we have been able to draw upon people who know what it means to stand shoulder to shoulder with working people.

Before entering this place, I worked for a decade as director of Professionals Australia, representing engineers, scientists and other technical professionals. Every day, I saw what happens when working people have no voice: decisions are made about them, not with them. And I saw the difference when they did have a voice: fairer pay, safer workplaces, stronger protections. That is what real representation delivers.

I stand on the shoulders of those who came before me, including my great-grandfather, William Henry Andrews, who was a delegate to the Trades and Labor Council. He knew over a century ago what we know today: that without representation workers are ignored. His generation built the foundation of the union movement in this state, fighting for fairness at a time when working people had virtually no protections at all. I carry that legacy with pride, and it reminds me every day that progress does not just happen, it has to be fought for and it has to be defended. That is what this bill does. It ensures that no government can ever again silence workers' voices on the ReturnToWorkSA board.

The bill amends the act to require that, of the seven members, at least one must represent the interests of workers and at least one the interests of employers. It requires the minister to consult with SA Unions and Business SA before making those appointments, and it has been drafted carefully so that these changes take effect as current terms expire, with no disruption to the board's operations. This is what fairness looks like and what respect for working people looks like, and this is what this government stands for. I commend the bill to the house.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:51):** I needed to remind myself of the progress of the bill, and I am glad I did, because it has been some time coming.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Heysen, are you the lead speaker for the opposition?

**Mr TEAGUE:** Yes. So it has been some time coming. As I think is apparent on the face of the bill, it is now called the return to work amendment bill 2023. I think that might be the result of a debate that occurred in another place. The bill was introduced, as I understand it, as a 2022 bill, but it was introduced in the other place in March of 2023. I am at a bit of a loss as to how it has taken quite this long to find its way here, but here we are anyway.

The debate that took place in another place will address circumstances of amendments proposed by the opposition at that time, and I will not stay to address those matters. There were concerns about individual unions, in particular the CFMEU. At that time, and I think still, there were real concerns. I take into account the contribution just now of the member for Gibson in particular about the voices of workers being relevantly heard and not overborne, including in those circumstances. There was particular concern from the opposition about the situation that might apply

in case these provisions were then to be used as a means by way of the CFMEU having a role in the circumstances that have been well documented.

But here we are in September 2025. The opposition notes the changes more particularly to stipulate those who will constitute the board of management. The opposition, as it has previously indicated in the other place, does not oppose the bill, and it is time that it was finally disposed of in the house as well.

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (12:55):** I thank members for their contribution, particularly the member for Gibson, the member for King and the deputy leader. I also acknowledge the fair and reasonable statements from the member for Heysen in his remarks. We are very keen, of course, now having had a particularly busy legislative agenda, to see the progress of this important bill through the House of Assembly.

I also acknowledge the member acknowledging, without reflecting on it improperly, the debate in the other place and particularly the matters of concern that were raised by the opposition. I also trust, having not been part of that debate but having reflected on the *Hansard*, that the concerns or otherwise have been either addressed or allayed by the government via the minister in the other place.

It is important both in values and principles but also in good governance in this bill that (a) it maintains the very important skills and qualification threshold that brings potential candidates and members to the board, and (b) it also recognises that the individual voices, individual perspectives of working people and businesses should and must be supported and guaranteed by right and by constitution on the ReturnToWorkSA board.

I have some skin in the game on this, having been a member of the ReturnToWorkSA board myself, having been appointed by the former minister and Attorney-General, the Hon. John Rau. In fact, it was only upon my candidacy for this place and my ultimate success in that by-election that I resigned from the ReturnToWorkSA board, of course, with proper course.

Unfortunately, I have the unenviable place as being the last voice of working people to be appointed to the board before the former Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, decided to rip up the long-held common custom and practice of appointing the unique and distinct representatives and voices of working people and, in the case that this government seeks to remedy, voices of businesses to the board of this very important authority. I commend the leadership of ReturnToWorkSA, I commend the minister in the other place and, in doing so, I commend this bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Third Reading*

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (12:58):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

#### **TAFE SA BILL**

#### *Message from Governor*

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** We have a few guests with us today in the gallery. I notice and acknowledge Alice Jim, South Australia's representative in Hong Kong, who has been doing that role for many years—certainly, when I was minister for agriculture, food, fisheries, forests, tourism, recreation,

sport and racing, and I am sure the member for Chaffey as well. Alice is the guest of the Minister for Trade today. Thank you, Alice; it is great to see you again. Thank you for all your fine work.

Today, we have a long-time listener, first-time visitor that I can remember, Fred Smith. Anyone who has done anything in the South-East would know of Fred's great work down there for the *South-East Voice*. It is really good to have you in here. Fred listens so intently to parliament—not just question time but all of it—that, whenever I have uttered the word 'Glencoe' it turns up in the very next edition of the paper. Fred, thank you for your great service. You always know what is happening in my family before I do, and I appreciate the heads-up on what the cousins are up to. It is great to have you in here as well. I have just seen a note here that Fred is a guest of the member for Frome. My spies in the South-East said you were going to be in here, Fred, so I already had you down for a little shout-out.

We have some schools listed here, but I do not see the school groups here yet. I might just acknowledge them before they get here: Salisbury Primary School students, who are guests of the Minister for Tourism; we also have students coming in from Ocean View College, who are guests of the Deputy Premier; and the Leader of the Opposition has a visitor as well, Mr Henry Brasher.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Public Sector Act 2009—

Overseas and Interstate Travel—

Minister for Infrastructure and Transport Report, 16 June 2025

Minister for Health and Wellbeing Report, 25 to 28 May 2025

Minister for Health and Wellbeing Report, 12 to 13 June 2025

Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services,  
15 to 16 July 2025

Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services,  
22 to 24 July 2025

### Question Time

### ALGAL BLOOM

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04):** My question is to the Premier. What input has the federal government had into the state government's algal summer plan? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** At a media conference on 20 August, the Prime Minister said:

...my Government will provide support. We already have, and we'll continue to do so, and we'll work with the state government on their summer plan as well.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:05):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. This morning, the task force set up by the state government, at a cabinet level to oversee all responses pertaining to the algal bloom, met. We discussed a whole range of different issues that we are working on. Obviously, this morning the state government was able to announce its plans to coordinate and assist with beach clean-up activities, and this is a plan that we will execute after some weeks of work in that regard, and I can talk about that at length.

One of the other issues that was discussed, of course, was the preparations of the summer plan as it evolves, including engagement with the commonwealth, but it is the state government that is leading this effort. It is principally an exercise of work within the state government across a range of agencies. DEW, DTF, Department of the Premier and Cabinet and PIRSA are amongst probably the key organisations that are contributing to it, but also the SATC and the support of tourism from the Minister for Tourism. There's a fair bit of effort going into it, but it is principally a South Australian government-led effort.

We will engage with the commonwealth on an ongoing basis, as we have been up to this point. The key thing we are looking for from the commonwealth more than anything is a sustainment of its contribution around science and research, which has been important up until this point. Ultimately, the summer plan will have costs associated with it, and we look forward to productive engagement with the commonwealth and assistance in that regard.

#### ALGAL BLOOM

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question again is to the Premier. Why hasn't the government declared the current harmful algal bloom emergency as a natural disaster under the Emergency Management Act 2004? What community outcomes are considered when declaring a natural disaster? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** On 22 July this year, the Premier, in an interview with ABC News Breakfast, when describing the harmful algal bloom crisis, said:

From the South Australian government's perspective I want to be really clear about this. This is a natural disaster.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:07):** As I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will appreciate, a declaration of major emergencies, or emergencies and the like, are decisions that are vested in the State Coordinator, namely the police commissioner. It is the South Australian government, though—that is—under the auspices of the task force—in cabinet that is doing all the work on the algal bloom response. There is nothing that the government hasn't been able to do under the current management arrangements that it would be able to do if there was a declaration from the police commissioner.

#### ALGAL BLOOM

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08):** I would say it's a supplementary, but I will leave it to your good judgement.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you much; very kind of you, leader.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** Pleasure. Can the Premier inform the house if declaring the harmful algal bloom a natural disaster under state legislation will unlock additional access to additional federal funding and support?

**The SPEAKER:** It might not surprise you; that's not a supplementary. The Premier.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:08):** We have no advice to suggest that is the case at all. In fact, let me provide a bit more detail around the prospect of a disaster declaration on a commonwealth level, and this is a point that has been lost in some of the discourse around this. The first thing is I don't resile from the fact that there is a point of difference between us and the federal government on this issue. We have stated our position and we have maintained it. That's clear.

With respect to natural disaster declarations, as distinct from national disaster declarations, they are arrangements that sit at the commonwealth level. I will make sure I get my acronyms right here: I think it is NEMA that's responsible at the federal level for making judgements around those declarations, and then there is a funding arrangement that sits, and there are categories A, B, C and D funding.

In the event that a decision was made to apply that declaration, then it would automatically be categorised as category D, the reason being that those categories are associated to the scale of the impact on human life—that is to say, loss of life or injuries or loss of homes, for instance. Thankfully, as tragic as this event is—and it is tragic—no-one is losing their lives and no-one is losing a home in the same way you would see in a fire or a flood.

As a result it would be category D, and category D brings with it potential funds, but also a whole range of requirements that sit around those funds, including the types of things that they can be expended on. What that would mean in practice, with respect to the algal bloom, is that it would

act as a constraint on the types of supports that we are able to provide in the community, such as those we are delivering at the moment, whether that be industry or economic support, commercial fee relief or small business downturn grants. Some of these types of activities would not be eligible under category D funding as a result of a natural disaster declaration at a commonwealth level.

I think it is lost on some people that, perversely, a declaration of that nature that would result in category D funding would actually result in a worse outcome in terms of getting support to those people who, in the government's view, need it most. It is also true to say that these types of events—namely, the algal bloom—and the fact they don't currently sit neatly in a declaration that might exist in the federal government, will invite consideration at some point necessarily by the commonwealth about whether or not the current arrangements are able to adapt to the challenge that climate change represents. That will need consideration.

Now, to the federal government's credit, the Prime Minister has contemplated this and obviously established the categorisation of a significant ecological event, which this falls under the auspice of, which speaks to a need to reform or adapt with the growing changes. But for people who simply cite a natural disaster declaration as somehow unlocking funds that will result in a better community response, perversely, if those categories are strictly adhered to and the criteria is strictly adhered to, it would actually not result in a better outcome for the people that we are seeking to assist on the ground. What we want is unencumbered contributions from the federal government so we can deploy those resources and make a difference where it matters most.

#### EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I have a supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** We will see how we go and see if it is a supplementary.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:12):** Supplementary to the Premier: the Emergency Management (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill went through this house this morning to give provisions on calling an emergency under a marine emergency. Will you be prepared to call an emergency under the state act?

**The SPEAKER:** It is not a supplementary question, for starters; it's a separate question. The Premier.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:13):** The government is familiar with those amendments to the bill—indeed, we supported them—but our position remains, as I said earlier, and I would encourage all members of the house to familiarise themselves with the act in terms of the circumstances under which those declarations can be made.

#### LITHIUM BATTERIES

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:13):** My question is to the Minister for Environment. Can the minister advise whether the government plans to introduce lithium battery stewardship laws like those recently passed in New South Wales and, if so, when? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr ELLIS:** I understand that all our nation's environment ministers agreed on that particular course of action in a December meeting last year, but I have been contacted by businesses in my electorate who are struggling to properly dispose of the dangerous lithium batteries.

**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) (14:13):** I welcome the question. The disposal of all batteries, but lithium in particular, is a fraught one, given that it is not merely, although importantly, a question of recycling and making sure that we are not wasting resources and we are not polluting the environment. It is also a human safety problem because the fires that are caused by some lithium batteries, particularly if they are disposed of inappropriately in landfill or appear in a recycling facility that isn't geared to take them, can be highly destructive and very dangerous for people.

We had a meeting late last year—I am trying to remember; I am looking at the then Minister for Emergency Services—where we got everybody involved together, from recycling and manufacturing but also from emergency services, firefighting and so on, to talk about the ways in which these batteries do cause problems.

The member is almost right in the description of what happened at the ministerial council. There is a general view at the ministerial council of environment ministers that it is desirable that there be product stewardship applied to batteries, and to other products, at a national level. That is to say that if a product is sold in Australia, whether imported or made here, a small amount is added to the price of that product in order for the producer to then be responsible for taking it back at the other end and disposing of it appropriately. Because the producer is required to add to the cost and be responsible for the scheme, they will make that work as efficiently as possible.

There hasn't been movement at the federal level for that. I don't know, with the new minister, if that might be the case, but in the absence of an Australian approach, which is the preferred model for all states, the New South Wales minister, Penny Sharpe, went ahead and brought in a piece of legislation that enables her to do that. That legislation has now gone through their parliament, and the other states are all looking at it and looking at how it is going to operate, in order to determine whether we would replicate that.

That is the important big policy area, and it is one that I think repays a lot of attention. Clearly with only, I think, five weeks after this one of sitting, it's not a piece of legislation that will occur in this term of parliament, but it is worth looking at in the future, particularly once it is in operation in New South Wales, so that we can understand the good and the bad in its application.

I would say, though, for anyone who is considering disposing of batteries, we are not just talking about the big end, the electric car battery. We are talking about electric toothbrushes, even—and the Premier might like to listen to this—the Taylor Swift concert bracelets that light up and sparkle. I suspect you might have acquired a few into your household. They have little batteries in them, and people don't always think about it, so when they are finished they throw them away. I am sure those ones haven't been thrown away, but if they are thrown away, they can make their way into landfill and they can cause a fire.

So, please pay attention to what you have that has a battery that is part of the product and therefore is a risk if you simply throw that product away when it is no longer working or useful. If you go onto [whichbin.sa.gov.au](http://whichbin.sa.gov.au) and look at all of the alternatives for where you can take batteries, there is an organisation called B-cycle which is government-backed, which accepts batteries, treats them safely and stores them. Please encourage people. If they can't see one in their local area—appreciating that this is a regional electorate we are talking about—they can get in touch either directly with Green Industries or with my office and we will help find a place that can take those batteries.

#### GATHER ROUND

**Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house how South Australia's economy has benefited from attracting major events like Gather Round?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:18):** This government has an economic growth agenda, and it is paying dividends. As I stated yesterday, the Australian Bureau of Statistics has confirmed that South Australia has the fastest-growing economy on the mainland of this country—faster than Victoria, faster than New South Wales, faster than Queensland, faster than Western Australia. If you care about economic growth and its capacity to improve living standards, you would rather be here in South Australia than anywhere else.

It is an enviable position. If you look at all the quarterly figures as they have come out one after the other, it is a consistent position that South Australia has had. There is a range of policies that are contributing to that effort, none more important than housing growth. Housing growth and housing supply are occurring faster here in South Australia than in basically any other jurisdiction around the country in percentage terms. If you want to see more houses being built, thousands of



slabs—thousands of slabs—are being poured in South Australia and it is at a growth rate faster than elsewhere.

But there are other policy contributors to our economic position and one of them is, indeed, major events. They are yielding dividends for small businesses in particular in South Australia. Countless small businesses putting on more staff around major events is a win for our economy and the people who work within it.

We are alive to the resistance that this policy has received from those opposite, but we persist because we do care about people's living standards, we do care about the future of this state, and we care about having the platform that major events provides to attract not just capital but also people to South Australia. We are unapologetic about putting a spring in the step of South Australians and using major events as a platform to do it.

This morning, the statistics around the economic success of Gather Round were released through *The Advertiser* and the numbers are remarkable. Anybody who was in South Australia for Gather Round early this year knew something was going on. It felt bigger—it felt bigger. You only had to walk up and down—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** They mock it. Let the *Hansard* reflect the interjections from those opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** That's right. We know those opposite are less than enthusiastic for Gather Round, but on this side of the house, we know the numbers do not lie: \$114 million added to the bottom line of the state's economy during Gather Round.

Of course, we saw significant amounts expended in regional South Australia, including the member for Schubert's electorate. The member for Schubert was a strong advocate for a game to occur in the Barossa and indeed that happened, which is why maybe she's so wise not to interject like the members around her.

Over 50,000 visitors across the course of the weekend and \$114 million went straight to the bottom line in the state of South Australia. The average stay was over four nights, so people weren't coming for a game and going home, they were staying and experiencing South Australia and spending money within it. We are seeing repeat visitation grow, so this has been an absolute unabated success for the state. It is a big win for a lot of people within it. The country looks at us differently now, not just because of Gather Round but because we have a strong growing economy and a government that's willing to take on risks to deliver it.

**The SPEAKER:** And just another reminder that the McLaren Vale wine region is keen for a game in 2027 at Shark Park, home of the mighty Aldinga Football Club.

**The Hon. V.A. Tarzia:** Or the Mudlarks—

**The SPEAKER:** Well, the Mudlarks are good, but I think in terms of infrastructure around it, Myponga is just a little bit too far and it's not in the McLaren Vale GI. But thank you for your encouragement. Nice to have you on my team.

### SURFING AUSTRALIA EVENTS

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier table the modelling that the government provided Surfing Australia officials in relation to future algal bloom movements? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** This week in the house, the Premier revealed that modelling had been provided to Surfing Australia in consideration of their decision to move their junior titles event from Fleurieu Peninsula. Surfing Australia currently has a Boardriders Battle event scheduled to take place in six weeks on 18 October also on Fleurieu Peninsula.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:23):** As I said yesterday, during the course of the week there was advice from PIRSA and the public health team at SA Health provided to those event organisers, and for any other event organiser who is keen to engage with the state government we will make sure we furnish them with the same information as well.

#### ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** My question is to the Premier. Do any of the conditions included in the funding agreement supporting the merger of the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia require that institution to implement measures addressing gender pay equity and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:23):** I am more than happy to inquire on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition and come back to him regarding that. What I know is that both institutions, to the best of my knowledge, are committed to addressing the challenge of the gender pay gap, which is a real life—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is on his final warning.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** The irony of the member for Unley interjecting on this subject matter is not lost on any of us. I was very pleased to see that the vice chancellor of the new institution is an outstanding woman who has been recruited to that role in the—

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** A woman? What, so they can save some money?

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

*The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** She is an outstanding woman who we believe will do an exceptional job in establishing that institution from the get-go. The bringing together of the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia is a milestone achievement for our state and was an important policy that this government took to the last state election. We genuinely believe that now, more than ever, is the time for the state to take on challenges and to take on calculated and thoughtful endeavours that might have a degree of risk—indeed, political risk—associated with them.

We are very aware that this policy enjoyed its critics, including those opposite, but we got it done. There are a number of people who said it would never happen, that it would be impossible, that it would never work. Yet here we are on the precipice of the new amalgamated university, a new institution starting next year that will genuinely advance the interests of future generations of South Australians and our economy more broadly.

This is probably one of the bigger microeconomic reforms that has ever occurred in the history of this state. Starting next year, Adelaide University will be the largest educator of domestic students in the country—the largest in terms of number of students. More than that, it has already achieved a top 100 ranking. People forecast that that would not be the case, yet it already has. This is something to be excited about. I know that a lot of people within the university are working very hard indeed to bring this ambitious project together in a way that is seamless for students.

Naturally, something as complex as this brings with it challenges, and there will be yet more that emerge. That is undoubtedly true but we believe it is worth it. We believe there is a long-term dividend to be yielded for South Australia as a result of this new institution realising all the benefits of bringing them together that can be realised, none more so than making sure that more young South Australians are getting access to tertiary education in the highest quality format. That is probably one of the most powerful levers that a state government can utilise to address growing degrees of income inequality across the spectrum, whether it be the gender pay gap or across socio-economic backgrounds.

We want more young South Australians getting access to higher education from an elite top 100 university, and we are willing to do the difficult things and the hard things to get the state

moving. Again, I submit to the house that this is an example of a government delivering on its commitments and it is yielding a result in terms of having the fastest-growing economy in the nation.

#### **VICTIM SUPPORT SERVICE**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** My question is to the Premier. Has the government refused a plea for help from the Victim Support Service to save it from closing? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr TEAGUE:** In a letter to its members and volunteers, Victim Support Service Chair Cecilia White writes:

We regret to inform you that Victim Support Services (VSS) will cease providing services from the end of September 2025...Recognising the gravity of these challenges, the Board initiated discussions with the Department of Social Services...and the Attorney General's Department...These talks have centred on exploring every possible avenue for sustainable service delivery.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:28):** I am not familiar with the quotes to which the deputy leader referred but I am more than happy to get further information and make sure that, as best as possible, the deputy leader is furnished with that detail.

The Victim Support Service is an important organisation that has done work in South Australia for some time. If my memory is serving me correctly, the member for Badcoe has a close affinity with this organisation, having served on the board—

**Ms Stinson:** Yes.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —of the Victim Support Service for some time. I recall the strength of the member for Badcoe's contributions when the former government I think cut funding to the Victim Support Service in South Australia, funding that I believe we have restored. I welcome the new-found interest from those opposite in regard to a service that they so willingly cut funding to in a way that was unfortunate for people who relied upon those services.

I am very proud that this government restored funding to the organisation following the cuts implemented by the former Liberal government. Given that is the case, people who are associated with the Victim Support Service can rest assured that given the deputy leader's inquiries we will make some inquiries of our own as a government.

#### **NURSE PRACTITIONER PILOT PROGRAM**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:30):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister expand the nurse practitioner pilot program to other parts of the state? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr McBRIDE:** Nurse practitioners are vital in supporting GPs, especially during a GP shortage.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30):** I welcome the opportunity to speak about the work we are doing in relation to the nurse practitioner pilot. This is a program that we have started, with support from the federal government, out of a decision that was made at national cabinet to provide some pilot funding to the states and territories to undertake pilots of innovative programs in terms of primary care.

We have used that funding predominantly for two purposes. One is to expand the services that are provided for people who are calling Healthdirect services. As people would know, when calling Healthdirect on 1800 022 222, 24 hours a day, you can speak to a nurse about health concerns. One of the issues had been that a lot of the time they would say 'Speak to a GP'. It is very difficult to speak to a GP particularly within a short timeframe, so we are now providing telehealth services to GPs through Healthdirect in South Australia.

The other component was to provide a pilot program, trying to demonstrate the benefit of fully unleashing the services of nurse practitioners in primary care. We have been running that

successfully in both metropolitan and country areas across the state, and the feedback has been very positive. The feedback has been exceptionally positive from patients and also from the practices involved.

This is really about demonstrating to the federal government that if we get a change to the Medicare Benefits Schedule rules, in terms of what nurse practitioners are able to do, then that is going to lead ultimately to a much better outcome for patients across the board. Nurse practitioners will be able to see a significantly larger range of both patients and conditions than they currently do at the moment. Through the program that we have been rolling out they have been bulk-billed services, which is obviously a significant issue in terms of the lack of bulk-billing that is available in the community at the moment.

These nurse practitioners are incredibly well trained and incredibly skilled. They have done additional training and can operate at that extended scope of practice, and it is about remunerating them to be able to do that at that appropriate level through the MBS. The results of this trial will then be going to the federal government to then hopefully demonstrate to them that changing those MBS rules will lead to a much more significant improvement in terms of primary care availability across the community.

The issue with nurse practitioners has also been that it is a bit of a chicken-and-egg situation in that nurse practitioners have been around for a long time now, at least 20 years or so, but in the past 10 years in particular we haven't seen a big growth in the number of nurse practitioners because there haven't been positions available, particularly in terms of primary care. We have been expanding the scope of nurses in the public health system over successive governments, but in many cases people haven't had to do the nurse practitioner official training to operate at that extended scope, but in primary care you do.

We are hopeful that changing those MBS rules will not only allow nurse practitioners to operate more but encourage more people to become nurse practitioners and do that additional training, because they will see the pathway to that job if they undertake that additional training and that additional qualification.

We are very keen, is the short answer, to see this program expand. We are waiting to see the results of the program. We will be knocking on the door of the federal government—as, I would say, WA have been undertaking some similar work and I understand they have had some similar positive results. Hopefully, we can demonstrate some national change in terms of the Medicare rules that will lead to improvements for patients in both metropolitan and country areas across the country.

#### AIDA

**Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (14:34):** My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister advise the house of any significant opera events happening in the state?

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:34):** Thank you very much to the member for Dunstan. Love, war, betrayal, destiny—these are the themes of one of the grandest of grand operas, Verdi's *AIDA*. We are going to see Zeffirelli's production of this for the very first time, an absolute world exclusive, here in Adelaide. It is the first time ever out of Verona and the first time out of Italy. What a coup for our state. We are bold, we turn heads and we have proven time and time again that we are a fantastic place to host amazing events.

The Italian company is bringing 400 people out here, international performances staff, including 106 musicians, 100 members of their chorus, and the ballet as well. Not only are we going to see this amazing opera performed here from a very famous company but State Opera South Australia will also have 300 people as part of this production. It is next year on 5 and 6 February. It is the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of our State Opera, and what an opportunity for our own South Australians to be on stage with people like the world's greatest tenor, Jonas Kaufmann, and of course Angel Blue is also going to be here, a Grammy Award winner.

This has got attention—very, very excited people. We expect a huge crowd of people from throughout Australia and international visitors as well. When TEG made the decision to pick Adelaide, it called us the event capital of the nation, and that did not just happen overnight, that happened

because this government made decisions that this is something we do well. The economic impact, as we have heard from Gather Round today or LIV Golf, or those other international events like the Tour Down Under—we do this so very well here in South Australia.

Last night, I had members of the Italian community in here, and can I tell you how excited they were. Many of them have known about the Arena di Verona for a long time. Of course, the Italian Consul General, Ernesto Pianelli, has already been on the phone, and the Italian Ambassador is doing the marketing for us. He has talked to all the consuls from around Australia and they are going to be promoting this event. This is a very proud day for our South Australian Italian community.

Tickets will go on sale on 17 September and we cannot wait to have this production here. I want people to have a think about this—and I thank *The Advertiser* for their great support of this event with a great front page yesterday—our historic Adelaide Oval, a hot summer's night and we are taken to ancient Egypt. It is going to be a spectacular: 28 containers and 400 costumes. This is something that is bold. This is something that is new.

But let's remind us we have done this before with *The Ring Cycle*, and 80 per cent of people attending were from overseas and interstate. This is going to have an incredible economic impact into our state but, more importantly, it plays to our DNA of festivals and events, one of the key drivers of tourism here in South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** The Pavarotti of the west, the member for Flinders.

#### **SELICKS BEACH HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:38):** My question is to the Minister for Housing. Will there be a delay for the 1,700 new homes slated for Sellicks Beach due to dust particles found in high levels from a nearby quarry? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr TELFER:** Land earmarked for a 1,700 new home estate at Sellicks Beach may now not be suitable for development after tiny dust particles that cause asthma and increase heart and lung disease were found in high levels multiple times near a quarry close to the development, with 134 hectares of that development now on holding status.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:39):** I thank the member for the question. My advice is that there will be no effect on Housing Roadmap timelines. The code amendment was slated for completion by December 2025. The land will be placed in the deferred urban zone and that means that the rezoning will be complete and there is only a short administrative process that will need to happen to take it from deferred urban to master plan neighbourhood.

That allows two things to occur: obviously, confidence that this land will be ultimately available for housing but also an additional year to provide that final air quality monitoring process to go on. This is not unusual; in fact, we have been through this process with other code amendments that are close by quarries. It is both prudent and diligent to do so and what we have found with those other developments is where additional testing is being provided, that allows for a longer period to be looked at and obviously allows some confidence to be found in terms of the air quality over the longer term.

What we have found is that it has obviously been a very dry and dusty period and so you need to look over a longer period—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Well, no. In terms of this but particularly dry and dusty because of the conditions, and there is a range of other—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** Do you want the answer or not? You want to scoff. You are a big expert on—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** No, no. If you listen, I will give you an answer. You asked a question, I want to give you an answer. There has been a particular set of conditions which means a longer period of air testing is required. We will do that because it is prudent and sensible, and once that is completed we are confident that we can meet our Housing Roadmap timelines—and this land, which has always been, I might add, in iterations of the previous 30-year plan. It has always been slated for housing under Labor and Liberal. It is just that we are doing the code amendment on it, which those opposite never did. You never did many code amendments, didn't bring much housing to market. Your previous minister admitted that. You didn't put any pipes in the ground, you didn't put any infrastructure in place, you didn't do a very good job on housing. You did nothing in regional housing and now you are big experts on it.

So the difference between you and this government is we do things and we put the accountability on ourselves by having the Housing Roadmap. I am very confident that Sellicks Beach will be a great housing development and will sell very well and provide a great new neighbourhood for people in the southern suburbs.

### **SELICKS BEACH HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr TELFER:** A supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** We will see if it's a supplementary.

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:42):** When will that area be available for housing?

**The SPEAKER:** That's not a supplementary. That's a separate question.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:42):** As I said before to those opposite, those opposite always yell, 'Slabs down, slabs down, slabs down.' If you want to go and see slabs down, you can go all over the city, all over the regions too, because we believe in building public housing, we believe in having Renewal SA out there doing developments, doing direct delivery, 5,000 properties. Those opposite would can that role of Renewal SA, they would close up shop. There wouldn't be a Southwark, there wouldn't be anything going on in Bowden, there wouldn't be anything going on in Playford Alive, there wouldn't be anything happening in Noarlunga. You would close it all up, just as you would close up regional housing as well.

So we know those opposite talk a great game on slabs. They didn't deliver any in government and their policies won't deliver any in the future. So what this government aims to do with the rezoning of this land—Sellicks, Concordia, Dry Creek and Onkaparinga Heights—is rezone it so that the private sector can bring this housing to market. And what happens? We rezone it, then the private owners have to take it through land division and then they do civil works and then they sell the blocks. So our job in the Housing Roadmap is that we undertook to rezone these areas and we will.

### **CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME**

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:44):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, what level of consultation did your government initiate with the South Australian wine industry before announcing the expansion of the container deposit scheme to include wine bottles? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** The opposition has been advised by the wine industry that the expansion could raise the cost of wine between 40¢ and \$1 per bottle, passing the added expense along to growers and consumers while costing the industry an additional \$85 million per year.

**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):** This is a version of a question that was asked yesterday, and I must say I was surprised that the opposition has gone against this extension of container deposit. I was surprised to hear that, not least because it was started under the previous government to start to look at expansion, but also because it is something that is widely popular and is very welcomed.

The initial discussion about this, as I understand, it happened under the last government, so it started in 2019, but since we have been in government it has continued. There have been ongoing discussions with the wine industry. There was a Hudson Howells report done that estimated the cost of adding to wine bottles—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I can't quite hear you, so perhaps I will just answer the question.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey will come to order or you won't hear the rest of the question unless you are tuning in from your office.

**Mr Whetstone:** I am asking on behalf of your constituents too.

**The SPEAKER:** You can leave until the end of question time, member for Chaffey. I'm quite capable of looking after the people of McLaren Vale and Kangaroo Island. I have been on this issue since the Liberal Party raised it in 2019.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

*Members*

#### **MEMBER FOR CHAFFEY, NAMING**

**The SPEAKER (14:46):** I name the member for Chaffey. The Leader of Government Business.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46):** Are you going to apologise?

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Sounds like I hit a nerve, sir. I apologise.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I name the member for Chaffey for a second time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I move that his service in the house be excluded for two sitting days. I move:

That the apology not be accepted.

**The SPEAKER:** I will put the question first whether the apology is accepted or not.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It has not been accepted, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, Leader of Government Business.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TEAGUE:** Point of order, sir, on the motion.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Thank you for the call, sir. I just indicate the objective circumstances in which the member has immediately returned and taken the opportunity to apologise to you, sir, and I ask you to take that into consideration in terms of the acceptance of the apology.

I note as well, just for completeness, there has been reference to a period of time. It's my understanding on consideration of standing order 139 just right now that, on a first occasion, a member is suspended for one day, on my reading of the relevant standing order.

**The SPEAKER:** I named the member for Chaffey a second time because of his second attack on me, and I won't stand for that. I know that he has been doing that for years in here to other members across the chamber, and he has made aspersions on how I deal with the people in my electorate, and they know—the wine growers and winemakers know—my fervent stance on this issue.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** It seems a good reason to name somebody?

**The SPEAKER:** Very good reason to name somebody. So we will put the first naming to the house. The Leader of Government Business has moved that the apology not be accepted. Is that seconded?

**An honourable member:** Yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** All those in favour say aye; those against say no.

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

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

*The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** The ayes have it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I didn't hear the call for division; there were people yelling out. There is a division called for. Ring the bells.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....24  
Noes.....9  
Majority .....15

#### AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Boyer, B.I.
Brown, M.E.	Champion, N.D.	Clancy, N.P.
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Fulbrook, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.
Koutsantonis, A. (teller)	Malinauskas, P.B.	Odenwalder, L.K.
O'Hanlon, C.C.	Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.

#### NOES

Basham, D.K.B. (teller)	Gardner, J.A.W.	Hurn, A.M.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Tarzia, V.A.
Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.

#### PAIRS

Dighton, A.E.	Pratt, P.K.
Mullighan, S.C.	Pisoni, D.G.
Michaels, A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Hood, L.P.	Batty, J.A.

Motion thus carried.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I move:

That the member be suspended from the service of the house for the remainder of the day.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** The question now is in respect of the second naming. I want to give the member for Chaffey the opportunity to apologise.



**Mr WHETSTONE:** Thank you, Speaker. I rise to apologise and give an explanation for my actions as I exited the chamber. Sir, as you would know, the Riverland region is seriously under economic pressure in the wine industry—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order by the Leader of Government Business.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** This is not an apology, this is a debate. Apologise unreservedly to the house and the Speaker, that's it.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader.

**Mr TEAGUE:** The member is entitled to be heard in explanation.

**The SPEAKER:** That was a speech and I was about to pull the member up. You can't come in here and make speeches when you have been named. So it is an apology, and it is a heartfelt apology, or it's nothing. The member for Chaffey.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Thank you, sir. Again, I rise and unreservedly make an apology to you on behalf of my community.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I move:

That the apology be accepted.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey will leave parliament for the remainder of the day.

*The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*Question Time*

### CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME

**The SPEAKER:** We will start the question time clock again. The Deputy Premier, you were on your feet.

**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) (14:56):** I was, thank you. I was trying to explain that it is a pity that the opposition has decided to oppose this move, because I think it unnecessarily creates a dynamic with the wine industry that is unnecessary and is certainly not coming from the government. We very much want to work with the wine industry on making sure about what is now inevitable, given that nearly all the other states are doing this anyway, and our winemakers, naturally, sell their wine into those other states.

By our choosing to go along with and to maintain the timetable of the other states gives the winemakers an opportunity to do this in the best possible way. Regardless of the position, of course, of the opposition, the government has already reached out to the wine industry pre the announcement yesterday, to reassure them about what the announcement was and to reassure them about the process, and we will work carefully with them.

The specific question that was raised by the member was the extent of consultation that had occurred previously. As I pointed out, it did start back in 2019, when the review initially started under the previous government and there were, of course, submissions from the wine industry at that point. There was a summit on container deposit held under the previous government also, and that was something that included the wine industry. There was a consultation on a specific document, Improving South Australia's Recycling Makes Cents discussion paper, again under the previous government, and the wine industry participated in that.

Then, once we came into government, I made it very clear to the wine industry, and anyone who would listen, that we would not go it alone in South Australia in adding the container deposit to wine bottles, but nor would we be the only state to hold out. We subsequently had many discussions, including with the head of the EPA, once Jon Gorvett took that place, and a meeting with Brian Smedley, who at that time was the chief executive of the Wine Industry Association.

Between September and October last year there was public consultation on the draft amendment bill. The wine industry made a submission on that bill and, of course, there have been constant meetings in between time, and I have specifically spoken, as well as the EPA, to various winemakers. There was a roundtable discussion as recently as October of last year held by the EPA and, of course, a meeting in Clare last week as part of the country cabinet in which the question of container deposit was again raised.

I reiterated that there appeared to be an inevitability with the other states moving and that we would, if we were to participate, do it in such a way as was least costly to the wine industry. Let's not forget that this is something that is about the sustainability of the wine industry, as they increasingly will be selling into markets that will demand that they operate in the most sustainable way possible. We are assisting them in doing this. We will do it in the best possible way, and we will do it with the strong support of the majority of Australians.

### **RED CROSS TRANSPORT SERVICE**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Human Services and Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well. Could the minister please inform the house what the government intends to do after the Red Cross has withdrawn its transport services due to a lack of volunteers? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave is granted.

**Mr McBRIDE:** It is my understanding that the Red Cross has struggled to find volunteers. I have seen the Tailem Bend Community Centre pick up some of the slack by expanding its footprint out of Tailem Bend into Bordertown and further, picking up the shortfall around transport services that the Red Cross used to operate.

**The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (15:00):** Thank you very much for the question. The Community Passenger Network, or the CTSA, has been under review and has had an open tender process, which has recently been undertaken. The new program has just commenced only this week and it is fair to say that there have been some challenges for many organisations right across South Australia in delivering some of these services.

In terms of specifics around that particular regional service, I am happy to talk to the member and have a meeting. We have held meetings before in parliament with many of these services, and together we have visited them as well, so I am really happy to meet with the member and provide a full update in regard to that specific challenge that has been undertaken.

### **SALARIED MEDICAL OFFICERS ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT**

**Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house on the pay and conditions for doctors in the public health system?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02):** I thank the member for Davenport for her question and her interest in the health system and its impact on patients. We know how important our doctors are for the hard work that they do across SA Health and our community. This is a government which respects and values and is investing in our doctors. That is why when we came to government we made a commitment to increase the number of doctors in our public health system by 100 extra doctors across the board. I am happy to report to the house that we have now increased that well above 100 over four years to the now 646 over three years that we have been able to deliver in increased recruitment. That, of course, accounts for doctors who have left, so this is a net improvement in the number of doctors working in SA Health.

Of course, we have been in recent discussions with the Salaried Medical Officers Association about the new enterprise bargaining agreement. The previous enterprise bargaining agreement that was entered into under the previous government set pay increases for our doctors of only 1.5 per cent, which was clearly well below the rate of inflation and was something which, obviously, was of concern to many doctors as we saw inflation continue to increase.

This government has taken the approach in relation to all enterprise bargaining agreements of wanting to work constructively with our workforce to try to reach fair and equitable deals across the board. We have done that, firstly, in relation to the allied health agreement, the first one of those that we have struck in this state's history, and now have reached that in relation to the salaried medical officers agreement.

I was really delighted that we got the results of that this week, which had a result resoundingly in favour of what the government had put on the table, which is 72 per cent of those doctors voting in favour of this agreement. That was on the basis of a turnout of doctors almost double the number that had voted in the previous ballot. This agreement includes total wage rises over the course of four years of 13 per cent, above the rate of inflation, so real wage increases for our doctors.

Most importantly, we aim to focus particularly on our junior doctors, those doctors under the band of consultants, going from first-year interns all the way up to senior registrars, and we have sought to increase the base rate of those doctors' pay by over \$4,000 each. We did that on the basis that we understood we were falling behind other states in terms of those pay scales compared with where many other states were. That was an area that needed to be addressed. In discussions with many doctors across the board, they regarded that as more important than addressing an increase in consultants' pay. In many instances, our consultants' pay is already the highest in the country. Addressing that junior doctor pay was a critical part of this.

We have also added incentives, in particular for working in regional areas. Those incentives go well over \$39,000, depending upon the area in which people will be working, to incentivise people to work in regional areas because we know how important getting doctors into our regional hospitals is. We have also increased professional development pay, particularly for junior doctors who, we know, have a lot of course fees they have to pay. We have introduced, importantly, a mandatory 10-hour break between shifts for our junior doctors as well. We have also had formal recognition of rural generalists, with increased rates of pay for them as well.

I want to thank all our doctors across the public health system for the work that they do. I am really delighted we have been able to strike this deal, which is going to help us to recruit even more doctors into the future and have an even stronger medical workforce in this state.

#### ALGAL BLOOM

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:06):** My question is to the Premier. Will there be an underwater scanning and assessment program for the coastal waters off Fleurieu Peninsula? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr BASHAM:** I am still awaiting a response to a letter written on 24 July to the Premier and Minister for Primary Industries requesting the Fleurieu waters be scanned and footage recorded from the MV *Southern Ranger* for comparative data to that collected by the MV *Southern Ranger* in Gulf St Vincent in July.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:06):** I thank the member for Finniss for his question. Obviously, there has been a lot of work happening within PIRSA regarding the algal bloom. I am happy to follow up regarding the correspondence to which the member for Finniss refers.

One of the things, though, I can inform the member for Finniss of is there is a marine impact assessment that is being led by PIRSA in response to the algal bloom. It is one of the science and research elements of the package we announced back in July or early August—in that period—and the marine impact assessment has had challenges associated with it, principally because of weather conditions.

The marine impact assessment's principal objective is to assess the scale of damage to marine life below the surface in our oceans in a way that is not visible from satellite imagery or to the naked eye. The marine impact assessment requires a high degree of visibility to be able to do that work so when seas are rough, their capacity to do that work is obviously diminished. There have been delays as a result of that, particularly given the weather conditions we have seen more recently.

I am more than happy to follow up on the correspondence to which the member for Finnis refers and furnish him with a response, if indeed there is one to be made.

### NORTHERN WATER PROJECT

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:08):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Northern Water project at risk? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PATTERSON:** Fortescue and Origin Energy, once mooted as potential water customers who agreed to contribute to a \$200 million feasibility study with BHP and the state government, have now pulled out of the project.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:08):** The short answer is no. The long answer is: as the member knows, the amount of money that these companies were projecting to supply for the prefeasibility was small in comparison with the commonwealth government's, the state government's and BHP's contribution to prefeasibility.

Prefeasibility is about making sure we can unlock the Gawler Craton primarily for copper production. Ancillary off-takers are welcome but, more importantly, this project will only proceed if BHP are able to negotiate with the state government a water off-take that is suitable for them, suitable for us and, of course, allows them to build their second stage smelter to unlock their mining-concentrated growth program at Olympic Dam, to expand Carrapateena, to make Prominent Hill a longer-life mine and, ultimately, to develop Oak Dam.

This project is about mining first and foremost. South Australia is blessed to have some of the world's largest copper reserves. We have a stable regulatory regime, a regime that is the envy of not only the nation but most Western developed countries. You have seen the pressure that other countries are putting on BHP to develop their copper mines. You are seeing pressure in Chile, you are seeing pressure in Argentina and you are seeing pressure in the United States. The truth is, though, that South Australia has probably the most secure, stable regulatory framework of any jurisdiction anywhere in the world for long-term copper mining.

BHP and Western Mining and other explorers have been drilling into Olympic Dam since it was discovered and still are yet to find the bottom. If you look at the projections from BHP, this is now a mine life of over 100 years. What we need is to make sure that we can limit the off-takes from the Great Artesian Basin for those environmental benefits. The deal that was done in the 1980s to give BHP unlimited access to the Great Artesian Basin might have been suitable in 1982 but it is not suitable in 2025. The people who are saying that the loudest are BHP themselves. So an alternative water source for mining is absolutely important.

The opportunity for other off-takers is always going to be there, but the success or otherwise of the Northern Water project will hinge on the ability of BHP to invest that money in South Australia. That is what will drive the success of that one way or another. We know the best thing about Olympic Dam and the best thing about what is occurring at OD is not just the copper mining but the copper metals that are being made, because we are going up the value chain.

It was an inspired decision by Roger Goldsworthy, as we just discussed in this place. For this copper concentrate with these uranium levels, there would only be a few refineries around the world that would take that level of uranium in its concentrate to process it. Processing it here means we go up the value chain. A second-stage smelter will allow BHP to mine the ore body as it arrives rather than try to find different parts of the ore body to mine that can be mixed in the one-stage smelter that they have.

This is something that the state government is very excited about. We are working very, very hard to make sure the prefeasibility comes in in a way that allows us to go out for a request for tender to go to the next stage of the project, where we actually go out and have two entities fighting it out for the right to build this.

**GATHER ROUND**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:12):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Limestone Coast host a Gather Round game in 2026? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr McBRIDE:** The government media release says, '36 per cent of attendees come from interstate.' Given the position of the Limestone Coast and that a lot of the visitors are from Victoria, surely the Limestone Coast could host some of these visitors down there when they are coming across.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:13):** I want to thank the member for MacKillop for his question. It is a fair question.

**The SPEAKER:** Fred is very keen, too—Fred Smith up there, the boundary writer for 5SE.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** It is a fair question but not a unique one. If you are an MP in this place who hasn't written to me asking for a Gather Round game, you are in an exclusive club. There is already a significant benefit that we see in the Limestone Coast because of Gather Round, as the member for MacKillop well knows. A lot of people travelling from Victoria are taking the opportunity to travel through the Limestone Coast and the magnificent region that it is.

Although Mount Gambier, for instance, is not the most direct route to come from Melbourne, it is amazing to see the number of people who are going out of their way to stay on the Limestone Coast. That speaks to one of the figures hidden in the economic report that jumped out at me, which is that 4.7 days was the average length of stay for someone coming over for Gather Round, which is outstanding.

The Limestone Coast, whether it be the Mount, Robe, the lakes district, Coonawarra—all the parts of the member's electorate that he knows better than anybody—we have turned our mind to, it is fair to say, that in the event that South Australia is successful and the state government is successful in getting an extension to the contract, what that would look like in terms of future participation outside the venues that have hosted it in the past. I think that we can improve the Barossa this year. There was year one for Mount Barker; year two was better. We got a few systems in place and were able to make some adjustments. In no small part the member for Kavel—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** That's right, the local—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, would you mind helping me out here by wrapping up your answer, because I actually owe the opposition a question and I do not want to deprive them of that.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Right. We will have a good look at it. We are looking at a whole range of options. I can see the merit of the member's question and will consider it in due course.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Frome, and I apologise that I skipped over you.

**MENTAL HEALTH CALL-OUTS**

**Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:15):** Mr Speaker, I thank you for your courtesy. My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What, if any, additional resourcing has the government established in preparation for the scaling back of mental health call-outs by SAPOL? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Ms PRATT:** It was reported in *The Advertiser* last week that police officers are currently undergoing training to help them assess which mental health jobs to attend and which to divert to other services to confidently redirect jobs to other agencies such as ambulance or other healthcare services.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16):** Specifically in terms of the question 'What investments are we making?' there is a huge number of investments in terms of mental health. We have dramatically increased funding to mental health over the course of the past 3½ years, and there is more investment coming. In particular, we are soon to see the first opening of what is going to be a series of additional mental health investments into our public hospital system, the first big increase in generations to the capacity of our mental health system.

The first of those will be The QEH mental health rehabilitation beds, and then there will be more to come at Flinders, Noarlunga, Modbury and Mount Gambier as well. But, of course, that is not all: we are investing significantly into community mental health services. One of the areas we are investing in is in relation to the work that we are doing together with SAPOL in terms of a mental health co-responder model. Where there is a call-out to SAPOL, a SAPOL officer, together with a mental health nurse, is able to respond to that call-out together and, in many cases, they are able to avoid SAPOL taking that person to an emergency department where they otherwise do not need to do so.

In relation to the other part of the question, which was specifically in relation to what *The Advertiser* article was about on the weekend, we do work closely with SAPOL. We are having discussions with SAPOL in relation to their consideration of further work that they are doing in relation to their call-outs. The Deputy Commissioner, Linda Williams, was on the radio earlier this week trying to explain, I think, the call-outs—by the different nature of some of the things that they are looking to reduce. I think the example she used was if there was somebody who was impounding a car and when they were going to impound that car they made a SAPOL call-out—that might be something that they would regard as something they didn't need to attend, but she went on to list other examples where they would be attending.

We will continue to work with SAPOL. We want to make sure that there is a good system and a good relationship in place between SAPOL, the Department for Health, local hospital networks, and also in particular the SA Ambulance Service to make sure that we can get this right, and we will keep working with SAPOL to make sure that it has a successful outcome.

*Ministerial Statement*

**DEFENCE TRADE MISSION**

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:18):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** I inform the house that this weekend I will depart to lead a significant defence trade mission to the United Kingdom. The mission will focus on strengthening South Australia's international partnerships while further reinforcing our state's reputation as the nation's pre-eminent defence state.

The mission is about opening doors for South Australian businesses, securing opportunities through AUKUS and other naval shipbuilding activities, and ensuring that our state is firmly embedded in global defence supply chains.

South Australia has the expertise, the innovation and the workforce to deliver, and we are determined to make sure the rest of the world knows it. A key component of the mission will be South Australia's strong representation at the Defence and Security Equipment International conference, which is one of the world's most significant defence and security exhibitions.

Our delegation will showcase South Australia's leading capabilities and seek to attract greater investment, collaboration and supply chain opportunities. DSEI will feature over 1,600 exhibitors from more than 90 countries. This will include more than 50 South Australian companies and research organisations showcasing their cutting-edge capabilities across defence, space and cyber.

For the first time, the South Australian government, through Defence SA, will host its own stand at the global trade show, reinforcing its position as the defence state. In addition to the participation of more than 50 South Australian companies at DSEI, the delegation will be

strengthened by a significant contingent of senior industry leaders and CEOs. This will include chief executives from some of the state's most prominent defence companies, such as BAE Systems, PMB Defence, REDARC Defence & Space and Novafast, amongst others, demonstrating the depth and breadth of South Australia's defence industry capability.

The state government has prepared an extensive program for CEOs and businesses participating in our trade mission that will give them the opportunity to engage directly with their international partners, including key UK government and defence sector officials. The defence industry is a critical part of the South Australian economy, and this trip aims to further strengthen AUKUS ties and unlock opportunities for South Australian businesses.

In addition to the defence-focused program, which is rather intense, I will also undertake a series of meetings in relation to Australia's bid to host COP31, where I will highlight South Australia's leadership in renewable energy, emissions reduction and climate innovation, as well as Adelaide's capacity and experience to successfully host one of the largest international conferences ever to be held in the nation's history.

I will also engage in dialogue on South Australia's nation-leading political donation reform framework, which has set a new benchmark in transparency and integrity and is being recognised as a model for jurisdictions both nationally and abroad.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** No worries. I will depart for the United Kingdom on Saturday 6 September for five nights. During my absence, the Deputy Premier will assume the role of Acting Premier of South Australia.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **ALGAL BLOOM**

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (15:22):** We have just heard that the Premier is on another trip. Maybe before he packs his bag for the United Kingdom he could unpack his plans for that summer plan that South Australians are desperately waiting for in terms of what is happening with this summer plan. We are now in spring and still there is no summer plan for this algal situation.

The first matter that I want to talk about is the harmful algal bloom, because we know we are already in spring. Over the last week, we have again learned of organisations, this time Surfing Australia, which has unfortunately made the decision to relocate one of its championships, the 2025 Australian Junior Surfing Titles, which was originally planned for the Fleurieu Peninsula in November.

In this place, we were actually told that the decision was made following discussions with the Premier's office, which provided Surfing Australia with modelling apparently to inform their decision. It is extremely disappointing for not only local surfers but also local businesses to hear this news, because they were anticipating widespread economic activity that naturally comes from the holding of such an event, but unfortunately it has been moved.

Curiously, Surfing Australia has not cancelled the Australian Boardriders Battle event, scheduled for just six weeks' time, despite local reports, unfortunately, of the re-emergence of dead fish washing up like never before at Waitpinga beaches yesterday. It begs the question as to what is the modelling showing and, more concerningly, what about the mixed messages coming from these decisions? Like the health advice, sometimes, I have got to say, it has been as clear as mud, or as clear as foam as the case may be. Our beaches have become what some are saying is a complete health hazard.

We know the algal bloom, unfortunately, is choking parts of Gulf St Vincent and beyond. It is not just an environmental crisis, it truly is a public health issue. From Victor Harbor all the way through to Henley Beach, residents and visitors have actually reported flu-like symptoms: sore eyes, persistent coughs and even asthma-like symptoms. You just have to go through social media at the moment to see some of the commentary from locals.

Households even some distance from the shore are feeling the effects as airborne particles drift through communities. Whether it is surfers or swimmers, they have been forced from the water after suffering sometimes even breathing difficulties. In August, this affected entire stretches of Henley Beach; I saw it for myself with my own eyes. These beaches were smothered in thick white foam, leaving locals coughing and wheezing. I can report to the house that I went there with the member for Morphett and our candidate for Colton, and there were so many people who had impacts like headaches and things like that. It had quite severe consequences on those who were spending an extended period of time out there.

Authorities might insist that the algae is not toxic, but tell that to the parents who are having to constantly comfort children with things like burning eyes and to the elderly who are struggling to sometimes catch their breath when they walk along the beach. So the government's complacency is as suffocating as the bloom itself. It really is. We know that their response has been lacklustre and it has been flat-footed. We know that Labor has known about the risks of the algal bloom since 2023 and a \$4 million request for 10 years—\$40 million—was denied. They are lacklustre, they are flat-footed and they seem to be making it up as they go along.

We know this disaster was sparked by, amongst other things, warmer seas, nutrient run-off, conditions that we know are worsened by climate change, but also poor planning. Now, without decisive action, these blooms will get bigger and they will get deadlier. South Australians should not have to choose between their coastline and their health. The time for saving face is over and the time for saving our marine life and our coastal livelihoods is now. That is why we need a summer plan and we need it fast while we are in spring and these events are just around the corner.

Before closing, I also want to place briefly on record my sincere condolences to the family and friends of surf lifesaving stalwart John Baker, who passed away suddenly last month. He was affectionately known to many of us as JB and beloved by his community. I worked with him very closely when I was Minister for Emergency Services. As Surf Life Saving Australia's seventh president, JB's leadership saw the organisation truly flourish into a nationally trusted institution. He had a vibrant spirit, irreverent humour, love for family, mates and surf lifesaving, and he touched countless lives when he worked with people. Having worked with JB for some time now, I can attest to his incredible chutzpah with which he went about his work, matched only by his quick-wittedness. Vale John Baker. You will be deeply missed.

#### **HOSPITAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION GROUP**

**Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:27):** I would like to take the opportunity today to congratulate the Hospital Research Foundation Group as it celebrates an incredible 60 years of service to South Australians. What a milestone! This anniversary is not just about the passage of time, it is about recognising six decades of dedication, impact and real change in people's lives. Since its beginning in 1965, the Hospital Research Foundation Group has grown into one of the most important health charities in our state, funding vital research, improving patient care and working side by side with hospitals, clinicians and our communities.

Over the years, the foundation has been behind countless breakthroughs. It has supported more than 60 different areas of medical research and patient care, tackling some of the biggest health challenges of our time—cancer, mental health, women's health, infectious diseases, neurological disorders, cardiovascular disease and more. The reach and impact of this work is extraordinary. Medical research is at the heart of every improvement in health care. Every new treatment, every new model of care, every step towards preventing illness before it takes hold begins with research.

Thanks to the foundation, South Australia has not just been a recipient of advances from elsewhere. We have been a leader, an innovator and a contributor on both the national and global stage. One area where the foundation's commitment is particularly important is endometriosis. As chair of the select committee that spent many months looking into endometriosis and hearing from researchers, I learned that too many women live with this painful debilitating condition, often in silence, with delayed diagnosis and limited treatment options.

The foundation is helping to change that by funding innovative projects that focus on pain management, understanding the underlying mechanisms of chronic pelvic pain and ultimately finding more effective treatments. Dr Jane Chalmers is leading the development of a groundbreaking pain



management program that helps women understand the neurobiology of their pain before undergoing a laparoscopy. This pain science education approach not only helps women manage their symptoms but also reduces the anxiety that comes with surgery.

At the same time, researcher Jessica Maddern is investigating how chronic pelvic pain develops in endometriosis by analysing patient samples. Her work aims to uncover the key pain-signalling pathways, with the goal of identifying new treatments that can improve quality of life and address infertility linked to this disease. This research is about more than science. It is about giving hope to women, reducing stigma and ensuring they receive the care and support they deserve.

This is the kind of work that does not just improve outcomes, it empowers people. The foundation's influence is not confined to hospitals and labs—it is out in our communities too. In my own electorate, our Mitcham and Hills wellness sessions are a perfect example. We have been fortunate to have several speakers from the Hospital Research Foundation Group present to our community at these monthly sessions, which give people the chance to learn about their health and wellbeing in a supportive and practical way.

At a recent event, senior exercise physiologist, Laura Johns, shared insights on bone health. Laura works hard, in partnership with the Hospital Research Foundation, to educate and help those in need. Sessions like these help people take charge of their health, reduce risks and stay active and independent for longer.

Last year, we had two fabulous talks on arthritis, presented by Ben Trobbiani and Tom Craig—two more excellent health educators from the Hospital Research Foundation Group. They spoke about tackling common myths and helped attendees understand the different types of arthritis and current recommendations for management and treatment. Can I take this opportunity to thank Laura, Ben and Tom, who were generous with their time, with many questions to answer both at the talk and also afterwards as a follow-up.

These sessions have been really appreciated by my community, where we have different health topics every month. Just recently, last Friday we had over 100 locals in Mitcham attend one of our sessions about gut health. It was pouring with rain and it was just really lovely to see so many come out and be able to learn more about how to look after themselves.

For over 60 years, the foundation has built a remarkable legacy. It has saved lives, advanced knowledge and delivered care and hope to thousands of South Australians. Its ability to keep growing, adapting and innovating is a testament to its leadership, its supporters and the dedicated researchers, clinicians and nurses it partners with. On its 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary, I want to wish it a very, very happy birthday, and thank it for all the work that it does in our communities.

Just quickly, I want to wish Belair Primary School and Blackwood High School alumni Matthew Nicks, and all the Crows, all the very best for the game tonight. You are the pride of Waite, you are the pride of South Australia. Go Crows!

#### FLINDERS ELECTORATE

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:31):** I rise on behalf of the Elliston community to voice their concerns about the ongoing water supply. I meet regularly (and did so recently) with Mayor Andrew McLeod of Elliston council to hear the latest regarding their concerns about the ongoing fragility of the Musgrave Prescribed Wells Area, which in particular holds the Bramfield Basin, which serves as a critical water resource for overlying landowners, both residential and rural, supporting livestock and horticulture, as well as agriculture.

I know that the council has also written to the government, and I want to impress on them today the importance of this subject. There needs to be proper, long-term planning around the Elliston and surrounds water supply. It cannot be ignored. The water supply for Elliston is not connected to the rest of the Eyre Peninsula system. Although there seems to be some assurance that there will be enough water for the supply needs of Elliston in the short term, I am also concerned about what additional impacts there might be on primary producers on the edge of the Bramfield Basin who have no other supply options.

This is why I am calling on the government to prioritise the investigation, the planning and the implementation of a suitable water supply augmentation strategy for the Elliston township. This is something that the Select Committee on Water Supply Needs of the Eyre Peninsula highlighted last year. We need to have that planning done and a solution put in place as soon as possible.

The EP water supply pipeline currently only extends as far as Poldia, which is around 50 kilometres away from the Elliston water supply system. Can the design and costing be done for that extension? Is that the solution? Is there a niche desal solution available perhaps? I know the Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board has been doing a body of work around the Eyre Peninsula water allocation plan, which is looking at all aspects of water supply and demand. There is concern about the encroachment of the saltwater interface. There have been concerns voiced about compliance with trigger levels in the water allocation plan.

I believe that there needs to be an independent evaluation of SA Water's proposed augmentation options so that there is some appropriate transparency for the people of Elliston not just now but into the future. I know that the council and the community are keen to work collaboratively to ensure the Bramfield Basin continues to meet the needs of current and future generations, both as a sustainable water source and as an environmentally significant system worthy of protection. To ensure that, the community of Elliston needs there to be serious consideration of all augmentation options.

The community of Streaky Bay is thirsty for investment into the ageing and run-down water infrastructure that services their town. Streaky Bay is a town that is growing, with houses being built, families moving into town and businesses looking at opportunities, but, unfortunately, they are currently being hampered because of the lack of investment into water infrastructure. There has been a fair old history with water at Streaky Bay. Previously, water was supplied through the local Robinson Basin, which unfortunately was mismanaged, over-extracted and ended up not being able to supply the water needs of Streaky Bay.

A small pipeline was put in place to supply the town, coming from Poochera through to Streaky Bay, which at the time was thought to be a temporary solution which would only be necessary until the Robinson Basin recovered. It has been in place now for decades. It is still relied on and it is fair to say that it is insufficient. The size of the pipeline does not correlate to the size of the town and its needs. As well as this, there is the associated infrastructure around the town. The tanks, which are relied on for evening out supply and providing head pressure, have also deteriorated. I am informed that they are no longer able to be filled to capacity, only half-full or so, which has a significant impact on both the quantity and the pressure of the water supply for Streaky Bay.

I meet with the Streaky Bay council regularly (and I did so just recently) and hear from them about the strong level of housing and industry development happening, as well as the opportunity for more. However, SA Water are refusing many of the applications that they are receiving for water supply because of the lack of certainty around their capacity to be able to supply those needs. It is adding extra costs and extra uncertainty around development, and that uncertainty is holding Streaky Bay back.

For example, there is great potential for the expansion of the Streaky Bay Caravan Park, but can that happen without any more water? There is also a need for more industrial land at Streaky Bay, but can that happen without more water? The residential land that is ready for new houses to be built on, can that go ahead without more water? SA Water needs to be investing into key infrastructure in regional South Australia, and Streaky Bay is a key example. Provide some certainty for the people of Streaky Bay. Let's do the planning to upgrade the pipeline and replace those faulty tanks into the future and set up Streaky Bay for the future so that they are able to take up the opportunities they are seeing.

#### GILES ELECTORATE

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:37):** I rise today to talk about a number of issues impacting upon my electorate. Obviously, this week there has been some very positive news, with the Federal Court confirming that the port and the assets of the port are part of the steelworks, so it is good to see that confirmation. It is yet another confirmation of the action that we took when we took that

unprecedented step to push GFG in Whyalla into administration. Hopefully that augurs well for the future and the potential sale of the steelworks, the mines and the port to a credible buyer.

One of the concerning things in Whyalla at the moment is also concerning on a state basis, given the unique nature of the giant Australian cuttlefish aggregation. The concern, of course, is the movement of the algal bloom. It has moved huge distances. At the moment, it is still 70 kilometres to the south of Whyalla, and it is entirely possible that it will not reach the waters around Whyalla and the area where the cuttlefish aggregation occurs.

The aggregation is over this year. The eggs are there, and we will have hatchlings in the not too distant future. As a state government we are obviously incredibly mindful of this unique biological phenomena that is just outside of Whyalla. We also realise the challenges, the uncertainties, that come with this particular algal bloom.

The intent to put in place a 200-metre bubble curtain is welcome. We cannot guarantee that it is going to be effective, but it might well be, and it is something that has been done in other localised locations elsewhere in the world to protect particular habitats. Obviously the aggregation is far more than 200 metres, but the estimate is this might well protect somewhere between 50,000 and 80,000 eggs or hatchlings, so it is something worth doing as some insurance.

Over the years there have been a lot of champions for the cuttlefish aggregation. Tony Bramley, one of the divers with a diving business in Whyalla, always has been an incredibly strong champion of the cuttlefish aggregation. Chris Fewster, one of the professional fishermen, when other professional fishermen were hammering the aggregation he was also a champion. He is an excellent photographer and a man with an interest not just in the cuttlefish but a whole range of species in the northern Spencer Gulf. There is also Carlo Possagno, another fantastic photographer and advocate for the cuttlefish. He does an excellent job with the work that he does.

The waters at the moment around the aggregation in Whyalla are good-quality waters. We have people like Steve Storic, a local who has a marine-based business, who goes out on a regular basis and reports on the quality of the water, and he has been bagging out on plenty of fish. Let's hope it continues to be that way, that we are able to protect the cuttlefish and that the algal bloom does not spread much further north and we get out of a very difficult predicament on this occasion.

There has been a whole range of positive initiatives in the electorate of Giles. There is obviously Port Augusta with its new ambulance station and now the go-ahead for the new ambulance station in Whyalla. The extra crews that that is going to entail is a real positive. There was the official opening of the Port Augusta Technical College just recently. The college is now fully enrolled and there will be an open day for the whole community on Sunday, so that will be a good opportunity for people to go and check out this amazing facility.

### CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:42):** Our wine industry needs support, not another cost burden, yet that is exactly what this state Labor government has delivered by deciding to expand the container deposit scheme to include wine bottles.

We all appreciate how the CDS works. You pay a little bit extra when you are buying a drink, you return the container and then you get 10¢ back. It has been around since 1977 and I am sure most of us in this place would remember collecting soft drink cans and taking them to the depot. I certainly remember doing so in Angaston. It is a great scheme but it is not one that should include wine bottles here in South Australia.

Labor's decision is simply not supported by the evidence either. If the problem that we are trying to fix is litter—which is why this scheme was first implemented all those decades ago—then wine bottles account for just 0.07 per cent of all litter, so essentially Labor has a solution to a problem that does not even exist. No-one is guzzling bottles of shiraz and throwing them out of their car window, and I am sure that no-one is tripping over riesling bottles as they are trotting down Hindley Street.

We see a lot of litter in South Australia. I had a look at the facts, and around 30 to 40 per cent of litter is cigarette butts, paper and cardboard is around 5 per cent, plastic bags is around 5 per cent

and random other items like toy parts, fishing lines, etc., is 2 per cent. Wine bottles are 0.07 per cent. Wine bottles have never been included in the CDS because the litter is so low—in fact, it is basically non-existent—and that is because wine is primarily consumed at home or in a restaurant and that is generally when you put the bottle straight into the recycling bin. If that process needs to be improved to ensure that more glass comes back into the system, then that is something that the government should be focusing on.

But the timing could not be worse for this imposition. As the Australian Grape and Wine CEO has said over the last 24 hours, this is an industry that is already grappling with global oversupply and rising production costs, not to mention we have a market that is very sensitive to price increases. Adding more costs now only threatens jobs, and it also threatens the long-term sustainability of an industry which really is the cornerstone to regional South Australia. It is the cornerstone to my local community, not to mention our overall state economy.

In the last 24 hours, I have heard directly from a number of producers in the Barossa Valley who are absolutely seething at the government's decision to implement this, and so I thought that I would quote the reality from some of them:

The impact of wineries levying a 13.9 cent charge on their wholesale price could translate to a \$1 increase in the retail price of wine and up to \$4 at the restaurant table.

That's a handsome premium to pay to get 10 cents back in your pocket.

At the cellar door, it's probably a matter of either increasing prices by \$1 or sucking up the \$1.60 a dozen in new costs.

Either the consumer pays more for a 10 cent gain, or the producer starts to look at cutting costs elsewhere in their business.

The Government [is] hell-bent on positioning itself as a winner for the consumer and the environment yet ironically delivering neither with this new tax.

This will hurt everyone connected to the State's wine and grape sector. A dark day at a dark time for wine.

I see this as an additional tax, when we are already paying 39% on wine.

And the human cost is real. One winemaker told me that they are asking themselves:

Do I absorb the cost? By absorbing the cost, I now lose \$50,000 in profit—or I may need to review staffing and put yet another person into unemployment.

As far as I could see, yesterday there was not one single grapegrower, not one single winemaker and not one single industry rep who came out to support the Labor government's move, which I think speaks volumes to how this has gone down. I do not think that anyone is raising a glass to this move, particularly in the Barossa Valley and the northern part of the Adelaide Hills, which I am so proud to represent.

The unfortunate reality is that this is a government that is completely blind to the struggles of the wine industry, introducing a tax that is dressed up as reform, that will deliver more pain to producers, higher prices for consumers and no real gain for the environment. I have to ask the question: what sort of government would want to hurt our most famous and most celebrated wine industry? This is not something which is supported by winemakers or anyone in the wine industry in the Barossa or the Adelaide Hills.

### **WORLD SUICIDE PREVENTION DAY**

**Ms CLANCY (Elder) (15:47):** On 10 September, we recognise World Suicide Prevention Day. Each year, more than 3,000 Australians die by suicide. For every life lost, there are countless others—families, friends, colleagues and entire communities—who feel the devastating ripple effect. We also know that around 65,000 Australians attempt to take their life each year. They are not just numbers; they represent real people with real struggles, and they give real opportunities for us to make a difference.

Suicide does not discriminate. It touches people from every walk of life, yet we know that certain groups—including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, LGBTQIA+ communities, veterans, first responders and those in regional and remote areas—experience a disproportionate burden. This reality demands targeted, culturally safe and accessible support services. On World

Suicide Prevention Day, we gather to reflect, remember and reaffirm our commitment to preventing suicide in our communities. We remember those we have lost, and we acknowledge the deep and enduring pain felt by those left behind.

In South Australia, we are leading the way in suicide prevention. We are the first state in Australia with a Suicide Prevention Act, ensuring a coordinated whole-of-government response. Through the South Australian Suicide Prevention Council, we are bringing together people with lived experience, researchers, clinicians and community leaders to drive meaningful change.

We are also strengthening suicide prevention networks across the state. These networks empower communities to strengthen mental wellbeing, prevent suicide and support those impacted. They raise awareness, encourage conversations and help-seeking, and break down stigma. These networks are driven by dedicated volunteers who know their communities and bring diverse life experiences to the role.

By recognising that local people are best placed to identify issues and create solutions, the networks foster hope, wellbeing and social connection. There are now more than 40 networks in South Australia, most placed in metropolitan and regional areas—particularly regional areas—with some supporting priority populations across the state.

Another stand-out investment by the Malinauskas Labor government is funding and expanding the SAPOL Mental Health Co-responder Model, a shining example of how collaboration can respond to crisis situations with care and compassion. We are investing \$13.9 million over five years to continue and expand this program, building on its success in the central and northern local health networks.

Launched in 2022, the program pairs a mental health clinician with a police officer to respond to 000 mental health calls. This approach has already prevented more than 2,470 emergency department presentations. With expansion to the southern suburbs from October, we expect to avoid another 800 or so each year. The results speak for themselves. The co-responder model improves crisis responses, delivers trauma-informed care and reduces pressure on both hospitals and our police. This is an initiative that supports community safety, strengthens mental health care and complements our broader investment in public mental health services, including the delivery of more than 130 new mental health beds across the state.

Suicide prevention work cannot rest solely with the government. Suicide prevention is a shared responsibility, one that must unite us across sectors, services, communities, and generations. When we share that responsibility and we work together, we can make a real difference. By fostering connection, breaking down stigma, and ensuring that support is accessible and safe, we can create hope through action, and every action, no matter how small, has the potential to save a life.

Let us build a culture where talking about mental health is a normal part of everyday life, where reaching out for help is met with understanding and compassion and where no-one is left to face their struggles alone. I recently heard the phrase 'trusted other' in the context of suicide prevention. I will leave you with this thought: if you were in need, who would be your trusted other? And arguably, just as important, whose trusted other could you be? Today is a good day to reach out to them and tell them that you are there for them.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:52):** I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 16 September 2025 at 11am.

Motion carried.

*Resolutions***SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ALGAL BLOOMS**

The Legislative Council passed the following resolutions to which it desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

1. That, in the opinion of this council, a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the harmful algal blooms in South Australian marine and coastal environments, with particular reference to:
  - (a) contributing environmental, land management or water quality factors;
  - (b) ecological, economic, cultural and social impacts of algal blooms including impact on community health and wellbeing;
  - (c) the cultural and economic impacts on Indigenous communities, including any loss of access to cultural practices;
  - (d) the coordination of state government responses, including agency responsibility, industry engagement, scientific advice, and public communications;
  - (e) the current support and recovery arrangements for impacted industries and communities;
  - (f) the adequacy of long-term monitoring, forecasting and prevention strategies;
  - (g) the adequacy of research funding, rehabilitation and recovery planning; and
  - (h) any other related matters.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sitting of the committee.
3. That members of the committee may participate in the proceedings by way of telephone or videoconference or other electronic means and shall be deemed to be present and counted for purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member.
4. That this council permits the joint committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.
5. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:54):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) concurs with part 1 of the resolution of the Legislative Council contained in message No. 268 for the appointment of a joint committee on the algal blooms in South Australia;
- (b) concurs with the proposal that the members of the committee may participate by way of telephone or videoconference or other electronic means and shall be deemed to be present and counted for the purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member; and
- (c) concurs with the proposal for the committee to be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence or documents being reported to the parliament.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION:** I move:

That this house be represented on the committee by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee, and that the members to represent the House of Assembly on the committee be Ms Clancy, Mr Cowdrey and Ms Savvas.

Motion carried.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (VEHICLE PARKING AND URBAN RENEWAL) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:56):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 and the Urban Renewal Act 1995. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:56):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Parking is a significant and contested problem in our neighbourhoods, especially in areas where substantial general infill development is occurring. Ongoing feedback to the government has been clear: parked cars need to be off our streets and back in driveways and in garages. The Malinauskas government made an election commitment to 'bust congestion and improve amenity in Adelaide's neighbourhoods'. The Statutes Amendment (Vehicle Parking and Urban Renewal) Bill 2025 seeks to implement a strong but fair response to these critical issues that have been raised by the community and local governments alike.

Our consumer preferences have changed, with nine out of the ten top-selling cars in Australia being SUVs or dual-cab utes. Our cars are getting bigger but our garages have not followed suit. The government has engaged extensively with both industry and the community to develop a response to vehicle parking which balances housing affordability, construction costs and design.

The Statutes Amendment (Vehicle Parking and Urban Renewal) Bill 2025 seeks to address congestion through the following mechanisms:

- it specifies a minimum number of car parks that must be provided for new dwellings, based on the number of bedrooms. The bill allows minimum dimension requirements for proposed car parks to be specified through a vehicle parking scheme by the Minister for Planning;
- it stipulates that the scheme will only apply to residential development within Greater Adelaide in the first instance, but the scope may be increased by designating further classes of development, such as commercial development, in the future;
- it provides areas or classes of development that can be excluded from the operation of the scheme by ministerial notice;
- it establishes an offence provision for the failure to comply with a mandatory condition required under the scheme;
- it establishes a vehicle parking fund and provides for the winding-up of existing council car parking schemes that were established under the former Development Act 1993; and
- it makes amendments to the Urban Renewal Act 1995 to streamline processes associated with establishing and implementing precinct plans.

The scheme as drafted specifies that single vehicle parks must be 3.5 metres wide and six metres in length. This is a change in dimension from three metres wide and 5.4 metres in length and allows for the accommodation of wider and longer vehicles. Additionally, the bill seeks to include a minimum garage door size of three metres, with the industry standard being 2.4 metres.

Consultation on the bill and the associated scheme was undertaken for a two-week period from 24 February to 10 March 2025. Extensive feedback was received from both community and industry during the consultation period. I would like to thank all who participated and shared their views. This process has helped to shape the balanced and fair approach to vehicle parking in this bill.

As the Malinauskas government is committed to housing affordability and ensuring the supply of housing to the community, there are key aspects of industry feedback which have been recognised and addressed within this legislative response. Significant efforts have been placed to ensure that there is only a very limited increase in the cost of construction and no impact to the development yield.

The following amendments to the Planning and Design Code will be progressed to reduce impacts on the cost of new housing. We will remove the requirement to have a habitable room that is 2.4 metres in width with a two-metre wide window facing the street. This will now be replaced with a requirement to replace it with a one-by-one-metre window facing the street to ensure that there will be no increase in the width of housing impacting on yield and housing affordability.

It removes the requirement for the garage door widths not to exceed 50 per cent of an allotment frontage for single-storey dwellings, and an allotment with a frontage of less than six metres, and it removes the requirement to have a front door visible from the street and, as an alternative, the entrance then being required through the garage on allotments with a frontage of less than 4.5 metres.

The bill allows the minister to by notice, published on the SA planning portal, declare that forms of development do not need to comply with the scheme or the specified provisions of the scheme. In relation to meeting the minimum parking numbers, I propose to declare that dwellings in the Adelaide CBD, retirement facilities, residential parks, co-located housing that supports ageing in place, and workers' accommodation do not need to meet the minimum number of vehicle parks specified in the scheme.

Dwellings in strategic infill sites, apartment buildings and affordable housing are to have reduced requirements and only need to have one vehicle park in all circumstances, irrespective of the number of bedrooms. The basis for the reduced requirements for strategic infill sites is that they are close to the city or are close to high-frequency public transport. Often enough, private car ownership is reduced at these locations. The list of strategic infill sites that have reduced requirements will be determined prior to the commencement of the bill.

The bill also makes amendments to the Urban Renewal Act to streamline precinct planning processes. This will enable for parking requirements to be addressed at a recent level across multiple buildings or areas. This will drive efficiencies and how parking is addressed, lower construction costs, and improve housing affordability. Dwellings within a precinct under that act will not need to comply with the minimum number of vehicle park requirements specified in the scheme in the circumstances.

It is proposed that the amendments to the Urban Renewal Act commence as soon as possible after the bill passes parliament to allow precincts to be established as a priority. The vehicle parking provisions will commence 12 months after the bill passes parliament to provide time for the development sector to adjust to the changes and allow time for the amendments to the Planning and Design Code to be finalised.

I also propose to defer commencement of the bill in greenfield locations until 2028 to align with the commencement of the next SA Water regulatory cycle. The bill goes a significant step in addressing concerns regarding car parking in our streets. However, local government has the primary role in helping respond to the concerns of the community for vehicle parking issues. Local government must continue to develop and manage their on-street parking policies through consultation with their communities. Management and enforcement by council is key to ensuring that car parking remains fair for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

Upon commencement of the legislation, I will be writing to both mayors and CEOs of metropolitan councils to ensure that they are developing strategies that complement this legislation to achieve the full extent of our election commitment. The bill provides an opportunity to reduce congestion by ensuring sufficient car parking is provided with all new residential developments going forward, without impacting on housing affordability and supply. Cars belong back in garages and off our streets to improve amenity and reduce congestion within our neighbourhoods.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank key stakeholders who provided input and feedback to this bill and its development: the Local Government Association of South Australia, the



Property Council of South Australia, the Master Builders Association, the Urban Development Institute of Australia, the 13 councils across Greater Adelaide who provided detailed responses regarding parking issues in their suburbs, the submissions made by home builders and construction firms, and the Housing Industry Association.

Significant efforts have been made through the research undertaken by the State Planning Commission, led by Craig Holden, and the Department for Housing and Urban Development, led by Mr David Reynolds. Additionally, thank you to the University of South Australia for their contributions and research to ensure the fair but effective outcome we have achieved in this bill. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*

###### 3—Insertion of section 127A

This clause inserts new section 127A as follows:

###### 127A—Mandatory vehicle parking conditions

This section requires a relevant authority to impose certain conditions in relation to a development authorisation for a development within Greater Adelaide involving the construction of a new dwelling with 1 or more bedrooms for residential purposes or a development of a class specified by the vehicle parking scheme (referred to throughout the section as *designated development*). A condition in respect of the number of vehicle parks on the site of the dwelling, or provided in relation to the development, that are of at least the minimum dimensions, or a condition in respect of paying an amount into the vehicle parking fund, is required.

The Minister must publish a scheme relating to vehicle parking in relation to designated development on the SA planning portal (known as the *vehicle parking scheme*). The section sets out matters for which the scheme may provide.

The section sets out the minimum number of vehicle parks that the scheme may specify in relation to a designated development that involves the construction of a new dwelling with 1 bedroom (1 vehicle park) or with 2 or more bedrooms (2 vehicle parks).

The scheme may exclude designated development of a class from the application of the provisions of the section allowing a condition to be imposed requiring the applicant to pay an amount into the vehicle parking fund. In relation to such development, a relevant authority cannot impose such conditions and may refuse an application for development authorisation if the development is not proposed to be granted subject to a condition in respect of the number of vehicle parks on the site of the dwelling, or provided in relation to the development, that are of at least the minimum dimensions in accordance with the scheme or any other condition specified by or under, or requirements of, the scheme.

The section allows the Minister to require a relevant authority to refer to the Minister a particular application for development authorisation in relation to a designated development and to direct the relevant authority to refuse the application or only grant the application if certain conditions are imposed on the authorisation. The relevant authority must comply with such a direction.

The Minister may, by notice published on the SA planning portal, declare that the operation of the section, a provision of the section, the scheme or a provision of the scheme (or any combination of those) does not apply, or applies with variations, in respect of an area, dwelling, development, dwelling of a class or development of a class.

It is an offence for a person to contravene a condition imposed by or under the section in relation to a development authorisation. The maximum penalty for the offence is \$10,000 and the default penalty is \$250.

###### 4—Insertion of section 200A

This clause inserts new section 200A as follows:

###### 200A—Vehicle parking fund

This section requires the Minister to establish and maintain a fund to be called the vehicle parking fund. The section sets out the amounts the fund will consist of and the purposes for which the Minister may apply any part of the fund.

Money in the fund not immediately required may be invested by the Minister.

On or after a day designated by the Minister by notice in the Gazette (being a day that is at least 18 months after the commencement of the section), the Minister may wind up a scheme established under section 197 of the principal Act and determine that any amount standing to the credit of the fund established as part of the scheme be paid into the vehicle parking fund.

#### Part 3—Amendment of *Urban Renewal Act 1995*

##### 5—Amendment of section 7G—Preliminary

This clause deletes the definition of *Planning Minister* from section 7G.

##### 6—Amendment of section 7H—Establishment of precincts

The amendment in subclause (1) removes the requirement for the Minister to consult with and have regard to the views of the Planning Minister before publishing a notice to establish a precinct. This amendment relies on an amendment to section 7H set out in the *State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025* commencing first.

The amendment in subclause (2) removes the requirement for the precinct authority to establish certain panels in relation to a precinct.

##### 7—Amendment of section 7I—Precinct plans

This clause amends section 7I to remove references to the Planning Minister. The amendments in subclauses (2) and (3) rely on amendments to section 7I set out in the *State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025* commencing first.

##### 8—Amendment of section 7L—Governor may grant concession or make variation in relation to taxes etc on land within precinct

This clause amends section 7L to allow the Treasurer, or the Minister with the approval of the Treasurer, to grant a concession or make a variation in relation to taxes, rates or charges imposed with respect to land within a precinct by notice in the Gazette. This replaces the ability of the Governor to do this by regulation.

##### 9—Insertion of section 35A

This clause inserts section 35A as follows:

##### 35A—Recovery of costs of certain infrastructure

This section requires owners of land in a precinct identified by the Minister by notice as relevant land to pay the Minister the reasonable costs of providing primary infrastructure in the precinct identified by the Minister by notice as relevant primary infrastructure.

The Minister will determine the amount that constitutes their reasonable costs of providing the infrastructure.

Notices under this section must be published on the SA planning portal.

The Registrar-General will, at the direction of the Minister, enter a caveat on the title to relevant land that has been brought under the provisions of the *Real Property Act 1886* prohibiting any dealing with the relevant land without the written consent of the Minister. Such a caveat must be withdrawn at the direction of the Minister.

The definition of primary infrastructure in this section relies on a definition of primary infrastructure being inserted into the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* by the *State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Teague.

#### *Motions*

### **DECRIMINALISATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY 50TH ANNIVERSARY**

**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) (16:06):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that on 27 August 1975 South Australia became the first jurisdiction in the nation to decriminalise male homosexuality, with the passage of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Act 1975, which commenced operation on 2 October 1975;
- (b) expresses its regret to the many South Australians who were charged with and convicted of criminal offences simply for being their authentic selves;
- (c) recognises that, in making these reforms, our state began a process which would be repeated in every Australian state and territory;
- (d) acknowledges that in 2025 South Australia will commemorate this nation-leading legislation and mark its 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary;
- (e) expresses its support for the community coming together to celebrate this anniversary and our state's role in leading the way on LGBTQIA+ law reform;
- (f) celebrates the passage of other landmark LGBTQIA+ law reform in South Australia; and
- (g) commits to continuing to work towards equality for all South Australians.

In two senses, this motion speaks to the extraordinary events that occurred when South Australia led the way in Australia in decriminalising homosexuality. I say 'extraordinary' in the sense that it is wonderful that we were the first state to do that. It is also extraordinary that it was necessary to do and, indeed, that it did not occur until 1975.

There is a profound moral view that I think we all share that we should recognise each other's human rights and that we should acknowledge that homosexuality or same-sex attraction is part of the human experience. That is something that is widely and perhaps almost universally accepted in our nation. That is a moral position that is important to who we are and what we say matters.

It is nonetheless the case that for a significant period of time it was against the law. It is astonishing in some ways that it was ever regarded as something that was to be the subject of criminal sanction. We often think, 'In the old days things were different,' but were they? Knowing how widespread the experience of same-sex attraction has always been, was it ever really acceptable that that made it into the criminal provisions?

By the time it came time to overturn that law, it had become self-evident in the community that this was an unacceptable element of our law, and yet it took enormous effort to overturn. It was not a matter simply of people recognising that to criminalise someone for their attraction to another was denying their human rights and denying our shared humanity. I want to pay tribute to the effort of the people on both sides of parliament, Labor and Liberal, who made it possible to overturn that law.

Social change takes effort, even when it appears to be so utterly necessary that one should not even have to make the case. It is also true that often when these big changes occur that are heart-wrenching and take that effort and that moral leadership that it does not take long before they are banked and just regarded as 'of course that is the position'. We almost forget that it was such an intense argument only 50 years ago, that it becomes something that is regarded as so naturally obvious that we find it remarkable to think that effort had to be gone to and that friendships were lost and people were pilloried and criticised for taking this position that we now almost universally regard as acceptable.

We therefore sometimes forget to celebrate those people who went through that experience and I think we also tend to overlook that it did not instantly stop homophobia, it did not instantly turn around people's attitudes. So this happened in the seventies. My brother—and I do not speak lightly that I have a family member who is gay. We all have loved ones, we all love people who are gay, we all know people, some of us are gay, so I do not mean to particularise and make special somehow that I have a brother who is. My brother and I are very, very close. We share a lot in this world and yet he experienced at school in the eighties and into the nineties homophobia even then and a feeling that perhaps it was not okay to come out, that it was not okay.

First of all, he had to come out. I never came out as heterosexual, but he had to come out as gay. It had to be something that was declared and, in doing that, it was a bit scary because there would be people, and there were people, who no longer were his friend after he did that. We should

not forget that that is real pain, that is real suffering that occurred even after this big legislative change that exists still to this day in some parts of our society.

After this big shift occurred in at least decriminalising homosexuality, still there were changes that needed to be made and each time they occurred there was debate, hand-wringing and concern about whether we were letting go the morals of our society in recognising equal marriage. Because we were unable to get equal marriage done here at a state level, we had a relationship register and same-sex couples could adopt. It was a struggle that same-sex couples could have access to fertility treatments. We had the spent convictions that were recognised for those who had been caught up in the criminalisation of homosexuality. Each of these occasions, some of them very recent, nonetheless took effort from people to have to expose their personal stories, their experiences and to ask for the kindness of parliamentarians in overturning or changing laws in a way to recognise simply who people are and that we all share a common humanity.

So I am proud to be part of moving this motion, of it being recognised also equally in the other place. I acknowledge that we have the Hon. Ian Hunter in the gallery listening to us today. I am sort of ashamed to be an institution that had to make that change, that there were ever these barriers in the first place. But I accept that social change is often hard won, and then banked and forgotten and taken for granted. That seems to be the journey that we go on. So what I would like to do is not only acknowledge the cost to individuals in making this change in the first place but turn that into not just a celebration of that having occurred but a recognition that there is ongoing demand for us to treat people in their full experience of being human.

Whatever part of society we look at—whether it is women seeking to be treated equally in the gender pay gap, whether it is addressing domestic, family and sexual violence, as we did earlier today, and finally recognising coercive control as an indicator of future crimes to come and as a crime in itself, whether it is looking at the full variety of people's gender experiences and identity—we must lead with kindness and with generosity. We do not always in this place but, when we are at our best, we do.

The common theme is recognising not just our common humanity, but empowering the powerless that, wherever there are people who have been deprived of their power, it is our job to find room for them to be given it. If we apply that in every decision we make, then we can only ever make decisions that make our society better, stronger, more resilient and more loving. So I commend this motion to the house, and I thank everybody who has ever participated in this debate.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (16:15):** Today, we celebrate the history of the progression of humanity, from the decriminalisation of homosexuality in South Australia, to national marriage equality under Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull, and to the abolition of the gay panic defence under former Attorney-General, and Deputy Premier, Vickie Chapman. Each of these reforms reaffirm that love, fairness and dignity are universal and central to our society.

In May 1972, the tragic death of law lecturer Dr George Duncan in the River Torrens shocked South Australia into action. That anger gave courage to reform us. Liberal MLC Murray Hill introduced a private member's bill in July 1972, the first significant parliamentary attempt in Australia to decriminalise homosexual conduct. Though initially unsuccessful, it paved the way for further action. Ultimately, on 2 October 1975, the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Amendment Act 1975 (SA) fully decriminalised consensual homosexual activity—a world-leading reform outside Europe and North America.

Decades later, same-sex couples sought full legal recognition through marriage. On 7 December 2017, following a national postal survey, the Marriage Amendment (Definition and Religious Freedoms) Act 2017 passed parliament. As a member of the Liberal Party at that time, and as a supporter of marriage equality, I was unsure of the reasons why the parliament would not make that decision without going to a ballot of the public.

On reflection, the result was so overwhelming—particularly in some of the safest Liberal seats in the country—that it has put this argument to bed forever. No politician in their right mind is going to raise winding back marriage equality because of that people power. It was not just the parliament that gave the permission and the ability for same-sex marriage to be normalised—it was the people of Australia who did that through that plebiscite. As Prime Minister Turnbull later reflected:

The Australian people have said 'yes' to marriage equality, 'yes' to fairness, 'yes' to commitment, 'yes' to love. The time has now come to make that equality a reality.

When the result was formally announced, capturing the emotion of the moment, he said:

What a day. What a day for love, for equality, for respect. Australia has done it.

These words, straight from Turnbull's speech, resonate as one of the defining moments on national equality reform. We then move to the abolition of the gay panic defence in South Australia.

Despite South Australia being the first state to decriminalise homosexuality, it lagged behind on removing the destructive gay panic defence—a partial provocation defence in murder cases. As South Australia's first female Attorney-General, Vickie Chapman declared in parliament:

The law as it stands in regards to the gay panic defence is downright offensive...The amendments of the Provocation Bill will bring the law into line with modern community expectations.

She emphasised that the law before its amendment was 'downright offensive' and out of step with community values.

On 1 December 2020, the Statutes Amendment (Abolition Defence of Provocation and Related Matters) Act 2020 (SA) passed, removing the defence entirely, making South Australia the last state to do so. These milestones, from Hill's 1972 bill to Turnbull's leadership in 2017 and Chapman's reform in 2020, paint a picture of principled, reformist leadership within the Liberal tradition. They demonstrate that progressive change can come from anywhere, even where inertia once held sway.

While the law has evolved, gaps remain. Religious exception still allows discrimination in schools and workplaces. Access to trans healthcare protections remains unequal. Mental health outcomes remain a pressing concern. But our history gives us hope. When Liberal leaders decide to lead, equality advances. Today, we commemorate key landmarks: the 1975 decriminalisation, the 2017 marriage equality vote and the 2020 abolition of the gay panic defence. We should all be proud of South Australia's willingness to lead and of those leaders who stood for progress, dignity and equality. Let us commit to continuing the journey, ensuring that every South Australian, no matter who they love, how they identify, live their lives, are free from discrimination and inequity.

The ABC did a piece some time ago about the history of the decriminalisation of homosexuality in Australia, and of course South Australia is there as the first state to do that on 17 September 1975. That was under the Dunstan government and Attorney-General Peter Duncan. The ACT, even before they had self government in November 1976, prepared a discrimination bill. Before Dunstan, Canberra did not have full government at the time, so they relied on the federal parliament to enact laws, which were not passed until after the laws in South Australia.

On 23 December 1980, the Hamer Liberal government decriminalised male homosexuality. Surprisingly, up until 1949, the death penalty was still on the statute books for sodomy in Victoria. The Northern Territory passed its law in 1983 without a campaign for change. It was Chief Minister Paul Everingham's CLP government that reformed the law on that occasion. Ironically, there was discrimination before decriminalisation. Despite having Mardi Gras and Sydney's largest gay population, Sydney was not a gay law reform leader. Anti-discrimination laws were passed in 1982 before decriminalisation in 1984. Theoretically, for two years, being gay in New South Wales was not grounds for dismissal but it was grounds for imprisonment.

The biggest story to tell is that of Tasmania. Twenty-two years after South Australia's historic move, Tasmania stood alone persisting in criminalising gay men. Previously, reform attempts had been blocked by the state's conservative upper house. Gay activists took the matter to the High Court, so faced with the state law being struck down Tasmania's upper house finally passed gay law reform by one vote. It came into effect on 13 May 1997.

In Western Australia, after four failed attempts during the seventies and eighties, the Labor government of Peter Dowding removed consenting homosexual activity from the criminal code in December 1989. It passed into law in March 1990. In Queensland, it again was 1990. Under long-serving Queensland Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen gay law reform was not on the Sunshine State's radar. Following the election of Labor's Wayne Goss in late 1989 the law was changed, in October 1990. A very close friend of mine who is a gay man moved to Queensland in 1984, I think it

was, for a permanent move, a change of life, and he was very conscious of the fact that he was moving to a state where acts of homosexuality were outlawed.

When you think about it 50 years was not a long time ago. There are people in this chamber who were born at that time, and I was a few years old. 1975 was my second year of high school. But it did not take long for the many of those who had been active in social politics, or had aspirations to be involved in politics, to run for parliament. There were two openly gay men who were successful in the Australian parliament, in the House of Representatives. This is where the test is about the community's acceptance of homosexuality in the modern world. Tim Wilson, an openly gay man, won his seat in metropolitan Melbourne, he subsequently lost it and then he won it back. Another Liberal House of Representatives member, Trent Zimmerman, was elected and known as an openly gay man. I may have missed it, but I was not able to find any openly gay Labor men in the lower house seats in the federal parliament, and it would be great if somebody could put something on the record.

On that note, it is terrific to be in a parliament several generations down since this parliament was first in the country to decriminalise male homosexual activity. Of course, in this same chamber it was the first parliament in the world to allow women to run for parliament. So we have a strong tradition of being socially progressive in this state, regardless of what side of politics you come from. You can argue about the size of government and delivery of government services and the way we raise taxes or the way our services are run, but the one thing we agree on is that people have the right to live their lives as they wish without being ridiculed and without being unlawful. I dream of the day when the only time anyone is interested in someone's sexual preference is if they want to ask them out.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (16:28):** Thank you to the members who have already contributed to this debate, and to our Deputy Premier for bringing this really important motion to this house, and to the Hon. Ian Hunter who, I understand, brought a similar motion to the upper house also.

As has been spoken about, in this year, 2025, we celebrate and mark 50 years since Premier Don Dunstan led South Australia to become the first state in the country to decriminalise homosexuality. It is reforms like this one, ones that absolutely are about promoting love, equality and human rights for all, that make a real difference in people's lives and that are so very important to the wellbeing of South Australians and South Australia and to the very strength and fabric of our South Australian community.

I think it is really important to note that this is a reform that was fought so very hard for by incredibly brave leaders who should never, ever have had to fight for what is a basic right, a basic human experience, to love who you love and to be absolutely accepted and able to participate safely and equally in community life with that. I know that many of those early campaigners faced terrible, terrible hatred and discrimination, and it is tragic that some people in our community still experience that.

Thankfully, we have come a very long way in the five decades since. As the member for Unley and the member for Port Adelaide, our Deputy Premier, spoke about, there have been extensive reforms to superannuation and to adoption, the abolition of the gay panic defence and of course, that beautiful moment when finally—finally—as a nation we advanced marriage equality, the recognition of the right that should have always existed to love who you love and to be respected and enabled to access all of the rights to marriage that come with that.

We recently saw important changes to sexual activity eligibility rules for blood and plasma donation, with Australian Red Cross Lifeblood making donation more inclusive and accessible to as many people as possible. We keep taking steps forward, and our progress is always made possible through brave people getting together with others, with a strong commitment to improve outcomes for those people who do not necessarily have access to all of the rights that they deserve and the preparedness to act collectively together to advance change.

It is so right and appropriate that we do take a moment to mark 50 years, to celebrate our considerable progress since then and to acknowledge that those rights were really hard-won by a courageous group of people. It is also important that we acknowledge that we cannot take the

advancement of any rights for granted and that we are not done. I say that because, sadly, here and across the globe the fight continues.

The US Supreme Court has just been petitioned to overturn landmark same-sex marriage rulings. There are those in our community who continue to attempt to erode trans rights. Discrimination in particular quarters persists, and in communities across the globe there are still barriers to accessing particular health treatments. I know that so many are determined to maintain rights and continue to advance them and that they will continue to do so in the face of those who seek to divide, who wrongly refuse to include and empower all people to live with dignity, those who are determined to roll back progress.

Whilst we should absolutely celebrate, we cannot be complacent. We have to continue to act together to maintain rights and to advance rights. When I think about the continued advancement of rights, the continued work ahead to make sure discrimination does not exist anywhere, I think we can all reflect again on the incredibly courageous leaders who 50 years ago fought for this advancement that we celebrate today. We can honour them, and in honouring them we can all commit to continuing to act to advance change that ensures no-one is discriminated against ever for simply loving who they love. We can commit to making sure that we keep acting collectively, as they did so beautifully, to maintain those hard-fought-for rights and to make sure that we keep progressing others.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:34):** I rise to support the motion and note, as I do, that it comes following not so very long after the house debated a private member's motion also recognising that this year is 50 years since the decriminalisation of homosexuality in South Australia. It is a significant anniversary, a significant milestone.

As I did on that occasion, and bearing in mind the contributions that have been made to the debate, including as to the subsequent historical actions that have been taken not only in South Australia but throughout the rest of the country and elsewhere in the world, I just want to reflect on where we are now and to highlight something that is perhaps not often thought about in the public debate of significant matters of public significance, and that is that this concerns, in so many ways, the most private of matters for individuals.

I am very much alive to the fact that in the course of this debate it is very important that we respect the privacy of those who are perfectly entitled, just like all of us are, to privacy in our personal lives, so I emphasise that fact in that respect. I might come back to it in a moment.

I also want to take the opportunity to point out, in the context of a motion that is focused on that milestone 50 years ago, which was decriminalisation, something that seems really extraordinary now in the circumstances of subsequent debates about important civil matters like entitlements to have relationships recognised, including marriage, in the context of decriminalisation, it is unsurprising that an event that is now a kind of party and celebration in Sydney, the Sydney Mardi Gras, had its foundations as a protest against police brutality. It had its foundations in protest by those who were starting it off as an inappropriate, unacceptable oppression by those who were responsible to enforce the law.

The criminalisation, while it lasted, had sounded in South Australia as well in an important distortion of public affairs. At the time, in the 1970s, a young, celebrated, innovative leader in global policing, Commissioner Salisbury, who was brought to South Australia by Premier Dunstan as a young leader of policing, found himself caught up in and at the centre of a storm in relation to the secret files that were kept by Special Branch and police.

Now, that story is told and the whole turmoil that led up to Dunstan's eventual dismissal of Salisbury and the really unfortunate series of events in South Australia's history. Insofar as it concerned those secret files, concern included that those secret files contained information about individuals who might have been homosexual and evidence of their homosexual practices.

A virtue of the holding of those files that was talked about at the time was that because such behaviour was criminalised, there may have been public figures who were exposed to potential blackmail and might have been vulnerable to being blackmailed for that very conduct. Hence, police had a role in monitoring that and you had this whole debate that went on in the 1970s around this

whole universe of files being kept on people who, because of that behaviour being criminalised, were vulnerable and all the rest of it.

The decriminalisation of homosexuality was important in such a practical way that goes very much to the heart of all of those public functions. It served a very practical purpose back in 1975, not only to recognise what we all now would regard as uncontroversial—indeed, obvious—but in the circumstances of the time it had the effect of causing a whole world-changing approach to the way in which the police, the justice system, public affairs and all the rest were conducted.

It might be oversimplifying it to say that the decriminalisation at that time had the effect of sweeping away so much of what was wrong with what was going on at that time, but it had a really very significant effect. It is one thing to have the changing appreciation in the broader public—we have talked about South Australia being progressive socially, and all of that has been true in so many ways that have been exemplified—but the decriminalisation itself had such a very significant effect in terms of the application of the law and the behaviour of authorities. It is well that that aspect of the matter be really understood and emphasised—coming, as it is now, at this 50-year distance.

To return to where I started, here we are 50 years on from a decriminalisation. In the years since, the emphasis and the debate and the actions that have been talked about subsequently have indeed spoken to questions of social and civil measures to work towards actions against discrimination and so on. In my view, where we are now is a time when it may be an opportunity to emphasise that privacy is so very central to ways to progress forward. Not everyone wants to have their sexuality publicly demonstrated or shared, of course, and that is a matter that ought to be respected in the lives of individuals.

I hope that in recognising this significant milestone, 50 years post decriminalisation, we might have an ever-greater appreciation of the privacy, the dignity and respect for all people. That is not to take away from those who we ought properly celebrate for leading the way to making significant changes, but privacy is hugely important, and I do want to emphasise that on this occasion where we once again recognise this significant milestone.

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (16:45):** I rise to say a few words, adding my support to the motion moved by the Deputy Premier that reads in part:

...South Australia became the first jurisdiction in the nation to decriminalise male homosexuality...[this house] expresses its regret to the many South Australians who were charged with and convicted of criminal offences...expresses its support for the community coming together to celebrate this anniversary and our state's role in leading the way on LGBTQIA+ law reform...celebrates the passage of other landmark...law reform in South Australia...commits to continuing to work towards equality for all South Australians.

The Dunstan government law reforms were many and made for a more humane society with South Australia often leading the way.

The 1975 reform was a significant victory. However, it was the beginning not the end for the fight for equality. The Hon. Peter Duncan, Attorney-General and member for Elizabeth, introduced in 1973 the Criminal Law Sexual Offences Bill in this house. Devastating for many, it was defeated. However, he reintroduced substantially the same bill on 27 August 1975. The bill was passed and on 2 October 1975, South Australia became the first state to fully decriminalise homosexual acts between consenting males.

I want to make mention of a few of the pieces of legislation. South Australia's pioneering legislation really did in fact serve as a catalyst, inspiring other Australian states to reform their own laws, leading to a national journey towards greater equality. It also set a precedent for future legal changes, paving the way for broader reforms in the following decade. The Hon. Peter Duncan said recently, 'That I say the world and South Australia is undoubtedly a better place for these law reforms,' and I wholeheartedly agree with him.

In recent times governments have passed laws including hate crime laws, which were passed here in 2021, that explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity with its hate crime legislation, and more recently the ban on conversion therapy that the state passed, legislating banning gay conversion therapy.



Of course, we have equal rights for same-sex couples and, at a national level, marriage equality. These law reforms make for a much more humane society. I wholeheartedly agree with the words moved by the Hon. Mr Duncan when he said that it made South Australia a better place.

**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) (16:48):** I thank everyone for their very sincere contributions and I commend the motion to the house.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Just before I put the motion I would like to very quickly make a few comments. It is an important motion and I would like to make some comments. First of all, if my memory serves me correctly, there was a private member's bill by the then Hon. Peter Duncan which gave rise to it, so I think we should acknowledge that, even though he was part of the Dunstan government. I must confess that I have known Peter for many years. In his days in government he was quite a leading reformer not only in this area but also in consumer law and a whole range of other areas.

The member for Heysen made reference to the Special Branch files. I think we should be careful about what history tells us about that, in the sense that Special Branch files contained a lot of files about people who had committed no offence, and that was the offence for which he was actually dismissed. A lot of them were about ALP members, trade union officials, community activists in a whole range of movements, whether it was the women's movement, the gay rights movement, etc., all those people; in fact, there were over 25,000 different people on the files.

I think we need to put into context that, even though that may have led to some other changes, that act in itself was one which was not helpful to a democratic society. The royal commission later proved that it was inappropriate, and based on that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, I am old enough to remember those days. In closing, I would like to make a comment which I made last sitting week. I think that any act which diminishes the dignity of another person should be unacceptable in our society, irrespective. It does not matter what it is. Anything that diminishes a person's dignity—I prefer not to use the word 'rights' because that is often a legal term, but the human dignity which goes beyond rights. I think we should always be mindful to deal with others with compassion and understanding. Even when we differ, when we have differences, it does not mean you have to diminish someone else's dignity to get your view across.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **SUMMARY OFFENCES (PROHIBITION OF PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN MATERIAL) 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) (16:51):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** I am really pleased to introduce the Summary Offences (Prohibition of Publication of Certain Material) Amendment Bill 2025 to this house. It is a really timely and important bill that responds to community concern about an issue that has emerged in the past few years. It is a bill that acknowledges that we live in a world in which technology continues to rapidly evolve. Whilst this comes with excellent opportunities to share information, it has also created an environment in which information can be distributed for nefarious and harmful purposes, sometimes with devastating consequences.

Recent reports of young people posting material on social media platforms to brag about their involvement in crime, a practice known as posting and boasting, have raised concerns about the risk of harm to the community, including other young people and sometimes the young people involved themselves through the promotion of crime and community exposure to offensive material.

Our government is determined to act to tackle new ways in which crime is perpetrated and information about it is distributed, promoted and, sadly, sometimes celebrated. To address rightful community concerns, this bill criminalises posting and boasting through the creation of a new standalone offence.

The bill proposes to insert a new offence of publishing material depicting an offence in the Summary Offences Act 1953. The offence has a maximum penalty of two years' imprisonment. It will apply if a person publishes material depicting conduct constituting, or apparently constituting, a prescribed offence, if the person publishes the material with the intention of encouraging, glorifying or promoting the conduct, or to increase a person's notoriety because of their involvement in the depicted conduct.

To respond to the contemporary ways in which information is shared in our community, 'publish' means publish by electronic means and will include the posting, uploading or sharing of material via the internet, on a social media platform or other electronic platform. A 'prescribed offence' means any offence involving driving or operating a vehicle or vessel, violence, weapons, damage or destruction of property, theft or criminal trespass.

The regulations will allow for an offence or class of offences to be included in or excluded from the definition of a prescribed offence. Offences against the law of another jurisdiction that would, if committed in South Australia, constitute any of the offences I have just outlined, will also be considered a prescribed offence for the purposes of the posting and boasting offence.

A person may be charged with the new offence whether or not the person or any other person has been or will be charged with the related prescribed offence. This means that a person can be charged or convicted of the posting and boasting offence even if the person was not involved in the prescribed offence depicted in the published material. It will be a defence to a charge of the new offence if the defendant proves that the depicted conduct did not constitute a prescribed offence.

Additionally, a person will be taken not to have committed the new offence if the publication was for a legitimate public purpose. Publication of material will be taken to be for a legitimate public purpose if the publication was in the public interest, having regard to various factors, for example, whether the publication was for the purpose of educating or informing the public, for the purpose of publishing a fair and accurate report of any event or matter of public interest, or a work of artistic merit. Regulations will create the ability to prescribe other factors, with the onus lying on the prosecution to prove that the publication was not for a legitimate public purpose.

Finally, to ensure that the penalty imposed for the new offence is rightly not disproportionately high compared to the maximum penalty for the prescribed offence depicted in the published material, the bill provides that a penalty imposed for the posting and boasting offence must not exceed the maximum penalty that may be imposed for the related prescribed offence. This bill is intended to promote the safety of our community through the prevention of crime and its promotion on social media. It will also send a really clear message that crime causes harm and is not something to be glorified in any way. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

###### 3—Insertion of section 21AA

This clause inserts new section 21AA as follows:

21AA—Publishing material depicting offence etc

This clause provides that a person who publishes material depicting conduct constituting, or apparently constituting, a prescribed offence with the intention of encouraging, glorifying or promoting the conduct, or increasing the person's, or another person's, notoriety because of their involvement in the conduct, is guilty of an offence. A person may be charged with an offence against this clause whether or not a person has been or is to be charged with the prescribed offence.

An exemption is provided where the publication of the material was for a legitimate public purpose. The clause also provides a defence against a charge of an offence against this clause for the defendant to prove that the conduct the material depicted did not constitute a prescribed offence.

**Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (16:58):** I rise in support of the Summary Offences (Prohibition of Publication of Certain Material) Amendment Bill 2025. This bill deals with a phenomenon that has grown across the world and, sadly, in our state, the disturbing trend of so-called posting and boasting. We have seen too many instances where people have used social media to glorify or celebrate criminal acts, treating serious offences as if they were trophies to be displayed online.

What drives this behaviour is the recognition and notoriety that can come from publishing such material. For the perpetrators, there is a thrill in showing off to their peers. For victims, however, the consequences are devastating. Not only must they cope with the immediate harm, be it the theft of their car, vandalism of property or a physical or sexual assault, but they are then subjected to public humiliation when the offence is uploaded, shared and even mocked online.

The Malinauskas government believes this is unacceptable. It is bad enough for a young person to be assaulted in a coward's punch or attacked at school but to then have the video circulated among classmates or broadcast across the internet compounds the trauma. We have seen this all too often. That is why this bill matters.

We are not alone in addressing this issue. Other jurisdictions, including New South Wales, Queensland and the commonwealth, have already moved to criminalise posting and boasting, and South Australia must not lag behind. This legislation brings us into line with those jurisdictions and ensures our community is better protected from the harm caused by the glorification of crime.

The bill inserts a new section into the Summary Offences Act 1953, creating an offence of publishing material depicting a prescribed offence with the intention of encouraging, glorifying or promoting that conduct or of increasing the notoriety of those involved. The maximum penalty is two years' imprisonment, subject to the important caveat that the punishment cannot exceed the penalty for the underlying offence. This ensures fairness that those who post are not held to a higher account than those who commit the crime itself.

The types of prescribed offences are serious and are carefully defined. They include:

- offences involving vehicles, such as high-speed joyriding or vehicle theft;
- offences involving violence or threats of violence, such as assaults and coward's punches;
- offences involving weapons;
- offences involving damage to property;
- theft, robbery and related offences; and
- trespass and related offences.

The bill also recognises the importance of balance. It does not prevent the publication and material for a legitimate public purpose. That includes fair and accurate reporting by journalists, educational material, works of artistic merit, publication for law enforcement or public safety purposes, and for medical, legal or scientific reasons. The onus lies on the prosecution to prove a publication was not legitimate. This safeguard ensures freedom of speech and responsible reporting are preserved, while malicious posting and boasting is stamped out.

Imagine a group of people stealing a car and live streaming themselves speeding through suburban streets. They laugh as they run red lights and narrowly miss pedestrians. They live stream

or share footage and get hundreds or thousands of comments turning reckless criminal conduct into a form of entertainment. Scenes like this could easily end in tragedy and they have before, at least twice in recent history that I can think of. But even if no lives are lost, the boasting, the glorification of this crime creates in the minds of some, sadly, heroes and encourages it to happen again. This bill ensures that such behaviour will carry consequences even for those who are not behind the wheel but who chose to glorify the crime online.

Importantly, while these laws will apply equally to everyone, we recognise that young South Australians are most at risk of being drawn into this behaviour. That is why the government will continue working with the Department of Education to ensure that young people understand the risks. The recent ban on mobile phones during school hours and the broader move to restrict social media use for those under 16 form part of this wider effort.

We cannot ignore the reality that every teenager now carries in their pocket what amounts to a film production studio. It is vital they understand that some content simply cannot be shared without serious consequences. This bill is about more than just criminalising harmful behaviour. It is about protecting victims from further trauma, about removing the incentive for criminals to seek notoriety and about making it clear that crime is not entertainment.

I commend the Attorney-General and the minister, those who have contributed to this bill. We have a responsibility to send a clear message: if you commit a crime and then choose to broadcast it, you will face the consequences. This bill does just that and, in doing so, it strengthens our justice system and safeguards our community. I commend this bill to the house.

**Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (17:03):** We live in an age where the device in your pocket has more processing power than computers that took astronauts to the moon, and what do some people choose to do with this incredible technology? Film themselves stealing a car or starting a fight and then they upload it to TikTok. Well, that is not ingenuity. That is not rebellion. That is just idiocy filmed in HD. We have all seen it: clips of high-speed joyrides on our streets, often with offenders hanging out the windows, selfies taken seconds after smashing a shop window, grainy footage of coward's punches uploaded with hashtags like it is some kind of sport.

Well, it is posting and boasting—crime not just committed, but packaged up and promoted and pushed out for likes, shares and five seconds of notoriety. Let's be clear, this is not harmless showing off. For victims, it is a second round of trauma. First, they suffer the crime itself, then they are humiliated all over again when the crime becomes content on social media. This is not theoretical; it is happening here.

In South Australia, Instagram accounts have circulated schoolyard brawls for years. Students egged on fights, recorded them and shared them online. The humiliation for the victims does not vanish when the bruises heal. It lingers, replayed every time the footage is shared. In Adelaide, an anonymous account was brazenly encouraging people to film themselves drink driving, drifting, and then to send it in to be posted. Think about that: someone actively promoting dangerous criminal behaviour like it was a Friday night party trick. This bill is about shutting down that culture of crime as content.

This bill introduces a new offence in the Summary Offences Act. If you post material that glorifies, encourages or promotes crime, you can face up to two years' imprisonment. You will not face a harsher penalty than the original offender, but you will be held accountable for fanning the flames of criminal behaviour. The offences covered are not trivial. They include car theft and joyrides, assaults and coward's punches, weapons offences, property damage, robbery and trespass. These are the kinds of crimes that hurt families, that hurt small businesses and communities right across South Australia. If you upload and promote it, you can face up to two years' imprisonment.

Some might ask, 'Why criminalise it? Isn't it just kids mucking around on their phones?' Well, I will tell you: when your idea of fun is stealing a car at 2am, and uploading it with a Drake soundtrack, you are not mucking around—you are a menace. Frankly, if your greatest life achievement is becoming a viral idiot on Facebook, then maybe a short holiday from society, courtesy of our correctional system, is exactly what you need. We are still protecting free speech. This is not about silencing journalists, educators, law enforcement, legitimate reporting, public education or even

artistic work. They are all protected. This law is targeted squarely at those who glorify crime, not those who shine a light on it.

We also need to be honest about the world our kids are growing up in. Every young person is walking around with a film studio in their pocket. While most use it for good, capturing sports games, music or family events, we need to teach them where the line is. That is why this bill goes hand in hand with the ban on phones during school hours and the ban on social media for under 16s. It is about protecting our kids from the false glamour of online crime culture and ensuring they understand the real-world consequences of what they post.

We are not alone in facing this problem, nor in acting on it. New South Wales and Queensland, even the commonwealth, have already moved to criminalise posting and boasting and other jurisdictions are moving in the same direction. South Australia cannot be left behind while crime is being turned into clickbait. This bill is about responsibility, it is about accountability and it is about respect, because South Australians deserve better than to be victims twice: first for the crime and then the online circus that follows.

So let's send a clear message: if you commit a crime, do not expect to go viral, do not expect likes and follows—expect the law. I commend this bill to the house.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:08):** I rise to indicate I am the lead speaker for the opposition and indicate the opposition's support for the bill. I just emphasise a couple of things, including one of several concerns that the Law Society raised, and that is to make it clear that the offence that is the subject of the bill will be committed by the individual who publishes the relevant offending—certain prescribed offences—but they need not be engaged in the conduct of the offence itself. So it is very much targeted to the publication of material that is depicting a prescribed offence. In that way it is different to the law in Queensland, for example, where that is a circumstance of aggravation of the underlying offence that is going on, that is depicted in the publication. So to be clear about that, it stands alone.

In that regard there is at least a concern, or a question on my part, raised about whether or not knowing, as we do, that in plenty of circumstances the only evidence that is capable of proving the occurrence of the offence is the filming and the publication that is then available to prosecute the offence and whether that would have the effect of making it more difficult to prosecute offending. I understand that SAPOL's point of view is that there is a whole category, a whole raft of offending that just would not be occurring but for it providing an opportunity for somebody to film it and then publish the offending in the way that this bill is directed to be criminalising and providing sanction against.

Let's see that pan out and look to see a reduction in the underlying offence that is depicted. As we have heard in the course of the debate, let's see a change of behaviour to the extent that this filming of criminal conduct has become a trend in certain circles—let's see that ended and let's also keep a close eye on the evidence that is then used to prosecute offending.

On all of those fronts it will be necessary to keep an eye on how matters progress and let's continue to ensure that the prescribed offences that are the subject of the bill are happening less, that the so-called posting and boasting ceases and that we see a diminishment in both kinds of criminal conduct. I commend the bill to the house, and I look forward to seeing the results post its passage.

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (17:12):** In recent years we have seen an online trend emerge across the country of people not only committing crimes but filming themselves and sharing those crimes online for recognition and notoriety. Think street racing for views, the violent pub fight that goes viral, or bragging about graffiti on a significant or heritage building.

It is a phenomenon that has become known as posting and boasting. This behaviour is not harmless bravado: it fuels copycat conduct and it gives criminals the very thing that they seek, an audience. It deepens the trauma for victims who must endure not only the immediate harm of the offence but also the public humiliation of seeing it broadcast online for entertainment.

Our responsibility as legislators is to protect our communities from harm, and this bill sends a clear message that criminality is not content, offending is not a brand, violence and theft are not a stage for likes and clicks. This legislation creates a new offence in the Summary Offences Act for

posting and boasting. Under the bill, a person who publishes photo, video or audio of a prescribed offence with the intention of encouraging, glorifying or promoting the conduct it portrays, regardless of whether or not they were personally involved in the offending, can face a penalty of up to two years imprisonment. It is important to note that the penalty of up to two years' imprisonment cannot exceed the maximum penalty of the underlying prescribed offence. That means that someone who boasts about a crime online will not be punished more harshly than the person who commits the crime itself.

The range of prescribed offences is significant. They include offences involving driving or operating a vehicle or vessel, such as high-speed joyrides and vehicle theft; offences involving violence or the threat of using violence, which captures fights and coward attacks; offences involving weapons; offences involving interference with, damage to or destruction of property; theft, robbery and related offences; and criminal trespass, or an offence in which trespass is an element.

This bill has been carefully designed to avoid overreach, because we recognise the need for clear exemptions for legitimate public purposes. That means journalists can continue to report fairly and accurately on matters of public interest. Artists can still create works of artistic merit. Law enforcement can use material for the purpose of public safety. Medical, legal and scientific purposes also remain protected. These exemptions strike the right balance between shutting down glorification of crime without impacting legitimate voices.

Other jurisdictions have also taken steps, such as New South Wales, Queensland and the commonwealth, in regard to criminalising posting and boasting. Although these laws apply to all South Australians, we know that this trend has a particular hold on younger people, who consume their news, socialise and express themselves on social media and live much of their lives through the phone that they carry in their pocket. We need to make sure our young people understand the boundaries and that crime is never entertainment. That is why it is important to work with the Department for Education to ensure our younger South Australians understand the risks and know what is acceptable or not.

This builds on recent reforms such as the ban on mobile phones in schools and also the ban on social media for those under 16, of which the conversation was led by our Premier, Peter Malinauskas, in South Australia. It also complements our significant \$18 million-plus investment in civics and citizenship education. We are both protecting our kids and arming them with the knowledge and tools they need to live in an increasingly digital future.

This bill is about protecting victims, it is about stopping the spread of crime as entertainment, and it is about making sure South Australians can go about their lives without having their trauma replayed online for clicks. Posting and boasting is not just juvenile showing off: it is a scourge that amplifies harm, fuels further offending and corrodes community trust. With this bill, we are drawing a line. Criminal acts will not be celebrated, shared or glorified.

I want to thank the Attorney-General and his team, both in the department and in his office, for bringing this bill forward and for their careful and considered work. I acknowledge victims and their families, those who have had to relive their trauma when crimes against them were turned into online content. Their voices, their experiences and their resilience remind us of why this bill matters. I commend the bill to the house.

**Mrs PEARCE (King) (17:17):** I rise today to speak on the Summary Offences (Prohibition of Publication of Certain Material) Amendment Bill 2025. In recent years, there has been a growing and concerning trend of individuals using social media platforms to share content that both glorifies and boasts of criminal activity. These posts are not simply expressions of criminal intent. They often serve to incite further harm, intimidate victims and undermine our justice system.

As digital spaces increasingly influence public behaviour, our government is taking steps to prevent individuals from publishing material on social media in order to brag about their involvement in crime, also known as posting and boasting. I, along with many in the South Australian community, have watched on in horror at some of the videos and content that have been appearing online and the trends that occur as a result. It is particularly upsetting to see these dangerous lapses of judgement coming from children in our local communities.

The Malinauskas state government has made clear our intention to protect kids from the dangers that social media can present, whether that be through a total ban of mobile phones in schools—which fortunately has seen a positive impact both on the learning outcomes in the classroom and also on how young people are interacting with one another during recess and lunch and in their free time—or a pathway that I am particularly interested in, which is getting more kids involved in their community through the power of sport and active recreation.

We know if we have positive things to offer for young people to embrace, they are more likely to have opportunities to thrive and live more fulfilling lives. Criminalising posting and boasting is just another way we are looking out for our kids in the digital world. We are following other Australian jurisdictions such as New South Wales, Queensland and the commonwealth in helping to do more to protect our kids.

While these laws will apply to all, our government will work with the Department for Education to ensure our kids understand the risks, the danger and violence they perpetrate when filming and publishing a crime. Under this new offence, people who publish photo, video or audio of a prescribed offence with the intention to encourage, glorify or promote the conduct, whether or not they were involved in the offending themselves, will face a penalty of up to two years' imprisonment, so long as the penalty imposed does not exceed the maximum penalty that may be imposed for the relevant prescribed offence. This ensures that someone who commits a post and boast offence is not held to a stricter account than the person who commits the crime.

A prescribed offence can include an offence involving driving or operating a vehicle or vessel, which we have seen in high speed, joyriding and theft of vehicles, an offence including the threat of using violence, which captures fights and cowardly attacks, an offence involving a weapon, criminal trespass or an offence of which trespass is an element.

Of course, we understand that there are legitimate public interest reasons to publish material such as these. This new offence only applies to a person who has posted material depicting a prescribed offence as long as it is proved that they published the material for a prohibited purpose to be able to encourage, glorify or promote the conduct.

This means the offence will not cover the publication of offending material if the publication was for a legitimate public purpose, which includes:

- the publication was for the purpose of educating or informing the public;
- the publication was for the purpose of making or publishing a fair and accurate record of any event or matter of public interest;
- the publication was for the purpose of a work of artistic merit;
- the publication was for a purpose connected to law enforcement or public safety; or
- the publication was for a medical, legal or scientific purpose.

This will ensure that the legitimate use of photos, videos and audio of criminal activity by media or law enforcement is not restricted.

Criminal behaviour should never be given a platform for glorification. As our community continues to adapt to the digital age that we are now living in, our laws must evolve to reflect the real-world consequences of online behaviour. This legislation is about upholding accountability, protecting victims and defending our kids against the influence of criminal activity. For those reasons, I commend the bill to the house.

**Ms CLANCY (Elder) (17:23):** I rise today in support of the Summary Offences (Prohibition of Publication of Certain Material) Amendment Bill 2025, which seeks to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953.

The bill before us today is about respect, it is about dignity and it is about ensuring the most vulnerable members of our community are not re-traumatised by the careless or sensationalist publication of offensive material.

We have seen a disturbing rise in the number of incidents where crimes are filmed and uploaded online to be bragged about. Violence or humiliation, or sometimes both, wrapped up as some kind of sick entertainment, is disgusting in and of itself, before we even start to consider the victims who are left to deal with the trauma, not just once during the experience but again and again as material posted online just does not go away.

This bill seeks to insert a new offence of publishing material depicting an offence in the Summary Offences Act. This includes photo, video or audio content of a prescribed offence. A prescribed offence includes an offence involving driving or operating a vehicle or vessel; an offence involving the use of or the threat of using violence, which captures fights and coward attacks; an offence involving a weapon; an offence involving interference with, damage to or destruction of property; theft or an offence of which theft is an element, such as robbery; or criminal trespass or an offence of which trespass is an element.

South Australians who publish this material with the intention to encourage, glorify or promote the conduct it betrays, whether or not they are involved in the offending themselves, will face a penalty of up to two years' imprisonment. The maximum penalty for this new posting and boasting offence cannot exceed the maximum penalty that may be imposed for the relevant prescribed offence, to ensure that they are not held to a stricter standard or account than the person who commits the crime that is being recorded. It is important to highlight that this new offence does not apply to the publication of such material for a legitimate public purpose, such as law enforcement or journalism.

When I was growing up, an incident in the schoolyard or out in the community would end when the police arrived or the courts had dealt with it. For children growing up today, a violent act can be replayed endlessly, with each share or repost forcing the victim to relive their trauma again and again. We have seen violent assaults circulated online before SA Police have even been called. We have seen schoolyard fights posted to TikTok or shared on Snapchat way before parents and caregivers have even been notified. In the most harrowing of cases, we have seen sexual assault and harassment filmed and posted online to dedicated revenge porn websites.

These are not isolated incidents; they are part of a wider trend that some of the darkest places of the internet are perpetuating onto our community and communities right across the world—a culture where crime is glorified, violence is amplified and trauma is monetised through more likes, shares, followers and subscribers. We need to say that enough is enough. The bill before us today takes a stand by criminalising posting and boasting in South Australia. Today also serves as an important reminder that compassion should come before content, and that the right response when someone is in danger is to actually help them, not to film them or pull out your phone.

The responsibility to see an end to this trend lies with each and every one of us. Social media companies also have a significant role to play to take stronger action to curtail this behaviour. Social media platforms and their algorithms should not reward violence and pain, and they should not continue to profit from violence while ignoring the trauma of victims. Instead, we can all play a role in encouraging a culture, particularly among younger South Australians, where pulling out a phone is not the first instinct when something goes wrong.

I think it is really, really important that we actually ensure we are educating young people about social media and the use of their phones. I am really pleased that the South Australian Malinauskas government took a lead by looking into a social media ban, which was quickly picked up by the federal Albanese government, and that that work is now being done.

I am sure a number of people in this place heard a speech by Australia's eSafety Commissioner, Julie Inman Grant, to the Press Club maybe a couple of months ago. There is a really interesting way that she is looking at the social media ban, because I know that there have been some concerns around the idea that young people also need to be educated around how to use social media and through that use of it they can learn. She spoke about swimming between the flags: you do not just put your child into the ocean without teaching them how to swim and giving them a lot of understanding of what they are walking into, what they could potentially experience and what the potential risks are.



By putting a social media ban in place, she spoke about how it is actually just putting the pause button on. It is about creating a delay so that children have that time to have more conversations with the people around them and to actually learn what the risks are and what the dangers are of social media before they enter into it.

We also saw the mobile phone ban that was implemented by our government, as the member for King also raised. We know that the stats show that it has caused a big difference. Talking to school leaders and students, as well as teachers and parents, we know that it has made a big difference to them in a really positive way. Instead of hearing nothing at lunchtime and recess, when we enter into the courtyard or go out into the yard, we can actually hear kids playing and talking to one another, which is a huge win. We have also seen a reduction in negative behaviour because of the mobile phone ban.

In closing, I would like to thank the Attorney-General and everyone in his team for bringing another bill to this place, which forms part of our growing reform agenda to make South Australia a safer, fairer place for all. I commend this bill to the house.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (17:31):** Very briefly, I thank everybody who has spoken in this debate. I think this is a very good example of what is possible when a government is determined to make reform that responds to contemporary community concerns, and when our parliament backs that reform we can move forward to tackle what is a new concern for our community.

I thank everybody for their speeches in this parliament that have certainly supported that need to make sure we are contemporary in our approach to responding to community concerns about crime and the new ways in which crime can be perpetrated. I also want to thank everybody from the Attorney-General's Department and the Attorney-General's office who have worked very hard toward this and, indeed, many other reforms that I am really proud our government has made.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Third Reading*

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (17:33):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **AGEING AND ADULT SAFEGUARDING (REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

#### *Resolutions*

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ALGAL BLOOMS**

The Legislative Council informs the House of Assembly that it has appointed the Hon. N.J. Centofanti, the Hon. I.K. Hunter and the Hon. R.A. Simms to act on the Joint Committee on Harmful Algal Blooms in South Australia.

At 17:34 the house adjourned until Tuesday 16 September 2025 at 11:00.