

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 18 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.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NETBALL CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT

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

That the 149th report of the committee, entitled South Australian Netball Centre Redevelopment, be noted.

Opened in 2001, the South Australian Netball Centre, commonly referred to as the SA Netball Centre, is the host venue for the Netball SA Premier League, Adelaide Metropolitan Netball Division, City Night Division and other regular competitions, drawing approximately 500,000 visitors per annum. The centre also serves as the administrative headquarters for Netball South Australia, from here on referred to as Netball SA. Netball is one of the state's most popular activities, with as many as 35,000 people regularly participating. The project, proposed by the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, seeks to provide a contemporary fit-for-purpose facility to support the continued growth of netball in South Australia.

The SA Netball Centre is located at the Mile End sports centre, which it shares with multiple other prominent South Australian sports facilities, with frontages on Railway Terrace and Sir Donald Bradman Drive. The site is under the management of the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and is leased to Netball SA.

In 2021, the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing commenced planning for an \$18 million redevelopment. However, initial options revealed that a meaningful scope of works would require a larger budget. In June 2023, the state government made a commitment to invest a further \$80 million, with the aim of upgrading the 26 existing courts, increasing the number of indoor courts as well as upgrading associated infrastructure and amenities.

The commitment adds to existing investment in the Mile End sports precinct as well as South Australia's sporting reputation nationally and internationally. The project is a staged development, with stage 1 comprising the renewal and upgrade of the existing outdoor courts and stage 2 developing a new indoor stadium. The works will include all required car parking and public realm areas.

Stage 1, the outdoor works, will include: resurfacing of the 26 existing full-size netball courts, including all required regulation run-offs; provision of shade and seating to all outdoor courts; lighting upgrades from halogen to LED; construction of a food and beverage facility; construction of a combined trailer and first aid room; creation of a pre-game marshalling area; and upgrades to stormwater drainage.

Stage 2, the indoor stadium works, will include: increased indoor space from four to six courts; installation of retractable seating and courtside seating; installation of a netting system to separate courts for multiple uses; courtside amenities, including change rooms, staff and leadership rooms, an anti-doping room, first aid facilities and storage; general spaces, including cleaning, kitchen, meeting rooms, offices and staff spaces; food and beverage facilities; and a ticketing and service centre.

The centre upgrades will also include office space for Netball SA and Volleyball South Australia. Construction is expected to commence in March next year, with the anticipation to be

practically complete in February 2028. The state government has approved a budget of \$92 million and the project received a \$6 million commonwealth Community Development Grant. The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing will be responsible for operation and management of the SA Netball Centre and has an annual budget provision of approximately \$1.5 million.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing expects the SA Netball Centre to generate approximately \$1.9 million per annum in facility-related revenue and is working with Netball SA in preparation of an operating model that will include relevant distribution of additional revenue opportunities between the two parties. The project also anticipates the creation of 380 construction jobs.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing states that project implementation processes will govern the delivery of the project and, as a prescribed construction project, it will be managed and delivered by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. The general building contractor will be selected utilising general conditions of contract, and tenders have been sought from construction contractors registered in the applicable DIT pre-qualification system category.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and Netball SA share responsibility for risk management and mitigation and report to the project control group and executive steering committee. Risks include:

- inefficient design principles, for which design is tested at all phases;
- operational continuity of existing users of the centre, for which the project team is in ongoing communication with stakeholders;
- budget and scope alignment, for which cost advice will be sought at all stages of design;
- program alignment for least disruption, for which the master plan considers staging plans, mobilisation zones and other non-construction spaces;
- and latent conditions and site constraints, for which the project team has engaged relevant consultants during the design development process.

The project will include ecologically sustainable development strategies, which will be developed with reference to the state government's building sustainability guidelines. Proposed initiatives will include: a nominal plan for a 1,000 kilowatt photovoltaic system; localised lighting with separate controls, including sensors, switches and scheduling; the use of durable and reusable materials where possible; and consideration of water efficiency.

Existing trees impacted by the works will be assessed by an arborist in conjunction with relevant guidelines. The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing states that a search of the central archive identified no entries for Aboriginal heritage associated with the location. A search of the SA Heritage Places Database also confirms no state or local heritage places at the site.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and Netball SA have led several consultation sessions at relevant netball competition events to inform and hear feedback from the community. Together they have also developed an operational continuity framework to minimise unavoidable disruption to netball programming at the site. The project team has also consulted with stakeholders and sporting organisations that use the SA Netball Centre as well as relevant government departments and agencies.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the South Australian Netball Centre redevelopment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Abigail Parry, Director Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; Chelsea Crawford, Manager, Major Projects, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing; Adam Trottman, Director, Infrastructure and Planning, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing; and Ben Luppino, Director of DesignInc. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based on 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.

The SPEAKER (11:09): I would just like to add a little bit to the member for Adelaide's report. This is going to be fantastic for the sport of netball, which is one of the most participated-in sports in South Australia, but it is also going to be a great thing for the sport of volleyball. We have been home to the AIS beach volleyball program since before the Sydney 2000 Olympics, and we continue to host the men's program here. In November this year, South Australia is going to play host to the Beach Volleyball World Championships at Memorial Drive in the member for Adelaide's electorate, which will be a terrific.

Talking to Adam Trotman of the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, who does a really good job on infrastructure and the facilities for sport, there are going to be 10 volleyball courts when it is configured for volleyball and then a show court with 3,000 seats. That actually gives us the opportunity to host national and international volleyball here when they have the indoor volleyball tournaments, so that is another good thing for our major events calendar. If we can use this new facility come February 2028 and beyond in the lead-up to the Brisbane Olympic Games in 2032, it is going to be terrific.

I know Craig Carracher, who is the national president of Volleyball Australia, Andrew Dee, the CEO, and also Karla Della Pietra, who is the head of Volleyball South Australia, are very keen on this investment by the government. I think volleyball is one of those great sports. It is one of the most watched Olympic sports in the world. We are obviously going to be tapping into that when the Beach Volleyball World Championships are held here in November. I should give a shout-out, too, to Jenny Mann, who is the CEO of the world championships. I know they are all getting very excited; it is only a few months away.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ALBERTON OVAL STAGE 4 REDEVELOPMENT

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

That the 150th report of the committee, entitled Alberton Oval Stage 4 Redevelopment, be noted.

This project from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and the Port Adelaide Football Club will make further upgrades to Alberton Oval. Managed by the Port Adelaide Football Club, from here on referred to as 'the football club', the project will upgrade and extend the Allan Scott headquarters as well as construct a new grandstand. The new and upgraded facilities aim to consolidate a high-performance football infrastructure whilst improving community access to this premium sporting facility.

Alberton Oval is one of the Australia's oldest continuously operating football grounds and has been home to the Port Adelaide Football Club since 1880. Today, the venue serves as the administrative, training and match-day base for the football club's AFL, AFLW and SANFL teams, as well as the Next Generation Academy programs. The oval is also a vital community asset for Adelaide's western suburbs, providing accessible sporting facilities, community programs and educational opportunities that directly benefit one of Adelaide's most diverse regions.

The proposal states that, despite past upgrades to the oval facilities, significant infrastructure gaps remain, making particular note of the AFL and AFLW national competition requirements. These include the oval's lack of dedicated female change rooms within the main training facility, inadequate medical and recovery areas, insufficient meeting and education spaces, restricted access to training and conditioning areas and lack of appropriate technology integration for coaching. The proposal also notes the current facility's insufficient spectator infrastructure, including limited permanent seating, accessibility compliance gaps, lack of game-day audio and inadequate corporate and hospitality infrastructure.

The redevelopment comprises a multitier extension to the Allan Scott headquarters, estimated to cost approximately \$8 million, and the construction of a \$2.6 million grandstand on the eastern boundary. Detailed works for the headquarters include:

- a two-level extension to the existing headquarters building;
- ground-floor AFLW change rooms with wet areas, medical facilities and recovery spaces;

- meeting rooms, additional office space and expanded reception area;
- a new lift, upgraded mechanical systems and enhanced accessibility;
- function space and viewing areas;
- audiovisual systems; and
- technology infrastructure, environmental systems and security integration.

Works for the grandstand include steel-frame construction with precast concrete elements, 1,040 sheltered tiered stadium-style seats and integrated technology, as well as concession areas, amenities and accessibility features. The development also includes features to support community access, including multipurpose spaces, allied health integration, event hosting and educational opportunities.

Construction is expected to commence this quarter and is anticipated to be complete in June next year. The project cost is approximately \$10.5 million, drawn from a state government contribution of \$17 million, the balance of which will go towards a future project for the Port Adelaide Bowling Club grandstand. A grant agreement has been executed between the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and the football club for an initial \$8.5 million.

The project is expected to create 104 full-time equivalent positions and create indirect employment of 35 positions via supply and support services. The project anticipates that 85 per cent of construction value will be through South Australian suppliers. The project will also capitalise on growing investment in Adelaide's western suburbs, contributing towards precinct activation, tourism and events, property value enhancement and employment generation.

To optimise project delivery, the project has adopted a staged procurement strategy combining early contractor involvement with a competitive tender process. The project is overseen by a project steering committee, with representatives from the football club, the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, and an independent project adviser. Weekly operational management, technical decision-making and progress monitoring will be administered by a project control group.

Project risks include delayed approvals, for which early engagement aims to mitigate project interruption; weather impacts, for which project management is considering scheduling; in-season disruption for oval users, for which project management is considering scheduling, staged construction and temporary facilities where necessary; site conditions, for which relevant contractors have been engaged; and service integration, for which early works will prepare for service diversions.

The redevelopment will incorporate ecological and sustainability initiatives, including advanced lighting systems utilising LED technology and smart controls; a high-performance building envelope utilising double glazing, insulation and natural light optimisation; advanced climate control and specialised ventilation systems; water conservation utilising efficient fixtures and maintenance; stormwater and landscape water management; use of sustainable materials, utilising recycled content, adopting a local procurement focus and preferencing low-impact products where possible; and selection of native plants, microclimate management, habitat creation, heat island reduction and wind protection.

Port Adelaide Football Club celebrates the Kurna land on which the site sits and states that a search of the central archive identified no Aboriginal heritage within the development site. The football club will take internal guidance and leadership from its First Nations leaders in relation to engagement and approach. The submission also states that a comprehensive search identified no state or local heritage at the works location.

The project team has engaged in community consultation via two information sessions, as well as through communication with local residents, adjacent property owners, the local business community and sporting organisations. The club has also received feedback from targeted consultation with the AFLW and women's sports advocates, as well as relevant technical and professional experts.

The project has subsequently enhanced design based upon feedback from consultation regarding traffic and parking, construction noise, community access and visual impact, considering

acoustic treatment, landscaping expansion, accessibility improvements, community programming and parking management. The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and the football club have also consulted with relevant government departments and agencies, including regarding approvals where necessary.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Alberton Oval stage 4 redevelopment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Matthew Richardson, Chief Executive Officer, Port Adelaide Football Club; Shane Smith, Chief Operations Officer, Port Adelaide Football Club; Michael Lambert, architect at Brown Falconer; and Adam Trotman, Director, Infrastructure and Planning, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. 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: WHYALLA SPORTING HUB

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:19): I move:

That the 151st report of the committee, entitled Whyalla Sporting Hub, be noted.

This project from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing proposes a joint project with the Football Federation SA Incorporated, from here on referred to as Football SA. The works will construct a sports hub in Whyalla that meets current football standards. Football SA will have responsibility for the management and implementation for the project in accordance with its policies and procedures and the reporting and accountability requirements outlined in its funding agreement with the government of South Australia.

As part of its 2022 state election commitment, the state government dedicated \$6 million to build a new sports hub in Whyalla. The Department of State Development, through Planning and Land Use Services, has been developing a strategic master plan for the area. Following discussions with the member for Giles, the Whyalla city council, local community, Football SA, South Australian National Football League, and the Department for Education, it was decided that the Whyalla Secondary College site is the most appropriate location for the new facility.

Open to students in 2022, the secondary college replaced three previous high school campuses in the area. The college site already has a double-court gymnasium and five outdoor multi-use netball/tennis/basketball courts, two full-sized soccer pitches, as well as an Australian Rules football oval that are available to the community. The new sports hub will host junior and senior soccer, women's Australian Rules football, and will be suitable for other field and court sports.

The hub also expects to provide young people with increased opportunity to participate in sport and pathway programs, contribute to a better quality of life for the community by providing modern, accessible infrastructure that is inclusive for women, children, First Nations people and people with a disability, as well as provide facilities that support community pride and that are capable of hosting regional-level competition.

The facility will also be available to the secondary college during school hours. The project works will deliver a new clubroom with change rooms, social space, kitchen, a referees' room and amenities, new fencing, goals and nets, lighting to one pitch, rejuvenation of the oval and two existing turf pitches, as well as minor landscaping.

The site is located at 117 Nicolson Avenue, Whyalla Norrie, on Crown lands administered by the Minister for Education. Upon completion of the project, Football SA will hold the head lease for the facility and will coordinate its use, utilising it as a base for junior and senior soccer, women's Australian Rules football, and its own development programs.

Westlands United Soccer Club will also be a key subtenant of the facility. Construction is anticipated to be completed in June next year and staged completion is being considered to provide early access for training and games. The project is expected to cost \$6 million, funded through a grant agreement administered by the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Upon completion, operating costs of an estimated \$45,000 per year will be borne by the head lessee and user groups.

Costs are expected to be lower than other venues, as the grounds are already maintained by the school, and any increase in maintenance or water costs will be borne by tenants. Whyalla city council has agreed in principle to contribute towards these costs to further reduce the impact on users, recognising the hub's benefits to the broader community.

The project expects the work to generate up to 24 construction jobs, as well as maintain ongoing general maintenance and operations jobs. A project team has been established, including representation from Football SA, the city council, the Department for Education, the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, and the construction contractor, Thorne Constructions. All procurement will be undertaken in accordance with Football SA's procurement policy. Football SA states that Thorne Constructions is committed to using local trades where possible and has already engaged several local contractors.

The design for the Whyalla sports hub includes several ecological and sustainable initiatives, including:

- a 10-kilowatt solar array;
- 100 per cent use of LED lighting with adaptable control systems;
- optimisation of natural light and window glazing;
- enhanced thermal insulation and energy-efficient heating, cooling and ventilation;
- efficient tapware, showers and toilets;
- native plant selection and landscaping to reduce irrigation requirements;
- recycled wastewater where appropriate;
- recycled and durable building materials, where possible; and
- preference of locally sourced materials.

Football SA states there are no state or local heritage places or contributory heritage at the project site. It also states the search of the central archive identified no entries for Aboriginal sites within 500 metres of the works' location. It will also ensure unexpected finds protocols are included in the contractor's conservation environmental management plan.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and Football SA have engaged in consultation with stakeholders and end users, including the SANFL, Department for Education, Whyalla Secondary College, Whyalla Junior Soccer Association, Westlands United Soccer Club, competition administrators, and the South Australian Sports Institute.

The project team has also consulted several relevant government departments and agencies concerning design and development. The development process considered impact of the works on the local community and notes there are no businesses in the immediate proximity of the project that will be affected by the construction phase.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Whyalla sporting hub. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Adam Trottman, Director, Infrastructure and Planning, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing; Michael Carter, Chief Executive Officer, Football SA; and Nick Thorne, Managing Director, Thorne Constructions. I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for Giles. He presented to the committee concerning this important project in his electorate.

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

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:25): I am very keen to speak on this great proposal for Whyalla. This is a project that has been a long time coming. I did put a proposal prior to the 2018 election to start on the development of a sporting hub in Whyalla. Of course, we lost that election, so it was good to see that come 2022 the \$5 million that we were going to allocate was increased to \$6 million, and now we are starting to see some real progress on the sporting hub.

Initially, I was pushing for the hub to go at the surplus Eyre High site in the centre of the city. At the moment the council are managing that site. They have the council chamber there, and the agreement with the state is on a peppercorn rental. They maintain the grounds around Eyre High and the building. Eyre High proved to have some challenges associated with it, and unfortunately the hockey club, which is a combined hockey club in Whyalla, which was looking to expand into that site, had to miss out this time. But I am very mindful of the needs of hockey, so I will look at how we can address that.

Having the sporting hub where it is, behind the new high school, makes a lot of sense. You already have two soccer pitches there and an Aussie Rules footy oval. That in itself is a great start. You also have within the school the sport hall. It is an original, state-accredited court suitable for netball, and we do have a number of netball outdoor courts adjacent to that. So there is that potential, at another stage, for netball to make this area its home as well, given it will have the advantage, which it does not have at the moment, of having a decently accredited internal court.

One of the anchor tenants for the new clubroom that is going to be built will be the Westlands United Soccer Club. Initially they were not part of the thinking around the sport hub, but the council wanted the club to move away from their current site so that Discovery could expand the caravan park and make it a destination caravan park.

At the time I did intervene. I did not think it appropriate on the basis of a song and a prayer to kick out a club that had been there for over 50 years. I managed to secure an agreement that there would be a no-disadvantage test for the Westlands United Soccer Club, and they are going to become the anchor tenant at the new hub.

It is also going to be a home for junior soccer. Junior soccer has been kicked from pillar to post. They have been here, they have been there, they have been everywhere. Now they are going to have a decent home with this new sport hub, with state-of-the-art changing facilities. That will be a real plus for junior soccer in Whyalla.

There is potential also for female Aussie Rules to use the oval. There is also potential for cricket to use that oval as well. There has been some conflict between female football and cricket over the use of Bennett Oval and Memorial Oval in Whyalla, and this will help resolve that conflict over use. That is another positive.

This is the first properly constituted sports hub in Whyalla. We have Jubilee Park, but I have always been of the view that that is a bit of a dog's breakfast. It is in the wrong location right on the periphery of town. Having the sports hub in the geographic centre of town, behind the high school, is going to be a real plus. It is going to enable one of the things that does not happen to the degree that it should in Whyalla, and that is resource sharing. For instance, the Westlands United Soccer Club—who have just moved out and have some transition arrangements in place—their previous location had a sloping soccer pitch, and they were paying a minimum of \$15,000 a year just to water it.

The building was built back in the seventies under a federal employment program at the time. Some of the old-timers are very committed to that building because they used their own hands to help build it, but just about everyone in the club thinks there are going to be great opportunities in moving to the new site. I recognise the emotional commitment of some people, but this is a really positive step forward for the Westlands United Soccer Club.

It is a big step forward for Whyalla. The great thing about this particular site, over and above the resource sharing, is the need for the education department to commit to assisting, and the Whyalla City Council is going to assist, so the maintenance is going to be shared and that is going to reduce the cost to a club like the Westlands United Soccer Club.

The other big advantage of the site is that there is a lot of room around it, so there is real potential in the future for a staged expansion of sporting facilities in Whyalla. At the moment, we have five soccer clubs in Whyalla and all of them have their own pitches and their own clubrooms, and that does present some challenges. When it comes to Aussie Rules there is a sharing of ovals for the junior games, the B-grade and the A-grade with Bennett Oval and Memorial Oval, and then the

clubs have their individual clubrooms. There are six footy clubs in Whyalla and I think everyone recognises that that is not sustainable and there will be some changes in the future.

This initiative is going to be a great one for Whyalla. It has been a long time coming. It has been a bit of a saga in a number of ways, so I am keen to see the physical work started. As part of the history of Whyalla, when you look at the soccer clubs, they were all built on the cheap in the sixties and the seventies. They are all ageing facilities, so it will be good to see something in Whyalla in the sporting arena that is going to be new and contemporary. My view is that this is just the start, and there is potential, on the basis of funding being available, to go to additional stages so that we can have something that we are incredibly proud of.

If you look at other regional communities, Port Augusta has an amazing facility, a combined sports hub, a very expensive combined sports hub. Port Pirie has it. Port Lincoln has had the Ravensdale combined sports hub for years. Other significant regional communities also have sports hubs. Whyalla is coming late to this, despite all of the efforts over the years, and sometimes it is a case of it being difficult to herd cats, and you do not want to come in and be a bully, but we are now finding our way forward, and it is good that other sporting organisations are coming to me and saying, 'In future, how can we be part of this development?' It is going to be a big plus for Whyalla and I am very keen to see the sod turned and the building started.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NEW MOUNT BARKER HOSPITAL CLINICAL SERVICES BUILDING AND CENTRAL ENERGY PLANT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:34): I move:

That the 152nd report of the committee, entitled New Mount Barker Hospital—Clinical Services Building and Central Energy Plant, be noted.

The proposed works from the Department for Health and Wellbeing (SA Health) constitute the next stage of the new Mount Barker hospital development, following the previously approved enabling and early works package in October 2024 as well as the multideck car park and structural works for the clinical services building approved in June this year. Considered as the main works, this project will complete the clinical services building and build the central energy plant. The works do not include the decommissioning phase, which will be subject to a future submission to the Public Works Committee.

Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital is operated by the Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network. It is currently a 34-bed facility providing services including 24-hour accident and emergency, inpatient and day patient surgical and medical services, obstetrics and gynaecology, chemotherapy, renal dialysis, palliative care, allied health and community-based services. There is an increasing health service demand in the catchment area driven by the rapidly growing population in Mount Barker and the Adelaide Hills, and the facility will require additional beds to meet the demand on services and emergency care.

The new Mount Barker hospital is being built on the existing hospital site. The plan is to triple the inpatient capacity from 34 to 102 beds while also expanding specialist beds, providing new outpatient and community health facilities, establishing an onsite pharmacy and establishing a new mental health unit. When completed, the main works package will address the existing inpatient capacity challenges. The scope of works for the clinical services building (CSB) will include:

- a new purpose-built L-shaped building of approximately 16,600 square metres across five levels, including one level of engineering and plant space;
- a 28-bed women's and children's inpatient unit;
- a 28-bed acute inpatient unit;
- a 28-bed subacute inpatient unit, including six palliative care beds;
- a 12-bed mental health inpatient unit;
- three operating theatres;

- four birthing rooms and two women's assessment rooms;
- the central sterile supply department;
- an allied health department comprising clinical support spaces, 15 places of care, consult and interview rooms, podiatry treatment rooms and a gymnasium;
- a paediatric outpatient clinic inclusive of consult and multidisciplinary therapy rooms;
- an outpatient department comprising consult rooms and an echocardiogram procedure room;
- an Aboriginal health unit inclusive of four consult rooms and service area;
- pharmacy departments, medication rooms, clean and dirty utility spaces, general equipment stores and biomedical equipment stores;
- on-ward staff stations and clinical workrooms;
- on-ward staff amenities, including respite rooms, office space, meeting areas, toilets and lockers;
- administrative departments;
- back-of-house functions, including kitchen, linen, loading dock and change rooms;
- education support areas; and
- a dedicated main plant floor, including thermal plant, cooling tower heat pumps, service risers, air-handling units, hot water plant, building management system and provision for a solar power system.

The central energy plant will be constructed adjacent to the CSB with two standalone buildings. The scope of works will include a bulk oxygen tank; water storage and treatment plant; a bottle store for medical gas bottles; a manifold room for medical gas distribution; a suction plant for vacuum pumps, filters and storage tanks; a medical and tool air plant for air quality management; the main switchboard and distribution room; an equipment store for allied health; and acoustic treatment for noise reduction.

Further civil works and car parking will include 25 new at-grade car parks to the north of the multideck car park; 30 new at-grade car parks at the CSB; modifications to the existing Summit car park; modifications to the CSB access road from Wellington Road; a new South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service vehicle path; a new hardstand loading area, recessed dock and three at-grade car parks for maintenance vehicles at the energy plant; and associated minor hard and soft landscaping works.

The project is expected to cost \$240.7 million, which is included within the hospital development project budget of \$365.8 million. Construction of the central energy plant is expected to commence this quarter, to be complete in October next year. Main construction of the CSB will commence this October, with the anticipation for clinical commissioning to be complete in November 2027.

The delivery of the project will follow best practice principles for project procurement and management, as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. This includes:

- development of formal communication channels;
- preparation and management of a project program;
- establishment of a cost plan and management of project cost;
- scheduling regular reviews of design, documentation and construction;
- appointment of professional service contractors;

- identifying risks and implementing mitigation strategies; and
- compliance with relevant planning, development and infrastructure legislation.

The professional services contractor team has been appointed and secondary professional service contractors may be engaged as required for specific project aspects. In order to qualify for invitation to tender, both the professional services contractor and managing contractor are to maintain current Department for Infrastructure and Transport pre-qualification levels for the design and delivery of state government infrastructure projects.

To manage the project through planning and implementation, as well as manage any risks and issues arising, a two-tier governance structure has been established, including an executive steering committee responsible for strategic oversight, and an integrated management team responsible for day-to-day operational management. Risks identified include:

- the proximity of construction works to an operational clinical environment, for which the project team is in ongoing communication with site management and patients attending the hospital;
- requirement for service cutovers to ensure continued operation of the existing hospital, for which the project team is planning service diversion where acquired;
- requirement for temporary facilities to ensure continued operation of the hospital; and
- traffic management and contractor vehicle interface with Wellington Road.

A search of the central archive identified no Aboriginal heritage in the proposed work locations. There is no registration of state heritage in vicinity to the site. The department is in ongoing consultation with various stakeholder groups and is working closely with key facilities management personnel from the local health network to ensure safe operations continue throughout the life of the project.

The local health network's governing board has also been engaged throughout each stage of the clinical aspects of the project, and the network will manage required communications around site planning and logistics to ensure hospital end users receive appropriate information concerning the development. Broader consultation on the new Mount Barker hospital project is ongoing, including with clinicians, workforce, industrial bodies, and the Mount Barker and Adelaide Hills communities.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the new Mount Barker hospital clinical services building and central energy plant. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Melissa Nozza, Director, Capital Projects, Infrastructure, Department for Health and Wellbeing; Dave Forster, Director General, Government of South Australia; Kylie Williams, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network; Layton Waters, Manager, Major Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Matthew Raven, Director, Swanbury Penglase Architects. I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for Kavel for his written statement in support of this project in his electorate.

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

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NEW NORTHERN SUBURBS HIGH SCHOOL

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:43): I move:

That the 153rd report of the committee, entitled New Northern Suburbs High School, be noted.

The Department for Education, from here on referred to as the department, projects that population growth in the northern suburbs will soon exceed the capacity for the constrained sites of existing schools in the region. In the 2024-25 state budget, the state government allocated \$155.3 million for a new high school for the northern suburbs. The new year 7-12 school will be built at Petheron Road, Eyre, in the City of Playford, where it will be located near existing and future residential developments.

The project will be delivered in accordance with the department's design standards, which set out requirements of accommodation, functions and technical specifications, ensuring contemporary educational facilities and resources that will improve accessibility to a high-quality local public education for students in, and nearby, the new housing developments in the area. The new high school will cater for 1,300 students and provide:

- a high-quality teaching and learning environment reflective of modern pedagogies;
- emerging learning options and pathways to further education;
- a learning environment that reflects the local Aboriginal knowledge, histories and cultural practices;
- the enhanced wellbeing of learners and staff, fostered across both internal and outdoor learning spaces; and
- strong partnerships in collaboration with families, local business and organisations to build ties between the new high school and the community.

Design development also envisions the school to act as an integrated hub with the local neighbourhood, reflecting the characteristics and aspirations of the local community.

Three options were considered when developing the project. Option 1 planned adding modular buildings at the existing Riverbanks College to support an additional 150 places, which does not address anticipated long-term growth. Option 2 proposed a new two-storey building at the Riverbanks College for 250 students, and construction of a new 1,000-place school at the proposed site on Petherton Road. This option was rejected, as it was deemed there was inappropriate space at Riverbanks College, and that it would also cause significant disruption during construction. The preferred option, option 3, proposed a new 7 to 12 school for 1,300 students at the proposed site on Petherton Road. The scope of works included:

- an administration, library and staff centre building;
- four learning community buildings;
- a health, fitness and performing arts building;
- design, art, technologies and science facilities;
- a cultural and wellbeing centre;
- new sporting fields and courts;
- external landscaping and outdoor learning areas; and
- car parking for staff and visitors.

Construction is expected to commence this December, with the anticipation to be complete in December 2027 in time for the first school term of 2028.

The project is expected to cost \$155.3 million, and recurrent costs of the school's operation as a result of this project will be funded from within the department's existing budget. The project site currently spans two certificates of title—Lot 104 and Lot 106 Petherton Road—and the department is working with Renewal SA to redraw the boundaries to create a single title. Once complete, it will be transferred from Renewal SA to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Land purchase transactions are expected to be completed by the end of the year.

The project implementation process governs the delivery of prescribed construction projects. As a prescribed construction project, the new northern suburbs high school will be managed and delivered by DIT (Department for Infrastructure and Transport) in accordance with the relevant requirements. The lead professional services contractor and cost management contractor have been appointed, and construction contractors will be appointed utilising general conditions of contract. All tenders have been sought from construction contractors registered in the applicable DIT prequalification system category.

Delivery of the project will follow best practice principles for project procurement and management as advocated by the state government and construction authorities, including:

- evaluation and review of solutions against the brief;
- preparation of a project program that reflects the scope of the project;
- development of formal communications;
- channels between end users, stakeholders and the department;
- establishment of a cost plan;
- scheduling of regular audit reviews of design documentation and construction progress; and
- identification and management of potential risks and implementation of mitigation strategies.

The design team has approached design with consideration of sustainability outcomes and considerations, including:

- a built form that leverages passive heating and cooling;
- consideration of solar power for onsite energy generation;
- energy-efficient lighting, heating and cooling systems;
- water-efficient fixtures, and landscaping that is drought-tolerant and minimises irrigation needs;
- selection of sustainably and ethically sourced materials, where possible; and
- a preference for recycled and re-used materials.

The department states native title has been extinguished at the project site and a search of the central archive identified no entries for Aboriginal sites at the location. It also states there are no state or local heritage places or items at this site.

The department states it is in ongoing consultation with local primary and high schools, noting that the new high school will be part of a network of schools across the northern suburbs of Adelaide. In lieu of an existing school community and leadership team for the new school, relevant subject matter experts have been consulted in the development of the brief. Once the school principal and senior staff have been appointed, they will be closely involved with further development of the project. The project team has also received input from DIT, Renewal SA and the local community concerning design and development.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the new northern suburbs high school. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Helen Doyle, Director, Capital Projects and Technical Services, Department for Education; Layton Waters, Manager, Major Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Michael Lambert, Director of Brown Falconer. 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.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: PETITION NO. 60 OF 2024, SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:49): I move:

That the 50th report of the Social Development Committee, entitled Petition No. 60 of 2024, South Australian Museum, be noted.

Petition No. 60 of 2024 was presented to the House of Assembly by the Hon. John Gardner on 28 August 2024. It contains 10,561 signatures of South Australian residents following the announcement in February 2025 of a proposed restructure and reimagining of research collections, divisions and exhibitions and saw an inquiry into various governance, staffing, budgetary and other matters related to the SA Museum and its administration.

The Social Development Committee received the petition on 5 June 2025 and commenced its inquiry. The committee notes the Premier, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas MP, established an independent review of the SA Museum in April 2024 to inquire into the proposed restructure of SA Museum and to examine the options going forward. The review panel reported on 19 September 2024 making six recommendations, all of which were accepted by the SA government.

Following this review, and the recommendations made, the SA government made commitments to support the SA Museum in developing its future strategy and committed a \$4.1 million injection of funds over two years. During the time the independent review panel was inquiring into the SA Museum, the Statutory Authorities Review Committee resolved on 13 May 2024 to inquire into and report on the SA Museum and the Art Gallery of South Australia.

That inquiry addressed other aspects of the SA Museum's administration, such as the role of the SA Museum Board, the funding program and the involvement of the community in the SA Museum's future. The Statutory Authorities Review Committee tabled its final report on 19 August 2025, making nine recommendations to assist the SA Museum in the future.

The Social Development Committee reviewed these two preceding inquiries, the recommendations made and the SA government's commitment to the future of the SA Museum. The committee determined that the terms for inquiry requested by Petition 60 of 2024 have been properly considered and addressed in the reports and recommendations of the preceding two inquiries. I commend to the house the 50th report of the Social Development Committee.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (11:51): I rise to make a brief contribution thanking the Social Development Committee for their report into the petition into the South Australian Museum. This report came off the back of more than 10,000 South Australians signing a petition to try to protect the South Australian Museum and to try to protect science, in particular at the South Australian Museum, which was presented to this house by the member for Morialta. I want to commend his work in gathering some 10,561 signatures on this petition, which I think demonstrates the significant regard in which the Museum is held by so many South Australians and demonstrates the deep concerns that were raised in the community by what was being proposed by the Museum and, indeed, what was being proposed by the Malinauskas Labor government.

I thank the member for Morialta and many other members of this place who helped gather those signatures on the petition, standing out the front of the South Australian Museum for many, many hours. I think the members for Heyden and Unley have been there doing it and, indeed, the Liberal candidates for both Unley and Dunstan have gathered many of those signatures as well.

That effort, of course, was being done side-by-side with a really concerned local community. I want to particularly acknowledge a couple of those community leaders, who are my own constituents, being Antony and Mary Lou Simpson, for the work that they did in shining a light on this issue and in trying to protect what is a beloved cultural institution here in South Australia.

Reaching that 10,000 threshold for a petition to be referred to a committee is not something that happens very often and when it does happen we should pay attention to the issue that is being raised. I think the proposal that was being raised and suggested was extremely concerning for not only the local community but the thousands of people from across the state, the country—indeed, the world—who signed this petition and expressed concerns.

The proposals would have drastically downgraded the scientific research capability at the South Australian Museum. They would have seen the loss of some 27 expert researchers, work that simply is not being done anywhere else, which would have been a devastating blow for the scientific capacity of the South Australian Museum. We also fear the reimagining that was being proposed could have seen some very unwelcome and indeed radical changes to the Museum galleries, including potentially the loss of some of the most beloved displays at the South Australian Museum.

I remember speaking to South Australians out the front of the Museum, while we were gathering signatures on petitions, and hearing South Australians of all ages and from all across the state talking about their fond memories of the Museum and their love for galleries like the Egyptian Room, for example, and the mammal collection. What was being proposed rightly caused a lot of concern in the community and should never have been proposed in the first place. Let's not forget that it has only been stopped now because of the work that was done by the local community; there was a huge amount of backlash in the local community for these fairly outrageous proposals.

Standing side by side with the community, those thousands of people, was the Liberal opposition, standing up for our cultural institutions, standing up for the South Australian Museum to ensure it can keep being enjoyed for generations to come, because again—and make no mistake about this either—these were proposals that were backed by the Malinauskas Labor government. That is very, very clear. Indeed, the Premier's own department was providing resources to the South Australian Museum management in implementing the proposed restructure.

Make no mistake: these were supported by the Malinauskas Labor government, and they have only been stopped after there was significant backlash in the community, after there was pressure from the opposition, after the Premier was embarrassed into activating what is fast becoming the favoured mechanism for putting out fires caused by his ministers, the Premier's Review, which is becoming a bit commonplace around this parliament. This led to the pausing of this restructure and a review of this restructure, and, hopefully, a different strategic direction for the South Australian Museum. I say hopefully, because while we of course welcome the abandoning of this reimagining it should not have been imagined in the first place.

We do fear that the battle is not over, because the South Australian Museum, like so many of our cultural institutions, has for a long time now been finding themselves in a financial situation where they are being asked to do ever more with ever less. It was as recently as budget estimates this year that we heard that perhaps the Museum budget, the operating grant being given to the Museum, is being reduced again.

Even on the back of the year or two of controversy that we have seen at the South Australian Museum, the year or two of South Australians expressing their love for the South Australian Museum, what do we see in terms of funding? I asked the minister about funding at estimates and was told that the South Australian Museum received an operating grant of \$13.57 million in 2024-25 but this year has received a letter saying they will receive \$11.454 million. As if trying to cut 27 scientific jobs last year at the Museum was not enough, as if trying to shut down iconic and beloved galleries was not enough, what we see now is the latest attack on the South Australian Museum from those opposite.

What the Museum deserves, as do all our cultural and arts institutions, is sustainable and long-term funding, not short-term sugar hits whenever Premier Malinauskas needs to clean up a mess that has been made by one of his ministers. If we do not see that, we will find ourselves back in this situation again. It will be death by a thousand cuts at the South Australian Museum—but we will be there watching.

The community will be there watching, because they have expressed loud and clear through this petition that they want to see a South Australian Museum backed with funding, that we are protecting researchers and protecting beloved galleries so that it is a place of not only education but inspiration and world-class research for many generations of South Australians to come. Doing anything less risks short-changing the next generation of South Australians, because the Museum is an institution cherished by all South Australians. This petition demonstrates that.

Debate adjourned.

Bills

NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW (RETAILER OF LAST RESORT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an

act to amend the National Energy Retail Law (South Australia) Act 2011 and to make related amendments to the National Electricity (South Australia) Act 1996. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Retailer of Last Resort, or RoLR, scheme is a vital safety net designed to protect energy consumers and maintain uninterrupted energy supply in the event of a retailer's failure.

The scheme is overseen by the Australian Energy Regulator (AER), working alongside the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) and energy retailers.

It transfers impacted customers to designated RoLRs in situations such as retailer insolvency, market suspension, or when a retailer stops operating. Historically, it has operated smoothly, with only four activations between 2012 and 2022, and no major interruptions to service.

However, Russia's invasion of Ukraine in early 2022 led to a sharp surge in wholesale electricity and gas prices, resulting in ten retailer failures and the first use of the AER's gas directions power. In response, in June 2022, Energy Ministers tasked the Australian Energy Market Commission with re-examining its earlier review of the scheme.

In August 2022, Energy Ministers agreed in principle with the AEMC's updated recommendations and committed to reforming the RoLR framework as part of wider initiatives to bolster retail market resilience during volatile periods and an unprecedented spike in RoLR events.

Following public consultation, Energy Ministers approved the amendments that are set out in the *National Energy Retail Law (Retailer of Last Resort) Amendment Bill 2025* on 6 December 2024.

This Bill puts those reforms into action. It fortifies the scheme's operations, increases market durability, and improves the handling of retailer failures. It offers greater assurance to participants, lowers financial risks, and fosters competition while placing consumer protections at the forefront. The AER will maintain oversight, including ongoing monitoring and scope for additional changes based on further AEMC guidance.

I will now speak to these critical reforms in more detail.

The Bill enhances clarity in cost recovery arrangements. At present, designated RoLRs can face substantial costs such as acquiring extra energy or hedging contracts—with recovery decisions left to broad AER discretion. This uncertainty can complicate financing and cash flow, particularly in large-scale failures. The reforms amend the principles to allow recovery of all prudently incurred costs, including administrative, energy, and financing expenses. They define eligible cost types, introduce fast-tracked cost recovery applications within three months, restrict scheme alterations to significant errors, and clarify recovery via distributor payments. These adjustments will build retailer trust, simplify access to finance, and motivate more retailers to step up as RoLRs, thereby distributing risks and sustaining market competition over the long term.

The Bill also extends the AER's window for designating RoLRs to up to 72 hours following a RoLR event, moving away from reliance on pre-set default RoLRs. This extension enables the AER to select multiple or alternative RoLRs after the event, inform AEMO, and distribute customers more effectively. It also clarifies the role of default RoLRs while guaranteeing uninterrupted supply, reducing the chance of chain-reaction failures and maintaining market variety by preventing customers from clustering with a handful of large retailers.

The Bill amends AEMO's credit support demands by establishing a one-week grace period for designated RoLRs, followed by gradual increases over four weeks, to account fully for the added customer load. Current requirements for swift increases can pressure retailers during unstable times, risking suspensions. Amendments to the National Electricity Law (NEL) and Rules (NER) permit the Minister to make initial rules to implement this phased approach, striking a balance between RoLR responsibilities and the risks to generator payments. This will encourage involvement, enable precise credit adjustments as customers transition, and ease immediate financing pressures.

The Bill also eliminates overly rigid language in RoLR plan requirements, granting the AER more leeway in crafting, upholding, and implementing these plans. Such plans detail event procedures and exercises for participants, but strict timelines presently hinder flexibility. These minor revisions will improve efficiency for everyone, aiding better preparation without undue restrictions.

The Bill permits RoLRs to provide transferred customers with a 'designated contract', based on the terms and conditions of a market retail contracts (MRCs). This reform provides an alternative to the RoLR deemed retail arrangements and has the goal of attracting wider participation and offering customers more affordable, competitive options. Transferred customers currently default to deemed retail arrangements equivalent to SRCs, which can be

more expensive than market alternatives. Retailers may now inform the AER if it is willing to transfer customers on to a designated contract, ensuring these contracts meet core safeguards:

- Contain the same terms and conditions as a market retail contract,
- Prices not exceeding the RoLR's standing offer prices,
- No price increase for the first three months,
- No exit fees for breaking the contract during the first three months, and
- Adherence to NERL and NERR standards.

Most importantly, the reforms ensure a small customer transferred to the designated RoLR's designated contract will not be in a worse position than if the customer had been transferred to the registered RoLR's standard retail contract.

Explicit informed consent is not required in relation to the designated contract. The intent of the RoLR scheme is to avoid interruption to customer supply by having pre-established contractual arrangements. The designated contract must be published on the RoLR's website.

The AER will evaluate and oversee these requirements through guidelines, mandating records and follow-up communications. After three months, prices may increase if customers are properly notified via best endeavours, in line with the AER's Better Bills guidelines to promote engagement. This approach balances benefits for consumers with incentives for retailers, lowering obstacles to joining the scheme.

Finally, the Bill adjusts the deadline for responding to AER directions on gas supply and pipeline capacity from 'immediate' to within 24 hours of the RoLR notice. Current requirements lack clear enforceability, creating compliance issues. This modification enhances precision and feasibility, aligning with the extended designation timeframe without compromising supply.

I commend the Bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provision

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *National Energy Retail Law*

4—Amendment of section 132—Designation of registered RoLR for RoLR event

This amendment relates to the designation of a registered RoLR for a RoLR event.

5—Amendment of section 135—AER RoLR Guidelines

This amendment adds an additional matter that the AER RoLR Guidelines must specify.

6—Amendment of section 136—Issue of RoLR notice

This amendment includes another requirement for a RoLR notice.

7—Amendment of section 137—RoLR notice—direction for gas

This amendment includes a requirement connected with a direction for gas.

8—Insertion of sections 148A to 148C

New sections 148A to 148C are inserted:

148A—Designated contract for RoLR

This section relates to designated contracts for RoLRs relating to transferring small customers.

148B—Transfer of customers to designated RoLR with designated contract

This section includes provisions relating to the transfer of customers to a designated RoLR with designated contracts.

148C—Keeping records about, and giving information to, transferred customers

This section relates to requirements for keeping records about, and giving information to, transferred customers.

9—Amendment of section 163—Contents of RoLR plans

These amendments are technical or consequential.

10—Amendment of section 166—RoLR cost recovery schemes

Additional provisions are included in relation to RoLR cost recovery schemes.

11—Amendment of section 167—RoLR cost recovery scheme distributor payment determination

This amendment provides that a RoLR cost recovery scheme distributor payment determination may involve distributors making payments to satisfy the full costs of the scheme.

12—Amendment of section 168—Amendment of schemes and determinations

These amendments make provision in relation to the amendment of schemes and determinations.

13—Amendment of Schedule 1—Savings and transitionals

Savings and transitional provisions are inserted for the purposes of the measure.

Schedule 1—Related amendments to *National Electricity Law*

1—Amendment of section 2—Definitions

Certain definitions are inserted for the purposes of the measure.

2—Amendment of section 6—Ministers of participating jurisdictions

The defined term *South Australian Minister* is substituted into this provision.

3—Amendment of heading to Part 7, Division 2, Subdivision 1

This amendment is consequential.

4—Insertion of section 90EH

New section 90EH is inserted:

90EH—South Australian Minister to make initial Rules relating to credit support for RoLR events

This section provides for the South Australian Minister to make initial Rules relating to credit support for RoLR events.

5—Amendment of section 90F—South Australian Minister may make Rules on recommendation of MCE and Energy Security Board

The defined term *South Australian Minister* is substituted into this provision.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Teague.

NURSE AND MIDWIFE TO PATIENT RATIOS BILL*Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 17 September 2025.)

Clause 17 passed.

Clauses 18 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

Mrs HURN: In relation to consultation for changing the regulations, can the minister confirm the process that the government will go through? Throughout the bill, there is mention that there is a requirement to consult with the relevant union, that is, the ANMF, but is there a requirement to do so for the change of regulations?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: While there is no formal requirement in the legislation, it would be the government's intention and, certainly from my perspective, commitment that we would consult with the ANMF. This is always something which is closely scrutinised by our friends in the Legislative Review Committee as to what consultation has occurred. I dare say, if the ANMF had not been consulted they would be knocking on doors in the Legislative Council pretty quickly to seek to have

some disallowance motion tabled. I think any government would be very minded to make sure they consulted with the ANMF about any regulations.

Clause passed.

Schedule 1.

Mrs HURN: Minister, just for the benefit of the house and members present, can you go through the details as to how the categories were determined?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The basis, as per previous discussion, is that we have been looking at the Victorian legislation, which has been in place for some time, so seeking a guide from Victoria in terms of the alignment of our hospitals versus their hospitals for where they would fit. That is then layered with a look at factors, such as the number of presentations, the number of beds, the acuity of patients in different hospitals, to reach the categorisations that are set out in the legislation. Of course, that has also been subject to negotiation with the ANMF.

Mrs HURN: Minister, in relation to category 3 and category 4 hospital sites, there have been many contributions, particularly from regional members of parliament, that potentially unforeseen consequences of the ratios could lead to a closure in beds and/or wards if the requisite nurses are not able to get to those regional communities. Can you give a guarantee that no beds or wards will be closed as a result of this bill?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That is certainly the government's intention. Similarly, at the moment, we have in place nursing hours per patient day already. It is fundamental, when considering this legislation, to understand that beds equal nurses. We cannot open beds unless we have nurses to staff them. That is true as a matter of course, otherwise it would be a completely unsafe proposition. That has always been the case, whether it is Labor governments, Liberal governments, whether this is legislated or not, we need nurses to be able to staff beds across our health system.

That is why we have been so busy making sure that we are increasing our nursing workforce not just in the city areas but across country areas as well. That is a key matter of patient safety. Certainly, our intention, as no doubt all members of the house are aware, is increasing the number of beds across the health system and therefore increasing the workforce. You cannot increase the number of beds unless you also increase the amount of workforce, and that has been fundamental to the work that we have been doing.

Mrs HURN: How will a surge in demand or staff shortages be managed in regional communities with a limited workforce? Obviously, when it comes to the category 1 sites and particularly the category 2 hospital sites, it is much easier to fill any staff vacancies as a result of sickness and the like, but that becomes more and more challenging the more rural and remote you get in South Australia. Can you talk us through what the plan is to manage the surge in demand and any staff shortages?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Obviously, there are a number of different factors. One, of course, is that we have incentives which are part of our nursing workforce payments for regional areas. The more remote and difficult the area is to recruit to, the higher the incentive is to give to nurses and midwives to work there. That is a fundamental characteristic of what we have as part of our enterprise bargaining agreement already. Obviously, it is subject to further negotiations, which are happening at the moment as part of the nursing workforce enterprise bargaining agreement.

Secondly, as we were talking about yesterday, the hospital teams do everything that they possibly can at the moment in terms of making sure that they can cover the shifts, keep hospitals open and keep those beds open because, whether we pass this legislation or not, they need to be able to staff the beds to open the beds. That is something that happens today and it will happen tomorrow if this legislation is passed.

There are a variety of different mechanisms. If people need to be called in to do an additional shift, sometimes that happens. If we need to use agency staffing, that sometimes happens but, of course, we want to increase the workforce who are staffed employees of SA Health as much as possible. We have had some success with that. Yesterday, we went through the figures of over 200 nurses who we have brought onto the books above the rate of attrition, coming into SA Health

in country areas. That has been very positive but there is no doubt there is more that we need to do and we know that there are particular areas, the more remote you get, where those difficulties become more acute.

One that springs to mind is Coober Pedy. Coober Pedy has long been an issue where we have faced workforce shortages. We are doing a number of different things there to try to address that. We are upgrading the accommodation for nurses, which has always been a bit of a substandard accommodation, to be able to bring in nurses to work there. We have also been trialling other methods, including FIFO nurses to Coober Pedy, given its very remote location and how difficult it has been to attract workers who want to live in the Coober Pedy town itself.

That is an extreme example. That is certainly not commonplace across the rest of regional South Australia. Compare it to areas, for instance, such as the Limestone Coast, where we have in place there a nursing school. That is a great opportunity for us to train nurses in the local area to work in the local area. There have been bumps along the way. The previous member for Mount Gambier raised a number of times how we can better support those nurses through their clinical placements. We are working on that to make sure that we can increase that pathway. We have increased substantially the pathway of graduate nurses in the Limestone Coast, for example.

In the Yorke and Northern area, there is another example where we have been working between Yorke and Northern and the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network (NALHN) to better connect those services. This is all about making the training closer to home. This has increased the pipeline of nurses coming into Yorke and Northern because rather than having to conduct a lot of their training, for instance, at the RAH or Flinders, they can conduct as much as possible of it locally in the Yorke and Northern region.

To the extent that some of it needs to happen in a major metropolitan hospital such as at the Lyell McEwin, which is obviously closer to the Yorke and Northern region, this has proved very beneficial for those nurses. The fact that the federal government is now paying for those clinical placements has certainly made it a much better pathway for those nurses. The short answer to the question is we are doing everything that we possibly can and that is irrespective of whether this bill passes or not.

Mrs HURN: Just to be clear, minister, if a ratio is not met in a ward, what is the practical next step? If there is an acknowledgement by the hospital or the leading team on that ward, and there is an acknowledgement that the ratio is not there, what is the next step for that ward or the beds that are there? Do they have a reduction in beds to ensure that there is the requisite number of nurses? What practically happens?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: In the current enterprise bargaining agreement already—and this is from back in 2022—there already is an escalation pathway where the nursing hours per patient day, which are now translating to ratios, cannot be met. There is a local escalation process which includes reallocation of patients, prioritisation of nursing and midwifery activities within the patient care area, deployment of nurses and midwives from other patient care areas, additional hours for part-time staff, overtime and engagement of casual and agency nursing staff. So a combination of those measures are the measures that are used. That is obviously the escalation path when it is understood that the ratio is not being met.

Mrs HURN: Just to be clear: the closure of a bed or a ward is not part of any escalation strategy or pathway?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: No, it is not part of that list that I mentioned. Obviously we would want to make sure that every stop would be taken before that would have to be considered, because patients need to be looked after. For example, we have a lot of nurses who do very important roles but are not necessarily patient-facing, and a reallocation of those activities to be patient-facing in those times when there is particular strain in a particular area is a sensible method that is part of the existing escalation pathway—as well as, of course, overtime, using casual staff, increasing the part-time hours of nurses and using agency nurses.

Mrs HURN: What is the timeframe in terms of that escalation strategy? Say if we go to a regional hospital and a ratio is not there, obviously with all of the items that are listed in the escalation

policy a number of those things would take some time to implement. Is there a period of time where it is acceptable to not have a ratio met?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think most of those things can happen quite quickly. Taking a staff member from a non patient-facing area—whether they are doing training, a management role or an education role—and bringing them to a patient-facing role can happen rapidly. Giving somebody overtime can happen rapidly. So quite a few of those things can happen quite immediately.

Ms PRATT: Minister, in relation to categories, the bill—as per the Health Care Act 2008—gives us a definition of 'incorporated hospital'. None of the hospitals within my electorate of Frome are listed specifically, so they are captured as small country hospitals. What is it about the definition, then, that precludes hospitals like Clare, Jamestown, Burra, Balaklava, Kapunda and Eudunda from being captured in a category?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: There has been work done looking at the exact bed numbers, and the hospitals that have been mentioned are obviously smaller hospitals comparative to the ones that are specifically legislated here. We are just seeing if we can find the exact bed numbers for what you have mentioned, and if we can we will come back to you.

Mr TELFER: Thank you, minister, for looking with us especially as local members to try to understand this bill, which is introducing nurse to patient ratios, on behalf of our communities. Obviously as the member for Flinders I am interested in what ramifications there might be or what potential there might be for my community.

Looking at the category 3 hospital sites and the Port Lincoln Health Service, the one on that list that is the furthest away from Adelaide, can you provide some reassurance, some confidence, to my community that having these ratios in place is not going to put at risk any of the existing services or the existing bed numbers? It is, as I said, the hospital that is the most remote as far as distance from Adelaide goes. Can you provide some certainty for my community that this is not going to have a negative impact on those who rely on the Port Lincoln Hospital and Health Service for their ongoing health needs?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I can, and I would in fact argue that this will have a benefit to the Port Lincoln community. To the extent that the member is worried about risks, those risks exist whether or not this legislation is passed, because we have commitments already in terms of nursing hours per patient day. This will make it clearer. This will make it easier. This will mean, I think, that the staff have a much clearer understanding of the ratios that will need to be in place and the methods that will need to happen to make sure that they can be met. For patients, hopefully that will mean a better experience overall, and safer staffing for the staff who work at Port Lincoln as well.

Mr TELFER: I think I have 10 hospitals in my electorate, obviously one here that has been categorised as a category 3. With the remaining, can you give me an insight into what, if anything, this legislation means for those smaller communities? We obviously have some hospitals that have smaller bed numbers but we have some more significant health-needs communities, such as Ceduna. Can you give me an idea as to the categorisation, and what the expectations are on those hospitals that are not categorised? I am thinking Tumby Bay, Cummins, Streaky Bay, but also Ceduna, which is a real health hub for the far west and for the Indigenous communities which rely on that health service.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Firstly, I do acknowledge the member has a lot of hospitals. I have visited them all, as I have visited every hospital in South Australia, and there are some incredible hospitals in some very remote locations across the state with staff doing amazing work. To get into category 4—and this goes back to the question that was raised earlier, and we have been able to find the categorisation in answer to the member for Frome's question—hospitals have between 25 and 29 inpatient beds and they also include specialty services such as accident and emergency, chemotherapy and surgical services; and they staff their accident emergency service separately and in addition to the inpatient areas. They set those hospitals apart from the smaller hospitals that do not fit into category 4.

There are a variety of different hospitals that fit into category 4. Obviously Ceduna hospital, which is one that has been mentioned, is much bigger than Cleve hospital for example. We are doing

some further work looking at this, and in conjunction with ANMF in terms of whether there are any other hospitals that may well in the future need to be part of category 4, and I would have thought Ceduna would be one of those ones that we are looking at.

In terms of the very small hospitals, say, for example, Cleve, the one-plus-one staffing, which is essentially taken from what currently is the practice and is brought into this legislation would apply and, of course, this legislation is also consistent with the aged-care federal rules that apply in terms of staffing requirements as well, so I would not anticipate any change for those staffing models.

The other thing to say is that, even for a hospital in the category of Ceduna, where we have additional staffing requirements as part of the enterprise bargaining agreement already, they are preserved. As I mentioned yesterday, no one is going backwards in terms of what staffing they would have, and so if Ceduna hospital has particular requirements that we have as part of the EB already, that will be maintained irrespective of whether they are a category 4 hospital in the legislation.

Mr ELLIS: I have a couple of questions around the categories as well. By way of background, the minister will be well aware that I have been battling to increase the size of Wallaroo Hospital for some time, and I just have a few questions around its categorisation. Firstly, you have just outlined that category 4 hospitals are between 25 and 29 inpatient beds. My understanding is that the Wallaroo Hospital is only funded for 21 beds. It often runs at a higher number than that because there are some beds left over from the shutting of the private hospital that it often used, but I just want to confirm the number of beds funded at the Wallaroo Hospital as being 21.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I will take that on notice.

Mr ELLIS: The other follow-up question I have on that front is that I have been calling, and it features as part of the health petition that was tabled in this place some time ago, for Wallaroo to be lifted to a comparable standard to the Port Pirie hospital. We often feel on the YP that it is a secondary hospital and that Port Pirie is a major hub for our LHN. I personally would like to see that rectified. The fact that Wallaroo is listed as a category 4 hospital and will therefore have a lesser ratio than Port Pirie as a category 3 hospital once this becomes law would seem to be supportive of the fact that it is a lesser hospital.

I ask for confirmation on that front because, in reference to the health petition inquiry that we had and the hearing in Yorketown specifically, we had the CEO of the local health network down there, Roger Kirchner, who said:

Also Wallaroo and Port Pirie, from a service delivery point of view, actually do the same level and care of services. I believe that Port Pirie is slightly higher in chemo...

The CEO of our local health network has them operating at the same level, but this bill has them at different categories and thereby different ratios, and thereby Wallaroo has a lesser level of nurse coverage.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Firstly, I acknowledge the member's unwavering advocacy on behalf of Wallaroo Hospital and on behalf of other hospitals on Yorke Peninsula as well. I would not characterise it as the member has—that a different category in this therefore leads to a different level of service—but it is a reflection of the current status in terms of, as we said, bed numbers, presentations, etc. I think it can be well anticipated that over time we will see Wallaroo Hospital grow. The population will see growth on Yorke Peninsula, and I certainly would regard it as an area where we will see growth in the level of activity that the state government deploys to SA Health to deliver at Wallaroo Hospital.

As the member knows, I have not accepted his proposition that it is a sort of either/or proposition for Wallaroo versus Port Pirie, and nor have I accepted the proposition that changing the boundaries of the local health network would lead to some significant changes in terms of healthcare provision for Wallaroo Hospital or the people on Yorke Peninsula more broadly. That is obviously a matter which is now being considered by our colleagues on the Economic and Finance Committee of the parliament.

So, in terms of legislation, I think it is an accurate reflection of where those categorisations of hospitals, based on the nursing numbers, need to be. But that is not to give or take anything away

in terms of the fact that I agree with the member that Wallaroo Hospital is an area where growth will need to happen in the future.

Mr ELLIS: If growth does occur in the not-too-distant future, and it is made to be a bigger hospital with a significantly larger number of beds, will it require the passage of an amendment bill through both houses of this parliament to lift it from category 4 to whatever category it might well rise to?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: No, we will be able to do that through regulation.

Mr PEDERICK: Noting that Murray Bridge hospital is a category 3 hospital, has the minister completed any modelling that shows what staff requirements will be needed to keep it fully staffed across all shifts? By that I mean modelling around full-time nurses, agency nurses and the need for interstate agency nurses to fill shifts.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Similar to the previous questions I have answered, we have nursing hours per patient day requirements at the moment. Those need to be met by our local health networks, and there is a variety of different mechanisms to do that. We have increased staffing, we have ambitions to do that even more, and we are improving the work that we do in terms of the recruitment of graduate nurses into South Australia. We are very ambitious in that regard.

The other thing to say is that there is a two-year transition in terms of this legislation. We would expect all our local health networks to have their own local plans about their implementation of this, and making sure that they have the appropriate number of staff is a key requirement that they have not only now but also into the future for when this legislation comes in at the end of that transition period.

Mr PEDERICK: With that answer, can you guarantee that no beds will be shut at Murray Bridge, with the proposition being that 86 more nurses will be trained, and obviously there will be access to agency nurses?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: There is certainly no intention at all to close beds in Murray Bridge. In fact, I would imagine that, over the course of years, there would be an increase in the service provision that we have in Murray Bridge, given the growth of population that is expected as part of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan. As I mentioned before, whether or not this legislation is passed, to have beds we need nurses, so we will need to make sure we have the requisite number of nurses to meet growing need, and that is true whether or not we pass this legislation.

Mr PEDERICK: In regard to my two other hospitals at Strathalbyn and Mannum being smaller hospitals and quite necessary for those communities, what guarantees can the minister give that they will always have the required level of service under this plan? From what I understand, because they are not listed, they will be in the smaller hospital category.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: There is no change to the current requirements, so either there is the minimum staffing requirements for those hospitals or, if there is a higher level of provision in the current nursing enterprise bargaining agreement, then there would be the same staffing that would currently be the requirement for those hospitals.

Mr BASHAM: My question is around the management within a hospital. It is a while since I have been inside the Southern Fleurieu Health Service hospital, particularly since the private hospital has been absorbed into the public hospital. With the operation of the wards and the nursing ratios, for example, historically certainly—and I am not sure whether that is still the case—the antenatal ward is a separate ward to the surgical ward, and often there can only be one midwife in the antenatal ward. Is it possible that that midwife can nurse in the side-by-side ward and be counted in those ratios for both?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think the short answer is no, it is a shift by shift, area by area work, and the only complication would be the passage of the section that we had yesterday in terms of mixed wards. That is the only complication there, and there are obviously separate provisions about those.

Mr BASHAM: If that is the case, having one midwife in there, for example, would you see patients then being moved into the antenatal ward to become a mixed ward for a period of time so that the nursing needs are spread without actually having to resource both wards?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I do not think that is the intention at all. We obviously talked a little bit yesterday about how the mixed ward arrangements would work, and there are particular requirements in terms of consultation and consideration that need to be put in place in terms of changes to those mixed wards. I can see what the member is trying to suggest, but I do not think that that is an accurate representation.

Ms PRATT: Minister, previously you answered my question about the hospitals that are not captured in the four categories, so the small country hospitals. Was your response that a review will be undertaken or is being considered in terms of those hospitals and perhaps a reclassification of them at some point in the future? For example, Clare Hospital. You can hear that country MPs are passionate about the hospitals in their electorates.

I would argue that Clare is uniquely positioned as a hospital supporting a larger catchment. It is benefiting from \$7.29 million worth of upgrade investment from the government. Ageing populations will require that we preserve the small country hospitals that we have and not lose them. I am concerned that by them not being listed specifically within their own category they will be invisible within this act. However, were you suggesting previously that a review of those categories of small country hospitals is likely in the future?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The short answer is yes, we are doing some more work on that. I think you can pick up my answer in terms of Ceduna and apply it to Clare. As I said, having visited every country hospital in the state, I think Ceduna and Clare are probably the ones that stand out on this list as not being included, so I suspect they will be the ones that we have a close look at.

Mrs HURN: With your indulgence, sir—otherwise, I am happy to hand my questions to the member for Heysen. That might take a little bit longer.

The CHAIR: I am glad you said that.

Mrs HURN: He agrees with me. I just note there are seven pages for schedule 1, and it is quite a complicated—

The CHAIR: And I have been very patient.

Mrs HURN: I am happy to hand the questions over to the member for Heysen.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We are all agreed.

Mrs HURN: Thank you very much for indulgence on this matter. Picking up on the small hospitals, particularly in relation to Tanunda and Angaston in my own local community, can you just potentially take on notice, minister, if you do not have this information at hand, how many beds are currently funded at both of those hospitals? In addition, I put on the record the concern that, at the Tanunda hospital particularly, there has been a reduction in bed numbers due to the inability to attract nurses, so that is a risk that has already been seen played out in my own local community. Do you have any comments on that or guarantees that there will not be a further reduction?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Firstly, can I thank the member for sparing us. This is a 46 to one issue of agreement—or 45 to one at the moment. I will certainly take that matter on notice. I am aware of the local concerns in terms of the two Barossa hospitals on a number of fronts. It is something I am actively raising regularly with the CEO of the Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network, and I am happy to get you an answer between the houses on that.

Mr TELFER: Minister, reflecting on the answers that you have given some of the other regional members, can you also provide, whether that be now or on notice, how many beds are funded at the hospitals that are not categorised under categories 1 to 4, being Tumby Bay, Cleve Cowell, Kimba, Cummins, Elliston, Wudinna, Streaky Bay and Ceduna?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am happy to take that on notice.

Ms PRATT: Minister, reflecting on part 2 and the breakdown of wards, where we see acute stroke, antenatal birthing suites, etc., were mental health nurses considered as requiring their own clause, if you like? If not, can you explain how that nursing ratio applies in country hospitals?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Mental health is not part of this legislation, as the member has reflected upon. That is, I understand, consistent with Victoria. There is current variability in terms of the models of care and the models that different mental health units have in terms of their staffing. It is not just, of course, nursing staffing in mental health; allied health plays a key role in terms of mental health as well, not to mention medical staffing as well. No doubt, it is fair to say, it is something that the ANMF are keen to further consider into the future and will be subject to further work down the track.

Ms PRATT: Chair, if you will allow a supplementary along that theme of how the wards are broken down: in regard to the birthing suites, how confident are you, minister, that where we see workforce shortages with midwives this bill will strengthen the availability of midwives to staff and be on shift for birthing suites, where without them we see the diversion of those services in rural health?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am always envious of ministers who have the ability to make things happen by legislation alone. That certainly is not the case in the health portfolio. I do not think anyone is representing the fact that the passage of this legislation is going to suddenly address every issue. What it is going to do is set the criteria that need to be put in place, and to a large degree they reflect criteria which are in place in many places across our health system at the moment. It will make it clearer and it will put more emphasis on our staff putting in place plans to make sure that they deliver upon that safer staffing in birthing, in general medicine and in a whole range of areas across our state.

We have gone through the process where we were in dire straits in Whyalla, and a huge amount of work has had to happen to now get Whyalla back up and operational. The member for Giles and I some months ago visited the team at Whyalla Hospital. It is an absolutely incredible team of midwives that we have there, who are now delivering more babies than was the case before the suspension of services, in a better unit and with better services.

It is certainly not legislation that delivers that outcome. It is a lot of hard work from the team, and no doubt a fair bit of money as well. This sets the guidance, this sets the framework of what needs to happen, but it is up to those hardworking public servants across our health system. We now have 50,000 people working for SA Health to put this into reality.

Schedule passed.

The CHAIR: Just for the record, there were 21 questions allowed on that schedule.

Schedule 2.

Mrs HURN: Regarding schedule 2, part 2, in relation to the transitional provision, obviously the moratorium period is two years. Can you explain, for the benefit of the house, why it is two years? Was that at the request of the ANMF? Would you like to see this come into effect earlier? Just talk us through that.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think we certainly regard it as important to have a period of transition for this legislation to come into place, to make sure that all the local health networks can gear up and have plans put in place to make it happen. It obviously was a matter of negotiation between us and the ANMF, as per other sections in this legislation. They can speak for themselves, but the advice that I have is that they wanted to make sure that we had a date on which this all switched on. There have been some other models where you sort of switch on hospital by hospital, ward by ward. What we have negotiated here is an outcome where this will all come on in two years' time across all the system that is affected by the legislation.

Mrs HURN: This is potentially supplementary, but could the minister just explain in a little bit more detail about the plans that the LHNs will need to put in place for the ratio? What is the government's plan to communicate with all of the LHNs and all of the hospitals so that they understand what this bill means to ensure the ratios are met?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Firstly, they are certainly aware already of the legislation coming to the parliament—and hello to anybody from our local health networks who is listening to the live stream. All of our local health networks are already working, in terms of their staffing and their workforce planning, at their local level to make sure that they are sustainable. They are already recruiting very significant numbers of graduate nurses but also experienced nurses into the system.

But this, no doubt, will also be another piece of work that they will be undertaking at the local level to make sure that they meet these requirements and are geared up over the course of those two years. I would well expect that we would see health networks geared up well before those two years to have this in operation, but certainly by the end of those two years. This gives them the right amount of notice to have those plans in place.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, you have a further question. Have your colleagues approved this?

Mr TEAGUE: I am certainly very happy to join in with the sentiments earlier expressed. I am looking to continually improve. This sort of takes us back to clause 17, and at least I will just refer to that for the minister's convenience. The moratorium period is two years, and subclause (2) says that a person cannot apply during the moratorium period—so that is all clear.

My question is: by reference to clause 17(3)—the evidence provision that we sort of dealt with last time—is conduct of that nature that is 'expressly, tacitly or impliedly authorised', etc., and deliberate and so on, that occurs during the moratorium period that leads to a claim after the two years going to be admissible as evidence, or is the impugned behaviour constituting the offence having to occur after the end of the moratorium period as well in order to constitute that claim that cannot come until schedule 2, clause 2(2) says, two years down the track?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Thank you to the member for Heysen for his question. He is welcome to ask questions at any time, of course, despite his colleagues trying to stop him. The advice to me is that might well be something that lawyers could sit around and come to different interpretations on, potentially. But I think there are a couple of things to note: one is that what is in part 4, clause 17(4)(a), the matters to which the court would have regard, would obviously be considered as part of that.

The other factor is that if there was a contravention up until this coming into place, then there are already provisions under the nursing enterprise bargaining agreement for an escalation of those matters as well, so we would expect the ANMF or others to raise them under those provisions.

Mr TEAGUE: I am sure that answer helps the committee and then those who have to interpret. The point to underscore here is that it is not the intention of the government to go ahead and give all of these hospitals a kind of two-year pause, obviously. They are all working on compliance straightaway, and it is not to be expected somehow that at the two-year mark they are meeting the criteria or else. It would appear to me, as just one humble member of the committee, that it would be a retrograde step if there was any kind of interpretation of all this that says, 'As long as you have your house in order two years down the track, everything else that happens before is a clean slate.' If there is a capacity to interrogate what happens in the two years to come then it seems that that is clause 17 doing its work.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: In terms of that I would refer you to this schedule's part 2, clause 2(4):

An incorporated hospital must act in good faith and take all reasonable measures to comply with a ratio or minimum staffing requirement during the moratorium period.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (12:51): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (INCLUSIVE EDUCATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 September 2025.)

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (12:51): I rise and indicate I am the lead speaker on this on behalf of the shadow education minister in the other place. Can I just indicate that I am sure in the other place there will be some even more robust discussion and questions on this bill.

The Education and Children's Services (Inclusive Education) Amendment Bill 2025 really stems from responding to the Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability. It is a response, obviously, from an education perspective, which aims to improve inclusive education in South Australia and South Australian schools by, firstly, removing discriminatory enrolment practices and, secondly, increasing transparency in disciplinary actions.

I indicate that the opposition support the bill, but certainly there are some aspects we will be seeking some clarity on during the committee stage and in between the houses and then in the upper house, particularly on the implementation, privacy arrangements and support mechanisms within the bill.

I note that the purposes of the bill—to reflect on those key recommendations from the disability royal commission—are to strengthen protections for students with disability by ensuring they are not unfairly excluded from mainstream education; to promote inclusive education across government and non-government schools, aligning with national and international standards; to ensure accountability through mandatory annual reporting on enrolment, refusals, cancellations and disciplinary actions involving students with disability; and to increase transparency by requiring non-government schools to publish their suspension and expulsion policies and align them with government school standards.

Indeed we do on this side welcome the alignment with the Disability Discrimination Act and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. We also acknowledge the inclusion of non-government schools, and we think it is a really important aspect to ensure that there is consistency and transparency across all sectors of education in South Australia and the confidence which that brings.

We believe this bill is a positive step towards equity but we also recognise the need for there to be careful implementation and also to ensure that there is appropriate and adequate support for schools that will have to deal with this extra obligation which stems from this legislation in particular. I indicate that we will unpack a bit at the committee stage, and I would suggest that in the upper house there will be some areas where we have concerns but also considerations that we will ask questions about.

Firstly, it is around the administrative burden. This bill introduces some new reporting obligations for school principals and, without adequate support, this could potentially divert time and resources away from teaching and student support. We need to ensure, when making decisions in this place, that schools have streamlined systems, they have templates, and they have that lead time to be able to comply effectively with what they are being asked and obligated to do.

There are also some considerations we will be putting forward around behaviour versus disability. The differentiation between behavioural issues and disability-related behaviours is a challenge in this space in particular. It is complex and I reflect on some of the contributions that have already been made on this bill. It must be a focus and, once again, there need to be clear guidelines, and also the capacity to have professional development in this space to be able to avoid both the underaddressing of disruptive behaviour and also the unintentional discrimination against students with a disability.

We are reflecting on the importance of the capacity for independent schools to continue to have their autonomy, and operational autonomy in particular. As I said, we support the overall sector

having the same sorts of guidelines in place and recognise that it is really important, but there does need to be consideration of flexibility in the implementation, I believe, to ensure that compliance does not compromise that independence or that educational philosophy.

There are questions both from the opposition but also from the sector around there being genuine capacity constraints when there are limitations in accepting students due to existing staffing, infrastructure or specialist support. As someone coming from a regional area, I know there are different resourcing challenges faced by regional schools as well.

There are also some questions that we have around privacy and data protection because this bill includes the requirement for pretty detailed reporting, but we need to ensure that student privacy is protected and that data is de-identified, and ensure that there are secure protocols in place, really, to be able to comply with privacy laws and maintain trust. So in indicating that the opposition supports the premise, the motivation, the basis for this bill, we certainly have some areas where I will be seeking some clarity from the minister as we unpack the different aspects in the committee stage, to ensure that there is not either a short-term or ongoing administrative burden on schools, and that there is clarity and transparency about the expectations that this legislation puts on schools.

I think, if we get the balance right, there is a really exciting opportunity for us to ensure that there is not a level of discrimination within our schools, something which should absolutely be avoided when it comes to ensuring that there is a safe place for children with disability in their learning. We know there are some real nuances and some challenges that come with that, but there are some really rewarding stories. In conversations with schools around my electorate, it is always encouraging and rewarding to see when this is done well in schools.

This legislation really does legislate some of the protections which I am sure we have been striving for forever when it comes to education, especially in this space. We need to make sure we get the balance right and I look forward to being able to unpack that a little bit through the committee stage of the consideration of this legislation.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (12:59): Today we take another step towards building a fairer, more inclusive education system, because when we remove barriers and provide the right supports, students with disabilities—I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Public Sector Act 2009—Overseas and Interstate Travel—Premier Report 16 June 2025

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009—

Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission Annual Report 2024-25

Assumed Identities and Witness Identity Protection

Undercover Operations

Independent Commission Against Corruption Annual Report 2024-25

SA Police Annual Report 2024-25

Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee—Annual Report 2024-25

Public Sector Act 2009—

Overseas and Interstate Travel—

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs Report 19 to 21 June 2025

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs Report 1 to 5 August 2025

Minister for Arts Report 24 and 25 July 2025

Minister for Human Services Report 21 to 24 July 2025

*Ministerial Statement***CLOSE, HON. S.E., RESIGNATION**

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) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Today, I resigned from cabinet and announced that I will not contest the next election. Leaving this job, this government and this Premier is the hardest decision I have ever made. I know that leaving politics at a time of my choice and still with enough energy to embrace the next challenge is a rare privilege. Yet, I have wrestled with this decision. I think we each know when our time has come to move on, when what you have given is greater than you have yet to offer in this particular role.

My mother's descent into the mist of dementia these four years has been my alarm bell, reminding me that life is precious, finite and all too short. I had always planned to leave with some fuel in the tank, not to stagger to the finish line but, rather, to still have something to offer. I realise that the time for that must be now, leaving a strong government, an incredible Premier and a team full of talent more than capable of replacing me.

I will miss so much: the Premier, and the extraordinary working partnership we have had for nearly eight years; the Labor team in parliament, full of genuine friends; the wider labour movement, which carries the aspirations of all decent working people; the staff I have had the privilege to work with over the 14 years of my time in parliament; and the public servants in the education, state development and environment portfolios, who make South Australia stronger, fairer and better every day. I have received far more from each of these people than I have ever given.

I will continue to have the honour of representing the people of Port Adelaide into next year and will have more to say nearer the election. The sheer joy of being their member of parliament is the highlight of my career. I will always remain part of that community, although not their representative in this place.

I am part of a long line of people who have stepped into parliament to do something good and have done their best for as long as they can. I leave confident of a government and a South Australia with a bright future and in safe hands.

The SPEAKER: I would like to place on the record my thanks to the Deputy Premier and to wish you all the very best for life after politics. Before I call the Treasurer, I would like to welcome his family to parliament. If anyone has not heard, they are in the house and they are much better behaved than a lot of people have been on the benches over the years. The Treasurer.

MULLIGAN HON. S.C., RESIGNATION

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:04): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and you can now see where I get my conduct from in this place. I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Today I announce I am not standing at the coming state election, and I have also resigned from the ministry. I realise that this will come as a surprise to many, and it draws to a close a career in government and parliament, working at senior levels of three Labor governments under premiers Rann, Weatherill and now Peter Malinauskas, spanning more than 22 years. It is with great pride that this term will see me serve as the member for Lee for 12 years and a minister for almost eight.

Being elected in 2014 as the member for Lee, representing the Largs Bay community at that time, where the Mullighan family comes from, meant an enormous amount to me and my family. Over the 12 years I have been in that role, I have tried to deliver as many improvements as possible for my local community as local MP. I have also been very fortunate to serve as a minister in the

Weatherill and Malinauskas governments, being only the second Labor MP to go straight into cabinet on their election to parliament.

I have sought to get as much done as possible with these opportunities as well, first as Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and now as Treasurer. Certainly, more recently in the portfolio of Treasury, good government starts with its finances, and we financed our ambitious agenda while getting the budget back into surplus and keeping it in surplus. We have improved our credit rating outlook. We have kept our commitment not to increase taxes or introduce new ones and we have the best performing economy in the nation, and we are regarded as the best place in Australia to do business.

However, these roles do take a toll. They require enormous sacrifices, mainly from our families. All of my significant life events have occurred during my time as an MP, from being a newlywed to starting a family with my wife, Antonia, and now having three beautiful children in Ben, Isaac and Olivia. It is actually they who make the greatest sacrifices. Antonia has made sacrifices with her career to do the heavy lifting at home with the family, and I am nowhere near as present as I would like to be with Ben, Isaac and Olivia. They have been extremely generous in giving me the freedom, support and love to allow me to do these roles over the last 12 years. I feel that I have achieved a lot, and now it is time for me to step back and allow the family the freedom and opportunity that so far has been afforded to me. So I am stepping away from politics and from parliament.

I will not lie, though, the decision comes with regret. The work of an MP and of a minister is never done. It is never complete. There is always more work to do, whether it is supporting our constituents or in our portfolios. It is also a regret not being able to serve with some of the finest South Australians who dedicate themselves to public service. It is an extraordinary privilege to have worked with people like the Under Treasurer, Tammie Pribanic; the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Rick Persse; and, during the course of this year, the police commissioner, Grant Stevens. But, most of all, I will miss being part of a team that is delivering stable, united, good government for our state.

Despite these regrets, this is the right time for me to go. We have a once-in-a-generation leader in our Premier. He is the best Premier in the nation and not just by head and shoulders. We have a backbench brimming with talent. Me stepping away provides others the opportunity to contribute in the same way I have over the past 12 years in caucus and in cabinet. I have never held aspirations to be a leader or to pursue a long-term career in politics. I have always been a strong believer in getting in, having a crack and getting as much done as possible and then handing over the reins to the next generation. I am extremely grateful for the opportunities I have had throughout my career.

I have had strong supporters the whole way through, starting with the Premier. There are many of us in cabinet and in caucus who are genuine, long-term friends, not just colleagues. First of all, my thanks go to them from the Premier down. I would also like to thank my constituents who have supported me at three successive elections; my electorate office and ministerial office teams who have supported me every step of the way; my colleagues in the broader labour movement, in particular in Labor Unity; and my friends from outside politics who have put up with 12 years of repeated apologies and cancellations due to work commitments. But most of all to my family, to my wife, Antonia, Ben, Isaac and Olivia: they have given me unconditional support and love and I cannot tell them enough how much I love them and how much they mean to me.

The SPEAKER: Again, I would like to add my thanks to the Treasurer for everything that you have done in this place over the years and, in particular, for the people of Mawson who have been recipients of lots of wonderful infrastructure in your time as transport minister and as Treasurer, so thank you again.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome students from University Senior College who are in with us today and I hope you enjoy your time in parliament. You are guests of the member for Adelaide.

*Parliamentary Committees***ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:11): I bring up the sixth report of the committee, entitled Delivery of Health Services on Yorke Peninsula.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***ALGAL BLOOM**

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Who will be the minister responsible for the harmful algal bloom crisis this summer? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Today the Minister for the Environment has resigned from cabinet.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:12): She is someone interested in facts, not conspiracy.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Premier, who will be the next Treasurer? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Today the ABS announced that South Australia has the worst unemployment rate in the nation. There are now 50,000 people unemployed in our state and the Treasurer announced his resignation today.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:12): No different to the environment minister, who has handled, I think, the unprecedented algal bloom with class and professionalism, the Treasurer of the state has dedicated himself to taking the financial position of the state away from deficit and towards surplus and led the state to having the fastest growing economy in the country.

Having a fast growing economy means that more South Australians are choosing to participate in the labour market, which is why we are seeing the participation rate jump up. We have seen the highest numbers of jobs in the history of the state. We have seen the unemployment rate with a three in the front of it for the first time in the history of the state, not once but 14 times. We have seen the South Australian economy be consistently awarded the best in the nation according to ANZ. The Commonwealth Bank: we are currently second. The ANZ Stateometer has got us best. The Business Council of Australia has got us as the best state in the country to do business. I think the Treasurer can be thanked for all of his hard work and I would add my thanks for his time in the parliament again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is on his final warning. Before I give the call to the leader, it's really annoying when you do that thing where you just like yell out of the corner of your mouth. You have been doing it all day; two minutes into question time. Please continue and maybe just keep the interjections to yourself.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier looked at today's ABS statistics? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Yesterday, the Premier stood over there and espoused how well the economy, he said, was going and making, he said, a 'statement on the basis of facts'. That basis was the ABS. That very same source has today released the latest unemployment figures, which show that South Australia now has the highest unemployment rate in the nation, up 0.6 points to 4.9 per cent.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:15): I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition has taken our advice and started familiarising himself with credible sources of information. That's a practice I would encourage you to maintain. I would also encourage you to—in fact, I noted this morning on ABC radio when you were asked directly whether or not the algal bloom was caused by desal—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order from the deputy leader.

Mr TEAGUE: It's 98(a). I am conscious of the time, and the Speaker has been quick to correct me. This is a direct departure from a straightforward question. The Premier needs to stick to the substance of the question in answering it.

The SPEAKER: He is less than 30 seconds in, and it was hard for me to hear what he was saying because of the noise coming from my left. So maybe if everyone on my right, on my left, keeps it down and then I can hear what the Premier is saying.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Consistent with the Leader of the Opposition—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: He has form, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley, once again, can leave the chamber until the end of question time. One go, but look, 19 years in here, interjecting—I mean, you have had a few warnings over the time, and it came just after I had asked everyone on both sides to keep it down. So enjoy your cup of tea. Come back in with 10 minutes to go, okay?

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The point I was making before the interjection was in terms of—and I will create a connection for the benefit of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—we know that the harmful algal bloom is having an impact on many people within our state. That, of course, has an impact on the economy. To that end, we know that conspiracies should be debunked. The Leader of the Opposition was presented with a direct opportunity live on ABC radio this morning. He was asked point blank about whether or not the algal bloom was caused by the desal plant. He was evasive and that is well noted by everyone who does agree with facts. In respect of the ABS statistics—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Premier, the deputy leader has a point of order.

Mr TEAGUE: 98(a): there is evident defiance of the standing orders. The Premier has continued on the same path that elicited a point of order after a relatively short time—absolutely no regard for that response. The Premier needs to stick to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: It was a bit of a speech, but it's their question time. The Premier might want to get back on track.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Thanks, Mr Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition referred to ABS statistics—which are a credible source of information, as distinct from other sources they often rely upon—and what the ABS statistics make clear is that the participation rate increased by 8,200 people in the most recent numbers, which is a very substantial increase of a full four basis points in terms of percentage.

The participation rate going up necessarily means, of course, that there are more people looking for jobs in South Australia, which is a very good sign. It's something that South Australia has continued to lag in and it's a reflection of the strength of the South Australian economy because, of course, the ABS also confirms—as the Leader of the Opposition might want to familiarise himself

with—that this is the fastest growing economy on the mainland of this country. Our economic growth is outpacing the rest of the nation and that is in no small part because of the Treasurer's good work, along with the work of the government, but more importantly as a result of the work of a large number of people within the private sector of this state with whom this government enjoys a good working relationship.

FEMALE UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. What is the government doing to address the worst female unemployment rate, seasonally adjusted, since September 2022?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:19): What we are doing is making sure that the state's economy continues to perform well and outpace the economic growth we see around the nation. That is the position we enjoy and the position we intend to sustain.

MOUNT BARKER AMBULANCE STATION

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister provide an update on the operational performance of the new Mount Barker Ambulance Station?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:19): Thank you very much to the member for Kavel; I note his extreme level of advocacy on behalf of ambulance services in the Adelaide Hills, particularly in Mount Barker. Cast yourself back to where we were just three years ago. We had a very small, cramped, not fit-for-purpose ambulance station. We had one ambulance serving the community, one 24-hour ambulance crew, despite the massive growth that had happened in the Mount Barker population over the preceding decades and the expected growth to come. That was a wholly unacceptable situation and one that we sought to make sure we remedied, and that is why we prioritised the Mount Barker region for investment in our ambulance service. That is why we committed to a new Mount Barker Ambulance Station and also to additional crews, paramedics and ambulance officers based in Mount Barker and in the Adelaide Hills.

Thanks to the advocacy of the member for Kavel, those things are now there. We now have a brand new ambulance station that is open and we have additional ambulance crews. Of course, in March 2023 an additional 12 paramedics commenced, and then in March 2024 a regional medical transfer team commenced, which had three paramedics and three ambulance officers. Since that time we have seen the crews of Mount Barker responding to an extraordinary increase in the number of cases in the community. Prior to that, of course, those cases were there, but it meant that crews were coming from elsewhere in the Adelaide Hills or from the city to respond, as opposed to crews based locally.

In our first year of government, from March 2022 to February 2023, there were 2,867 cases that were responded to in the Mount Barker community by the Mount Barker crews. In 2024 and 2025 that increased from 2,867 all the way up to 5,202—so a massive increase in cases being responded to locally by the Mount Barker crews, and that is continuing. We are seeing that massive growth continue. In the next six months, from March until August this year, there have been over 3,500 cases just in those six months alone. That is more cases in six months than what used to be seen by crews in an entire year. That means faster response times for local people in the community, and we now have an ambulance station which is fit for purpose for growth into the future.

We have excellent paramedics in Mount Barker. I had the pleasure of meeting a number of them during my time as minister. The morale of those paramedics is high, and the staff are well settled in their brand-new, purpose-built location of the ambulance station as well. It allows faster and quicker access to the freeway, which is obviously very important in accessing not only the Mount Barker region and the growth areas of Mount Barker but also, strategically, across the Adelaide Hills as well, which saves precious minutes when it's about life and death. The shared space and staff crossover improves the on-station collaboration that we have before and after cases and creates better team cohesion.

Adelaide Hills paramedic Gemma Gafney recently completed her paramedicine degree while also working for SAAS and raising two young children, and even adding a stint in Whyalla into the

mix. As well as her paramedicine degree, Gemma also brings her experience as an ambulance officer in our Patient Transport Service before she sets out on a SAAS career pathway. It has allowed her to combine her work with her study. That is just one example of the new paramedics based in the Adelaide Hills, servicing the Mount Barker community.

Of course, this adds to our other investments in Mount Barker, which everyone in Mount Barker can see at the moment: the massive crane that has been erected for the new Mount Barker Hospital as well.

NET ZERO

Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister explain how cohesion and discipline within a government can strengthen action on net zero for the people of South Australia, and what are the outcomes of alternative approaches?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:24): Last week I spoke on how cohesion and discipline in government can deliver very strong policy. We have certainly had that with energy policy, and we have received—

Mr Patterson: Highest power prices on record, excellent. Bin the hydrogen. Excellent. Great plan.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett—last warning, which also is your first warning.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suspected my young friend would walk straight into the trap. So I thought what I would do—self-praise is no praise, right? It's better to have people quote what they think about your policy, so I thought what I would do in the chamber is let people know what people have said about Labor's policies on energy:

So the previous Premier—

Jay Weatherill—

was actually a bit of a visionary, and I will give him some credit, not only for that but also for green energy in this state. The current—

that is, the former Liberal—

government can now boast and beat its chest about renewable energy in South Australia, but in actual fact it was the previous Labor government that kickstarted it...

That's high praise.

The Hon. N.D. Champion: Who said that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, there's more:

I acknowledge the work of previous Labor Premier Jay Weatherill and the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis—

now, self-praise means nothing—

in their push for renewables in this state where we now see the state as one of the leaders in the world for producing renewable energy with massive wind farms and solar farms.

That is high praise. Do you know who said that? The watchdog. The Liberal candidate in Waite.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Now, I thought I better check for authenticity, right? So do you check AI, or do you check *Hansard*? I checked *Hansard*, and it's a goal. It's a goal. So when you have got Liberal candidates praising your energy policy, it really undermines the interjections of the shadow minister and undermines his ability to be cohesive. When you have people who are praising the government's policy on energy, it makes you wonder what they must be thinking internally about cohesion: 'Why can't we have the same cohesion the government does?'

There's more. There's more about this lack of cohesion. There are professionals within the Liberal Party who have very different views about net zero. They have very different views about net zero. In fact their party's state director put together a list of policy motions for the Liberal Party to

consider adopting, including some energy policies which I have yet to see released. They include, and wait for it: it calls for an abandonment of net zero targets; pausing building transmission infrastructure to renewable projects—that is, actually using the regulatory powers of the government to stop transmission lines being built to new generation that can lower prices; supporting nuclear power, despite the results of the most recent federal election; and proposing a new nuclear dump in South Australia, something that the previous opposition, the then Marshall opposition, opposed.

So when you see this lack of cohesion, a lack of direction—you have one candidate in the Liberal Party praising the government's policies, then a state council debating whether or not you should even have transmission lines built to renewable energy—it is no wonder the members opposite lack the cohesion to form a government.

NET INTERSTATE MIGRATION

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Premier, are more people choosing to leave South Australia to live than are choosing to come here to live, and if so, why? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Net interstate migration is negative again for the March quarter, meaning more people continue to leave South Australia than move here from around Australia. Just yesterday the Premier was espousing this place—he said how well the state's economy was performing when these facts can certainly tell a completely different story.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:28): Yes, but more people are coming to the state as a whole, and we are growing our population.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier do more to help Mostyn Brown and other business owners like him whose livelihoods have been destroyed by the harmful algal bloom crisis? With your leave, sir, and that out of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Mostyn will be forced to shut the doors of his beloved business, Gotcha Fishing Tackle, after more than a quarter of a century.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:29): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. So some weeks ago, Mostyn Brown emailed the Liberal Party with completely accurate addresses, including the Liberal Party candidate for Dunstan, and then also emailed some Labor Party candidates and MPs, and those email addresses, interestingly, just had slight little errors in them—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: People make mistakes, we know that. My office got the email and we made sure we reached out to Mr Brown. In fact, someone from my own office went and met with Mr Brown. They had a really good conversation and we made clear that we were very keen to help. You may recall that when the Leader of the Opposition first stood up with Mr Brown he had not yet had the opportunity to even lodge an application for the support that the government is very keen to provide.

The next time, what I would say to the Leader of the Opposition is that our gratuitous advice is, if the Leader of the Opposition or any other member of the parliament comes across a business that would like some support from the government regarding the algal bloom, they should apply for it. That is the first job. One of my staff met with Mr Brown and encouraged him to apply, and he then got around to it and did.

That application was going through the process and it was established that his downturn in business—the amount that we set was a 30 per cent downturn and you qualify—was not at that 30 per cent level. In fact, he was quite a bit short of it. We said that we would continue to work with

him. We were working with the application and then the government subsequently received an email from Mr Brown's accountant, who contacted the government and explained, 'Please hold the application, sales are going up. Hold the application.' That was the advice, so we acted on the instruction of Mr Brown's accountant and then held the application as we were advised to do so.

I am also advised that at the Leader of the Opposition's press conference—and I haven't witnessed the press conference; I am acting on some preliminary advice, so I qualify my remarks by saying that—Mr Brown, during the course of the press conference, did not indeed confirm in absolute terms the closure of the business, as was characterised by the Leader of the Opposition on ABC radio this morning, the same radio interview where he continued to hold a flame to the idea that all the experts providing advice to the government regarding the harmful algal bloom is caused by desal.

This invites a few questions. The sense of urgency and desperation on behalf of the opposition generally to politicise the algal bloom has them racing towards the watchdog's AI fake documents and also racing towards other examples they might be able to elevate of people who need help who have not yet applied for the very help they say they want access to. As a government, what we are focusing on is the science and the facts and providing help to those who need it. We want to minimise the number of people who need that help by speaking accurately about the algal bloom rather than seeking to catastrophise it and make the problem worse than what it already is.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:33): My question is to the Premier. How many businesses impacted by the harmful algal bloom have now applied for small business support grants, and how many grants have been approved or rejected, and why?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:33): I do have some advice about that, not to hand, but I am pleased to say that we have had more than 50 applications for small business support and, off the top of my head, I think we have already approved more than 30 of those. Some of the other applications have not been approved because those applications may not have been completed. There may be more information that is required to be submitted.

I think the information I can provide to the house is that more than half of those applications that have been made across the various levels of financial support that has been approved by the government have already been approved, while the others remain not so much under consideration but in the course of the application process. It is only a very small number that haven't been deemed eligible for the support, principally not because of the parameters of how the support package has been drawn up but more that they are not in the cohort or the catchment of businesses that have been affected or they haven't been affected to an extent that would warrant financial support. But leave it with me and I will get the member those figures.

HAMMILL HOUSE

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister give my community confidence as to the future of Hammill House in Port Pirie? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: There was an announcement by the minister over 12 months ago that this facility will be retained. In response to my question on 24 November last year, it was stated that the government was committed to increasing the capacity to 18 residents; however, at the current number, there are only 10. The uncertainty shown by the local health board is raising grave concerns for the families of the residents, the residents themselves and also all the staff for the continuation and security of their employment and also the residents there.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:35): I thank the member for his question and note his very strong advocacy on behalf of Hammill House and his community's access to aged-care services. For people not aware, Hammill House is a facility adjacent to the Port Pirie Regional Health Service. It is a service for which, about a year or so ago,

there was consultation undertaken by the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network in terms of the future of Hammill House, bearing in mind a number of private facilities in the Port Pirie region.

The result of that consultation, with particularly strong advocacy from the member himself, was to retain Hammill House. That has been confirmed by myself and by the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network. The challenge has been that to increase the numbers we need to increase the staffing, very similar to the debate we were having this morning in terms of nursing across the board. This has been an area in which we have had challenges in terms of being able to recruit staff to Hammill House.

It is something that I have been raising very regularly with the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network to pull out every stop to make sure that we can address the staffing issues that have been very long term in Hammill House. They have been actively working to recruit roles. In positive news, I can report that Yorke and Northern Local Health Network have been able to recruit an associate nurse unit manager, who commenced in 2025, and have recently recruited an additional associate nurse unit manager, who is set to commence next month. That is very good news to have those leadership positions there in Hammill House, which are critical in terms of our ability to attract other nurses into that service.

As we were also talking about earlier today in terms of what happened with the Whyalla birthing services, that was critical to turning that around as well: getting strong nursing leadership in place—strong midwifery leadership, in that case. It was critical to be able to attract other midwives to want to work there, and I am confident the same will be the case for Hammill House as well. They have also been able to recruit a temporary nurse unit manager from an agency, who commenced recently on a short-term contract. That person, importantly, is very experienced in aged care and has been providing strong leadership for Hammill House staff, including identifying opportunities for improved services to be provided.

Obviously, there is still more work to do in terms of the recruitment of staff, but I think that is a good first step to be able to address those issues. They are still actively recruiting for additional staff there. I am advised by Yorke and Northern that there is currently one person on the waiting list as of 8 September this year, and no consumer inpatients who are in the Port Pirie hospital are seeking a permanent residential aged-care place in Hammill House. That is also positive news.

Where a patient's care and placement into aged care is a pressing necessity, Yorke and Northern regularly work to support access to an aged-care facility in a location as close as possible to that person's desired location. They have been meeting regularly with the other providers in Port Pirie to facilitate communication and collaboration between all of those services. It is worth noting that those other facilities have unopened beds as well. Obviously, over time we would like to see them being able to open as they address their own workforce issues.

All of this highlights another key measure that the member himself has been a strong advocate for, which is that we need to improve our pipeline of training locally in Port Pirie. I am really delighted that we're pushing ahead with plans to establish the simulator, or what is going to be a real training academy based in Port Pirie, which will enable universities—whether it's the Uni Hub or other universities—to be able to do that clinical simulation, based in Port Pirie, which is going to be critical for training that workforce locally.

HOUSING ROADMAP

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Is the minister aware of any alternative plans for Dry Creek land currently earmarked for 15,000 homes?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:40): I thank the member for Playford for his question. He would be aware that as part of the government's Housing Roadmap last year, we announced a government-led code amendment, a rezoning, for what is ultimately one of the biggest urban renewal projects in the country. Of course, that involves some 838 hectares of land split between ownership of the government, through Renewal SA, the City of Salisbury, and the private landowner who has both a portion of the land and the salt mining licence over that site.

The government-led code amendment has been initiated, and complex investigations are about to begin on infrastructure and a whole range of matters. We know that that work needs to be done and needs to be done methodically and carefully because of its importance to housing supply, particularly over the medium to long term.

We also know that the alternative government in this state, those opposite, took the opportunity to announce a policy for this site at 10.15 on a Sunday night on FIVEaa talkback radio. I am not knocking FIVEaa, an important station, but it is a somewhat strange time to launch a policy, and it was launched by the watchdog who apparently gets to set the policy of the opposition. What he said was:

You don't have to have it at North Adelaide... There's a greenfield site at Dry Creek that the government could take over tomorrow and build a public golf course very quickly... in three years you could have it done.

That seems to me a very distinct bit of public policy announced at 10.15 on a Sunday night. After that, you would expect the watchdog to be somewhat reticent when it is raised but, no, that is not his style. He didn't hide in his office this time—he doubled down on Facebook and various other ranges of social media. He made it very, very clear that he believed and that he committed to this policy of building a golf course on this site for LIV Golf in 2028.

The Leader of the Opposition, I think, has some questions to answer, and the first question is: how does he get water and power infrastructure to the site by 2028? How is he going to fill the site by 2028, particularly given that the portion that the golf course apparently is on is the government end of the land?

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphet!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: How will they negotiate the removal of the mining licence by 2028? Will they compulsorily acquire the land? That is an important question. Also, where are they going to find the housing supply that is displaced by building a golf course by 2028? They are all the questions that come with this policy of the watchdog. Are they going to put the housing in the suburbs or are they going to oppose it?

Are they going to put it in the CBD? The Leader of the Opposition himself outlined his policy to put more homes in the CBD in his budget reply speech. Are there going to be even more homes in the CBD as a result of this policy? Where is the displaced housing going to come from? Most importantly, he has to establish: with the watchdog out there making these pronouncements and giving these commitments, what status do they have? Are they the status of policy? Are they wishful thinking? Do we all get a hat over there? Do you get a hat, Sam? Do you get a little hat with a dollar sign on it?

The SPEAKER: Nice segue to the member for Flinders.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. How many businesses that have applied for the algal bloom assistance support grants have fallen outside the 30 per cent downturn criteria, and has the Premier used his discretionary powers to ensure any of those businesses receive the algal bloom assistance support grants?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:44): There have been exemptions granted; I am happy to take on notice the numbers you are talking about. Of course, when we put in place guidelines, we want those guidelines to be largely adhered to so that people are clear about what warrants government support or not, otherwise we could find ourselves in circumstances of people seeking money close to retirement, for instance, or people without necessarily experiencing a downturn in sales. We could find people saying, 'I experienced a downturn in sales of a very small nature that don't genuinely warrant support.' What we want to do is provide support to people who need it as a result of the effects of the algal bloom—plain and simple.

We acknowledge as a government that, no matter where you draw lines, people will fall one side or the other. Our modus operandi is to craft those lines as best as we can, be open to changing them where we need to—and we have done that in regard to the fishing sector—but then also apply

just a degree of human decency and compassion and have some flexibility, where we can, without being over the top about it. Otherwise, an exemption ends up becoming a new rule, and that's just a delicate balancing act that anyone on the Treasury bench has to apply a degree of judgement to, like anything in government.

I am happy to take on notice the numbers, just so I am accurate, for the benefit of the shadow treasurer, but there have been people who have been given grants outside the criteria. I will double-check this, but I am pretty sure that's true to say in respect to both the small business downturn grants and also the grants that apply to the commercial fishing sector.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:46): My question is to the Premier. What is preventing the government from bringing forward the release of its algal bloom summer plan? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BASHAM: Businesses across the state are hurting, and school holidays start at the end of next week when thousands of families traditionally converge on our coastal areas for their holidays, which many of the businesses rely on.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:46): We are working on the summer plan; in fact this morning, at the taskforce meeting, we had another update on that. What's preventing it? Well, we just want to make sure that the work is done as thoroughly as possible before it is released—so that's what we are doing. In fact, I have committed in this place that we will be doing it in October. That's very much on track. We think that's appropriate. October is the second month of spring, well in advance of summer.

The member for Finniss makes an absolutely accurate point around businesses on many of our coastal communities being affected, including in his own electorate, which I know he knows. I invite the member for Finniss—and I haven't checked; I will do that when I get a chance—but the member for Finniss could look at his own Facebook page. You have a capacity to tell the people of your electorate and more broadly what's going on in your electorate. This is a general question: I wonder has the member for Finniss gone on his Facebook page—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I am wondering if the member for Finniss has gone on his Facebook page and broadcast to his community that he hasn't had algae in most of his electorate for weeks. I wonder if he has done that? Or—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I am thinking now, detecting from the opposition's reaction, that maybe the member for Finniss hasn't been out there broadcasting to the community: 'No algae in my electorate, please come on down and support my businesses.' I wonder if instead he has been hanging out with the Hon. Frank Pangallo, cooking up ways to politicise the algal bloom, trying to find ways to create concern in the community.

If the member for Finniss shares our concern for the algal bloom, they would be putting a muzzle on the watchdog and saying, 'Stop inciting fear and start espousing facts like: the algal bloom hasn't been in much of your coastline now for some time.' The best thing that we can do for small businesses in our state is to make sure that they continue to have customers. They want customers more than they want government handouts and grants.

I hope a lot of people—and I say this with absolute sincerity—I hope all people in this state take the time to go down to Victor and Goolwa and Waitpinga and other parts of the member for Finniss's electorate to see firsthand how much beautiful coastline there is to enjoy. They can take up the government supports that are already in place. The Minister for Tourism today announced the launch of the Coast is Calling vouchers. Despite the fact there is no algae at the moment in the member for Finniss's electorate, his electorate is still eligible for that business support grant, and we hope people take it up.

My invitation, though, to every member in this parliament is let's have a team South-Australia approach. Let's put away the conspiracies. Let's stop trying to generate fake AI sources for misinformation, and let's start focusing on promoting the opportunity to be able to enjoy our coastlines. That's what we will be doing. We hope you join us in that endeavour.

Mr BASHAM: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss. We will see if this is a supplementary.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:50): In relation to the Premier's answer, in today's *Fleurieu Sun*, there is an article written by Greg James giving a fishing outline in which he pointed out there was an algal bloom in the Middleton Beach area. Was the Premier aware there was an algal bloom issue in the Middleton area only last week?

The SPEAKER: That is a question, not a supplementary. The Premier.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:50): We take our advice from the experts. We continue to receive updates from our experts in DEW and SARDI and we will continue to do so.

REX MINERALS

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Mining. Has Rex Minerals or its new owner reached agreement on a cultural heritage management plan with Narungga Nation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:51): The member for Narungga is keenly watching what's going on with Rex Minerals. I note he is very keen to make sure the full regulatory force that the government has is applied fairly. I don't want to put words into his mouth, but the member for Narungga has been a champion of farming families on the Yorke Peninsula and has had some concerns about mining on Yorke Peninsula. I am assuming he wants to make sure that the government is making mining companies aware of their obligations under law.

I am advised that, under the current mining authorisation, Rex Minerals is required to meet all its statutory requirements. While the Hillside Project is being developed on freehold land, it remains subject to the requirements of the Aboriginal Heritage Act, and this is the case for all developments. Rex Minerals is aware of that obligation, and I understand they are continuing their engagement with heritage holders at their mine site. This includes working towards a benefit-sharing arrangement with heritage holders.

The government does not insert itself in that process. We create an obligation on the company to obtain a heritage agreement, and then we leave it to them and the heritage holder groups to negotiate that. The Hillside Project, in my opinion, is vital for the state and vital for Rex Minerals, as it represents to the company and to South Australia a deposit becoming a mid-tier copper producer here in Australia, which is good news for the state. It will create jobs and diversity of employment on the Yorke Peninsula.

I understand that Rex has maintained an active engagement program with its local community, government and other stakeholders in this project. The moment that heritage agreement is in place, I will inform the house, but I again let the member know that this is not something the government inserts itself into, other than making it a requirement that Rex do this even though they are mining on freehold land. To reassure the member, if one is not in place yet, one will need to be in place and, if it's not in place, they have not fulfilled their statutory obligations that are required.

These negotiations can be difficult, but they are there for a reason. I am confident that the company and the heritage holders can come to an agreement about a path forward. I will keep the house informed and the member informed and I also offer the member a briefing from the department on this matter, if he would like, to make sure that he's fully informed and can inform his community, as the local MP that he is, that he can go out and keep them informed about what's going on.

BLUE DONUT WEEK

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister advise the house about SA Police Legacy's Blue Donut Week?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:54): It was important to me to have this opportunity, before I finish, to talk about this really important initiative of South Australia Police and Police Legacy as an organisation. You, in particular, sir, would know about Blue Donut Week, not because I am accusing you of eating them but because I have been strategically leaving them around your person in the hope that you will continue to raise them in the house and in that way help elevate this as an important cause.

Next week it is SA Police Legacy's Blue Donut Week. This is an annual fundraising initiative in South Australia to raise money for Police Legacy in the lead-up to National Police Remembrance Day, which is on 29 September this year. National Police Remembrance Day is a day of reflection and a day to honour the lives and service of fallen police officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the course of their duties. We also remember those police officers who have lost their lives through illness or other circumstances.

The first day was held in 1989 and it is commemorated annually on 29 September and it is the feast day of St Michael the Archangel, the patron saint of police officers. This will be the 36th year of commemoration. So from next Monday 22 September, and concluding on the 29th, participating bakeries and Drakes Supermarkets will sell blue donuts with a portion of the proceeds donated to SA Police Legacy.

Now in its fifth year, Blue Donut Week helps Police Legacy provide vital support to police families who are facing serious illness or the death of a loved one. They do invaluable work supporting police and those families. Members might recall that only a few sitting weeks ago I made another contribution about the work that they have done in South Australia. Here, in our state, they have been operational for those 36 years and they have paid more than \$2.5 million to support police families, and in the last financial year more than \$150,000 was provided to families across South Australia.

In particular, police officer Brevet Serjeant Nick Fatchen has benefited from their work, having Police Legacy stand by him when his wife Emma tragically passed away in 2013 from pancreatic cancer. Legacy reached out to Nick early on when his wife was sick to help lift the weight off the family and provide grants for him and his children, Izaac and Sophie, for schooling, laptops, phones, driving lessons, family outings and birthday gifts. They continue to receive ongoing assistance, with Police Legacy providing ongoing support for their studies, and Izaac, now following in his father's footsteps, is due to graduate from the Police Academy next month in October.

Police Legacy provides practical, emotional and financial assistance to families in their time of need and often beyond the initial period of bereavement. I would encourage all members out in their communities, particularly if they have a participating bakery or a Drakes Supermarket stocking the blue donuts, to go and grab one. And, of course, it would not be a parliamentary performance for me unless I broke the standing orders, and so I do so by making a display, Mr Speaker: this is them, and I would encourage you not only to buy one but to consume it as well.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk, please cover your eyes! The member for Finniss.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:58): My question is to the Premier. Will the algal bloom summer plan include clear and consistent communication with communities and visitors, public health advice for beachgoers and surfers, ongoing environmental monitoring, support for small businesses, including tourism and operators, and the recreational fishing industry already suffering losses due to reduced trade, as well as a specific plan for the ongoing sustainability of the fishing sector?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:59): I think that is a fair assumption, or a fair thing to assume by the member for Finniss. We are already doing each of those

things, and as the algal bloom progresses to summer there will be a need to continue that effort and then ramp it up in certain circumstances. So the short answer is yes.

RIVERTON SCHOOL COMMUNITY LIBRARY

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Education. Is the minister aware of community concern surrounding the Riverton School Community Library, which will lose council funding from 30 June 2026, and what steps, if any, will he take to investigate?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:59): I thank the member for Frome for her question. Yes, I am aware of this issue. I have been alerted to the position of the local council around the Riverton community library, which has been co-funded, I understand, for a number of years by local council. The information that I have is that council has made a decision around removing their contribution to the library. I think I am right in saying that it will not in any way jeopardise the school's use of that site, but it could have ramifications, of course, for the broader Riverton community.

We know that at schools in regional parts of our state, right across the state, community libraries, which often sit on the sites of public schools, are a very important asset not just to the school but to the broader community as well. So yes, I am aware of the issue. I believe the department, if not my office, has been in contact with the council about their decision. I would urge the member for Frome, if she feels that this is a poor decision and one that should be reversed by the council, perhaps to do the same thing, if she has not already. But I have sought more information and I am happy to provide that to the member for Frome when I have it.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:01): My question is to the Premier. Have the competitors in the Australian Boardriders Battle been informed of the latest health advice to asthma sufferers regarding the algal bloom? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BASHAM: The Australian Boardriders Battle is Australia's biggest grassroots boardriders event and involves more than 70 of Australia's best boardrider clubs, involving hundreds of competitors and their support teams who will converge on the Fleurieu Peninsula on 18 October as part of an eight-series national competition.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:01): All members of the South Australian public get access to public health advice, including organisers of events. We are very happy to—and we have already had instances where we have accommodated specific groups and event organisers not just having access to the public health advice but access to our public health officials to get more information. I will have to take on notice whether or not that has occurred in respect of this specific event, but if it hasn't and they would like it, we would be more than happy to accommodate that.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop.

FIREARMS LICENCES

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:02): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would just like to inform you that I have been lucky enough to have been selected as an umpire on Saturday. I will be umpiring the Hatherleigh Glencoe Murphys for the under 17s, so I hope I don't let you down. My question is to the police minister. Can the minister explain why there are such long wait times for people wanting to apply for a variation to their firearms licence? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: My office has been contacted by lots of constituents who need their licence for primary production purposes, but processing applications is taking months, in some cases years.

The SPEAKER: Go the mighty Murphys. The Minister for Police.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was expecting an anecdote about how you played for them or maybe went to the school in the location that they come from.

The SPEAKER: I don't want to steal any of your thunder on your final day in the job, Minister for Police.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:03): I thank the member for MacKillop for raising this. I have had a number of members write to me about this, particularly members who represent regional communities, for the very same reason that the member for MacKillop raises it—I think the member for Flinders has, and the member for Hammond, amongst others. Particularly for primary producers where this is a tool of their trade, particularly for things like pest control and so on, this is important to them. What members might not be aware of are some of the circumstances that have been causing the delays.

South Australia Police, and I as the police minister, are the first to admit that there have been processing delays. Just to put it in context, five years ago we had an annual number of permit applications of approximately 13,700. That has now risen to nearly 25,000 applications. While we of course realise the absolute necessity of primary producers having access to firearms so that they can do the job that they have been doing, I find it curious that there are other cohorts of the South Australian community who don't have such a necessity for firearm ownership or the permit that facilitates applying for it. South Australia Police have been doing what they can to try to keep up with the backlog.

In those representations that I have had from the member for MacKillop, the member for Flinders, the member for Hammond and others, I have been quick to refer them on—realising the necessity of their constituents having access to the permits and hence the firearms—to see if there is a way that those applications can be expedited. We continue to work through that backlog while making sure that we have a necessarily rigorous and robust process, so that only those South Australians who actually need or require access to a firearm are permitted to have that. We will continue with those endeavours.

A PLACE TO CREATE

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Arts. Can the minister provide an update to the house on South Australia's 10-year cultural policy, A Place to Create?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:06): I thank the member for Waite for this really important question and for her very keen interest in, and advocacy for, arts right around the state, particularly in her electorate. The Premier and I launched A Place to Create, our 10-year cultural policy, on 31 March this year. It really was the first of its kind and is aimed at strengthening arts, culture and creativity in South Australia. A Place to Create imagines a future where South Australia is renowned for its cultural life that enriches the whole state. The policy outlines a vision for thriving arts organisations, cultural institutions and creative businesses all operating within a dynamic and interconnected ecosystem. It places a renewed emphasis on access to and participation in our cultural life.

We developed this cultural policy after really extensive consultation, not only with the arts, culture and creative sector but also with the wider community and right across government. The three pillars of the policy are around strengthening our communities, enlivening our places and connecting us through arts, culture and creativity. The policy is underlined by three key strategies that are about making sure that we have arts, culture and creativity available for everyone, that we have thriving artists and creatives, and that we have robust arts organisations, creative businesses and cultural institutions.

We are delivering on the ambitions of A Place to Create through short-term delivery plans. They are being updated on a regular basis, and the first one of these I released with the Premier when we released the policy. It's from 2025 to 2027 and sits alongside the policy. Following its release, I am very pleased to say that the policy and the delivery plan have been really well received by the sector. We have received statements of support from many peak bodies and sector

representatives, and we have certainly wasted no time in getting started in implementing our delivery plan.

Some of the highlights from our 2025 to 2027 delivery plan include increasing funding that is available to applicants for our arts and cultural grants round, and a renewed commitment with Creative Australia's Creative Workplaces to deliver a framework of policies that promote fair, safe and respectful workplaces. That includes us providing funding of \$70,000 a year over two years, through the delivery plan, for that work. We are partnering with Creative Workplaces to respond to 10 of the Artists at Work Taskforce recommendations as well. That is going to make sure that the key recommendations raised by our task force are addressed at both a state and a national level, delivering widening and lasting change for the sector.

We have also provided a grant to Australian Dance Theatre, which is Australia's oldest continuing contemporary dance company. It started right here in South Australia and is celebrating its 60th year this year. ADT has been able to engage in a national tour of *Marrow*, which was completed in August. We have been able to fund performances in Port Lincoln and Adelaide through A Place to Create funding. We have had ADT perform to 422 audience members and engage with 771 participants across schools and community workshops.

I know those community and school workshops have really engaged with community members, particularly in our regions. There have been 115 regional South Australian students, teachers and community members participate in those learning opportunities offered by arguably one of the best dance companies we have here in Australia, based right here in South Australia. They had six sessions across Whyalla and Port Lincoln, and we had performances, of course, at Port Lincoln, including from the region as well—18 students from regions.

We also are undertaking an audit of our creative spaces and doing a whole lot of work in our delivery plan.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Is the cost of the flu vaccination a barrier to South Australians getting vaccinated? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: During a discussion on ABC radio recently regarding South Australia's vaccination rates Chris, a listener, stated:

In my view it is insane. The flu jab is so expensive...It would have cost \$140 for me and my three children.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:10): Thank you very much. We almost went the entire week without a question from the opposition, so I appreciate we just snuck in.

Thank you to so many South Australians who have rolled up their sleeve this flu season to get vaccinated for influenza. We have done very well comparatively to other states in terms of the flu vaccination rate. In fact, South Australia has the highest rate of mainland states of vaccination, and that is a credit to South Australians who have heeded that public health advice, particularly for those groups who are more vulnerable where the public health advice is it is important for them to get access to the flu vaccine.

I note Professor Spurrier was recently on the radio talking about this subject, and I believe the shadow minister called in or sent a text message to ask about this question. She was very adamant in terms of her advice, which is to focus on those key priority groups who are most likely to end up in hospital and most likely to have the adverse effects from the flu. We have listened to that advice, we are following that advice and that has borne us well in terms of the highest rates of flu vaccination of any state in the mainland.

*Grievance Debate***STATE LABOR GOVERNMENT**

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (15:12): Well, what can I say: the cracks are really starting to show in this state Labor government—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —and the cracks are starting to show in this economy, and they do not like hearing it. They do not like hearing it. What have we seen today? We have seen two ministers abandon ship. The ides of March have come early for South Australia, let me tell you. Our economy is bleeding. The alarm bells are deafening. And today it was revealed that South Australia's unemployment rate is now the highest in the nation under Labor: the highest unemployment rate in the nation under Labor.

We are seeing the worst debt in South Australia's history, we are seeing the worst ramping crisis in South Australia's history, and we are starting to see that we have got a wafer-thin veneer—it is this Premier, and then there is nothing underneath him. There is absolutely nothing underneath him, and today we have seen two jump ship.

Unemployment spiked by six points in August to 4.9 per cent; 50,000 people are now looking for work and unable to find it, according to the latest figures. These are the highest numbers since the COVID period. We have not seen these unemployment figures since COVID. Can you believe it? It is concerning to say the least.

Yesterday Jobs and Skills Australia data showed online job ads in South Australia have also fallen for the month of August. They are down nearly 3 per cent. It spells more bad news for our labour market in the months to come. Furthermore, net interstate migration again was negative for the March quarter. More people continue to leave South Australia than come here from around Australia. The brain drain is well and truly back under this Labor government. NAB's monthly business survey also reveals SA again had the weakest business confidence in the nation in August.

The Premier says he has known about these resignations for several weeks. But what has he done? Because we know that he cares more about PR than people he decides today, on a day which shows South Australia as having the worst unemployment rate in the nation, to drop this. I mean, does he really think that the people of South Australia are stupid?

Where is Labor's plan to restore confidence and momentum to the economy? Where is Labor's plan in terms of managing this harmful algal crisis? He could not tell us today, despite knowing that this minister was going to resign for several weeks. He could not tell us who was responsible for the harmful algal bloom going into summer and going into the election, and still we do not have a summer plan—unbelievable.

What is the Premier doing? Playing Caesar. Dishing out bread and circuses—events, festivals, photoshops, two overseas trips. It must be nice if you can get it. Well, guess what? The numbers are in, and it turns out you cannot run an economy on events alone. The numbers do not lie, unlike this government, and today's job reports reveal that the emperor has got no clothes. Look at the betrayal: worst debt in state history, COVID-like unemployment. What is he doing? They are abandoning ship. They say that they have got so much depth. Well, clearly the backbench is getting to them. Clearly, they have been plotting and scheming.

The member for Elizabeth laughs. I think he has got a new suit and a new haircut. What can I say? He wants to hear it. He says, 'More of it.' He is not abandoning ship, he cannot wait. What about the environment minister abandoning her post amidst the worst coastal ecological disaster that we have seen in this state. Coincidence? I do not think so.

Everywhere you look it is bad news for hardworking South Australians. What happened to power bills? They have gone up by nearly \$800 since the March state election. What happened to that hydrogen vanity project? Nothing to be shown for it. Millions and millions of dollars down the drain. What is left for groceries? We are now the second least affordable capital city in the nation to buy and the least affordable to rent a house. It does not all exactly inspire confidence, does it?

Marine life has been washing up along our coastline for months, there are 50,000 people looking for work, business insolvencies are up and record hours have been lost to ramping, not one month, not two months, not three months—39 months of the worst ramping in South Australia's history. Millions and millions have been blown on a hydrogen flop, power bills are up and houses you cannot afford. Where does it all lead? I can go on and on.

Amongst it all, the government blows millions and millions of taxpayer dollars on this Orwellian hydrogen vanity project scheme and government ads—\$2.2 million on SA is Building ads. Building what? They are building a mirage, that is what they are building. This is not governance, it is a tragedy worthy of the Colosseum. Our state's economy is calling out for help, because at the moment we have got unaffordable homes, unpayable bills, businesses on their knees, our people are fleeing, and Labor's response is more circuses, more spin and more betrayal.

South Australians deserve better. We need a new Liberal government to rebuild this state, not as a footnote in history but as a powerhouse. We will fight for jobs, not headlines; for homes and not hype; for South Australians and not against them. It is time to cast out this failing regime and restore South Australia's glory.

PIRIE VOICES

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (15:17): Today, I would like to talk about a significant event that was launched in Port Pirie yesterday, Pirie Voices. Pirie Voices is the first fully community owned and community-led initiative of its kind in Port Pirie. Too often programs are designed elsewhere and delivered to communities rather than with them. Pirie Voices turns this around. It puts local people at the centre, shaping their own future, their own priorities and their own solutions.

This movement has not come from a crisis or from government intervention, it has come from the community itself, from people who said, 'We want to build a better, more inclusive and a more resilient future together.' The groundwork began back in 2022 through the local Mid North Jobs and Skills Network. This brought together local employers, training providers and community leaders to address employment and skills challenges in the region. It has been instrumental in shaping the direction of Pirie Voices, ensuring that local priorities are at the forefront.

Since then, there have been community forums, workshops, research with Flinders University and countless conversations with local leaders, industry and service providers. That foundation has now grown into a broad and diverse consortium, bringing together industry, community organisations, education providers, council and both state and federal agencies. What makes Pirie Voices unique is that diversity. Local government and community services are deeply involved and, importantly, state government agencies, including Preventive Health SA, Country Arts SA and the Department of Human Services, are already walking alongside, and their contributions have been enormously invaluable to this organisation.

We are at year 1 of this journey. This is not a short-term project tied to an election cycle: it is a long-term community movement that will grow and evolve over the years ahead. Phase 1 is all about listening. Over the next 12 months, Pirie Voices will capture 1,000 conversations across the community. Guided by five simple but very powerful questions, these conversations will gather people's hopes, challenges and ideas for the future. Everyday people with trusted connections across the community will be supported to have these conversations in their own networks. These are parents, teachers, neighbours, young people, elderly people, people from all walks of life.

To make this possible, Pirie Voices has already managed to generate funding for a dedicated coordinator for 12 months, who commenced in July this year. The outcomes of phase 1 will be powerful: a clear set of community-driven priorities, a road map and theory of change, and stronger connections right across the community. This is about building capacity, collaboration and creating a long-term vision that belongs to the people of Port Pirie.

Pirie Voices has also looked outward and learned from the best. It has drawn inspiration from Logan Together in Queensland, the Greater Shepparton Lighthouse Project in Victoria and the Our Town initiative here in South Australia. Earlier this year, Pirie Voices was invited to be part of the national PLACE tour. Despite only just beginning, Pirie Voices is already being noticed on a national scale as an example of community-led innovation with potential to influence other regions.

This reflects a broader shift. Across Australia, both state and federal governments are recognising the importance of place-based approaches, where our solutions are designed with communities, not imposed from outside. Pirie Voices is a living, breathing example of what this can look like in practice. This is an opportunity for state government. The community is not asking for government to drive this work. What Pirie Voices needs and what it values is government walking alongside, recognising the leadership already in the community and supporting in practical ways.

Pirie Voices is more than a project. It is the start of a movement that has the potential to reshape how communities and governments work together. It is about shifting power, building trust and proving that when we listen deeply, when we act together and when government, industry and community all pull in the same direction, lasting change is possible. Port Pirie is ready. The community has taken the first step. The Pirie Voices initiative was officially launched yesterday in Port Pirie, and it went down very well. I believe Pirie Voices will not only shape the future of our region but also provide lessons and inspirations for communities right across South Australia.

ANDERSON, MS L.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (15:22): I am pleased the Minister for Arts is with us for this contribution. I think she will enjoy it and benefit from it in particular.

The SPEAKER: She is always here. We are all here.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: We are all here, sir, of course, as the standing orders reflect. I want to take this opportunity to pay credit to a South Australian writer who most people in the chamber probably know, and that is Lainie Anderson, whose third book is about to be launched on 1 October. I, for one, cannot wait.

Lainie and I got to know each other relatively well during the centenary of the Great Air Race a couple of years ago, when I was Minister for Education and she was the ambassador for the History Trust's series of events to celebrate 100 years since that race. It was an extraordinary body of work that was done and culminated finally, maybe a couple of years late, in the movement of the Vickers Vimy to its wonderful purpose-built facility at Adelaide Airport, with the support of the state and federal governments and significant contribution from Adelaide Airport.

One of the key inclusions in that program was the launch of the book *Long Flight Home*, which was to my knowledge Lainie's first published novel, a novelisation of that extraordinary story. Lainie, of course, has a long and successful career as a journalist and a commentator in South Australia. Early on, I think the first time I really became aware of her interest in education was when the member for Unley brought to my attention an article she had written in the *Sunday Mail* highlighting her support for the Liberal policy to move year 7 to high school at the time. But I want to focus the remainder of my time on what she is doing now.

A couple of years ago she wrote her first mystery novel. It was one that I think actually is worthy for all members of parliament to read. It is called *The Death of Dora Black*. It focuses on the character of Kate Cocks who was a historical figure. She was not only South Australia's first female police officer appointed to the same conditions as male officers, but she was the first one in the British Empire, possibly one of the first ones in any modern police force on earth, if not the first.

Kate Cocks is a well-known name in South Australia. Her role as the first woman police officer and indeed her role as a social worker is remembered through the stories of the children whose lives were saved and prolonged through her work, and who were given a future. It is a historical and significant thing for our state, the life of Kate Cocks.

What Lainie Anderson has done through *The Death of Dora Black* and indeed the new book *Murder on North Terrace*—which is to be launched in a couple of weeks' time—is to bring this character to life, along with the fictionalised psychic Ethel Bromley. It is a wonderful character piece that is highlighted by the strong writing, the strength of the mystery which stands right up there not just with Ms Cocks but with Miss Fisher and Miss Marple. They can all stand aside for the new crime-fighting duo that is sure to take on the world.

For South Australian readers in particular, hearing the descriptions of places—I think it was the 1915 or 1917 era that it was set—Adelaide landmarks, and the way in which that society and that

community lived is really worth reflecting upon for a South Australian reader. It is not just the opportunity to read about the landmarks described—including this building, half-built as it was at the time—but the Elder Rotunda is mentioned, the Glenelg jetty, and landmarks in Reynella and Victor Harbor are mentioned as well. Thinking about the way the social dynamic played out at the time is worthy.

Lainie must have gone to an extraordinary deal of trouble to do that historical research but then to take that historical research, to take those real-life historical characters and the made-up ones, and to bring them together in a story that is compelling is a tremendous feat of achievement. As somebody who enjoys consuming fiction from time to time, I express my appreciation for that.

For members of parliament who are too cheap to buy a copy, the good news is that the parliamentary library has a copy of it, so you have about a week and half to get it and read it before the new one comes out. But, do better than that, be better than that, go out and buy a copy and support South Australian artists and support South Australian writers. To Lainie Anderson, I offer my congratulations, and I am sure that my colleagues all join with me and, who knows, maybe by Christmas they will all have read the book and be ready to get the next one in their stocking.

PARAFIELD GARDENS FREE WALL

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:27): Congratulations to Lainie Anderson. From one artist to a number of artists, I rise to discuss the opening of the Parafield Gardens Free Wall. This is a story about how a rookie error turned into an opportunity, how constructive community feedback can lead to innovation, and how collaboration across council, schools, artists and residents can make something of real community value.

Back in 2023, I made what I can only describe as a beginner's mistake. After months of work I managed to have a large wall within my electorate cleaned of graffiti. The surface was not attractive and I thought I had done the world a favour by restoring it to a blank state. Against my better judgment, the owner encouraged me to share this news publicly. I posted about it online only to realise soon after that I had effectively announced the arrival of a giant blank canvas.

It did not take long before community members responded online, rightfully pointing out the error of my ways. Among those was a local resident, Brett Herbert, and I remain very grateful for his words which were both thoughtful and constructive. Mr Herbert suggested that instead of simply removing graffiti, we should open up creative channels by considering the concept of a free wall. On reflection of his suggestion, I realised the taste of humble pie was not so bad and that setting up a free wall had a lot of merit.

For those unfamiliar, a free wall is a designated public space where street artists can legally create. It allows for the practise and development of skills, the testing of ideas, and the expression of culture without the risk of breaking the law. It gives artists a chance to create without needing to watch over their shoulders. Importantly, it respects both property rights and artistic expression. With that in mind, I approached our local mayor, Gillian Aldridge, to see if council would be open to the suggestion. Following considerable research, including the need to find the right venue—along with discussions with police, community members and design professionals—I was delighted that council were on board.

In time, agreement was reached that the Parafield Gardens Recreation Centre would be the best site available. In acknowledging the realisation of this project, I wish to thank councillors Sarah Ouk and Kylie Grenfell for their dedication in helping to bring this vision to life. I also note the important work of council's public art panel on which the mayor, councillor Grenfell and councillor Lauren Brug serve. Their guidance ensured this initiative was considered carefully and delivered responsibly.

The wall itself has been lined with removable panels. This means that, if an especially notable work is created, it can be removed and preserved for safekeeping. This adds a unique element to the project: a rotating gallery, where art can be refreshed, with the potential to store any masterpieces before they are painted over. Already, the project has attracted local interest. Local schools, including Thomas More College, have expressed their desire to be involved. That means the wall will not only be a site for artistic expression but also a useful education medium. The first works were created

only last week. Street artists Jarrod Soden and Max Montgomery from Perplswet Designs were the first to christen the wall. Their contribution set a high standard and a strong tone for what may follow.

Of course, we cannot pre-empt every outcome. While the hope is that by offering a legitimate space, some artists who might otherwise tag private property or public infrastructure will instead find an outlet here. That is not said critically and, when no channel is provided, it will find its own. This initiative proves a better, more positive alternative. Councillor Grenfell captured the sentiment best when she said, 'This is hopefully the first wall of many within our community.' That optimism reflects the wider spirit of this project. It's about creating opportunities for expression, while also respecting the spaces that we share.

In closing, I wish to note something important. While we may have flown underneath the radar during the development of the free wall, I have recently spoken to Mr Herbert to remind him that it was his idea. I want him to know that this was his vision and that he has every right to take pride in seeing it realised. The Parafield Gardens Free Wall was a tribute not only to collaboration, but to the power of community voices. I commend everyone involved and I look forward to seeing this concept grow.

SCHUBERT ELECTORATE SPORTING ASSOCIATIONS

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:32): Winter sport in my local community is coming to a close, and there are so many associations, so many clubs, so many teams and so many volunteers to thank and to acknowledge their tireless work. Before I read out a number of fantastic achievements across many sports teams, I really would like to place on the record my sincere thanks to all the volunteers across my community who put in so many countless hours to make our sporting associations in the Hills and the Barossa Valley the success that they are—whether that be the coaches, the umpires, the runners, all those mums and dads who are working in the canteens, the Lions clubs and the various service clubs who are working on the gates each and every week—thank you so much. Your contributions really do make sporting associations in my community the best that there are in South Australia, probably the country and, let's be honest, probably the world—so thank you so much.

I would like to first of all start with the Barossa Light and Gawler Women's Football Association. This year, Tanunda played host to the grand final, and I was really pleased to be in attendance where I tossed the coin for the senior game. Willaston came out a winner—you will be happy with this, Mr Deputy Speaker—over Barossa Districts in a really tight finish. It really was a fantastic game to see on display, with so many fantastic women playing. In the under 16s, Willaston defeated Nuri; that was another really close game. In the under 13s Barossa Districts won over Gawler Central, so that was fantastic to see.

One thing that I do, and I have done for the last few years, is provide oranges to all of the local clubs to help keep them charged throughout the four quarters. It is a small thing to do, but one which I know they really do appreciate. I would like to give a big shout-out to the President of the BLGW, Bianca Williams, and her board for the amazing work that they do. To see the growth over the last few years in women's sport in the Barossa Valley is honestly astounding. They started out with 79, or thereabouts, players and they have now grown to well over 600, so it is absolutely outstanding and a testament to everyone who has been involved in the BLGW.

I attended their best and fairest at the Vine Inn, where I had one of the many meals and dinners that I have had there over the last little while. I was really pleased to help hand out the medallions for the Team of the Year. Again, it was an absolutely stellar line-up and one that reflects the depth of talent that we have in the BLGW. Tiarna Grovermann from Angaston took out the best and fairest, so well done to her. The runner-up was Kirra Tonkin from Barossa Districts, another star, and a shout-out to Hayley Henke from Angaston, who came in at third position.

Over the weekend. I went to the grand final for the Hockey Association in Stockwell. It was another ripper game. I presented the medals to the under 12s, so well done and thanks for having me there. Gail Kirby, Tammy and Leanne have all done a really remarkable job for this association. In the men's, the AMU defeated Nuri in a ripper game, but probably the best match of the weekend was the A Women, where Tanunda defeated Gawler in a game that went to extra time and then a penalty shootout. This was the first time in 31 years that Tanunda had won the A-grade women's, so a big shout-out to them and well done. I think the celebrations are still ongoing. In the B Men's, Trinity

defeated Nuri; in the B Women, Nuri defeated Trinity; in the C Men's, AMU defeated Gawler; and in the under-16s, Nuri defeated Gawler; and in the under 14s, Gawler defeated Tanunda. It was a ripper weekend, and I was pleased to be part of it.

Basketball is a massively growing sport in my local community. I was fortunate enough to attend the Barossa Basketball Association's 55th anniversary dinner. I would like to give a shout-out to the president, Nerida Burzacott, and Andrew Warnest for all of the work that they did in pulling this together. We saw new Hall of Fame inductees, including the Madgen siblings from Williamstown, so a big shout-out to them, among others. I went to the grand final on Sunday at the rec centre, and that was fantastic.

I have a number of other congratulations that I would like to give, but I will save that for when the parliament resumes because we will have more to celebrate. We have the BLG grand final on the weekend in Kapunda. I am really looking forward to heading along and cheering on local teams from the Barossa Valley and Light and Gawler. I really do wish them all the best. I hope that there are some fantastic games. Once again, thank you to all the volunteers who work so hard to pull it together.

GAZA SPORTS AND COMMUNITY CLUB

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:37): It is like a sporting afternoon. Today, I want to highlight an incredible sporting club in my electorate of Torrens, a club that has a long history dating back to the early 1900s, the Gaza Sports and Community Club. It is a club that in recent times has had its fair share of heartache, frustration and separation but has bonded together during these difficult times and has risen, you could say, like a phoenix from the ashes against all odds.

Together, volunteers have worked tirelessly for the benefit of local families, players, junior and senior officials and supporters. The club has an amazing committee leadership team of volunteers, which consists mostly of women and is led by the amazing club president Natasha Jenke, assisted by chairperson Dominique Downie, Kim Thomas in administration, vice president Chris Cooke, and deputy vice president Brad Dohrmann. Their hard work and incredible commitment to ensure Gaza's success into the future is a credit to them all. Of course, they did not do it on their own, but with all the supporters of the club.

Last week, I had the absolute pleasure of being one of the many supporters, as the Gaza Football Club B-grade team played their way into the grand final. This coming weekend, when they run out onto the field in the blue and yellow guernseys, supporters will again be full of pride.

The club, which has three dart teams this season, had to install two extra dartboards to accommodate extra teams playing. They have a T20 men's cricket team, two senior men's cricket teams, a women's cricket team, an under-10s junior cricket team, an under-12s junior cricket team and a Master Blast cricket program. Last year, was a very successful year.

A leader in the Gaza cricket community, Kelly Nesbit is driving women's growth and juniors and the club has four cricketers representing South Australia in the over-40 SACA competition in Perth in November this year.

It has also fielded two junior footy teams, growing to three teams in 2026, and three senior football teams. It has hosted a successful Auskick program, and I am delighted to say that I am now seeing people from juniors, in particular, from our multicultural community, participating in Aussie Rules. They have also hosted sessions for members on education around DV and gender equality.

Sponsors play an important part in our sporting clubs and I want to acknowledge and thank them all for their valuable contribution. I want to mention a sponsor who, during difficult times, really supported the club and helped keep the doors open, and that was Rachel Lawrie from Stadium Real Estate.

I am proud to have advocated for an election commitment for the Gaza Sports and Community Club that will benefit the community, including girls and women's participation in sport in our local area. I am particularly looking forward to seeing the positive outcomes through association with some of our professional female sports stars and the confidence that will follow from special skills training, including football, cricket and netball refereeing and coaching. It should flow on that

the improvements to infrastructure, including the change rooms, will ultimately benefit the whole Gaza community from a wellbeing, physical and social perspective.

I want to mention now the team playing in the premiership this weekend, and hopefully they will be able to bring home the holy grail. Coach Jed Greer, assistant coach Russell Bach, team manager Terri Crosnier, timekeeper Wayne Hammond, runner Brad Dohrmann and medical and water official Georgia Greer.

The players are Nathon Merritt, Jake Hennessy, Braden Maynard, Jack Stanton, Hayden Smith, Jordan Blackley, Angus Jenke, Baylin Jenke, Tyler Slater, Scott Weger, Sam Fuller, Aden Knowles, Nick Howard, Bradley Tudorovic, Spyro Dinedios, Rhys Jones, Jack Sandland, Lachlan DeMusso, Kody Prettejohn, Mitchell Ramsey, Patrick Hancock and Brad Smith. I want to give them my very best wishes to bring home the holy grail this weekend.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:42): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 14 October 2025 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (INCLUSIVE EDUCATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:43): I begin, of course, by thanking all those members of this place who have spoken on this bill from both sides. This has been a very big piece of work which has taken a long time to get to where we are. Obviously it flows out of the recommendations made by the national Disability Royal Commission, which in itself was a huge piece of work.

In my second reading speech I gave thanks to Neil McGoran and Anne Dunstan, in particular, from the Catholic Education and Independent School sectors for the very collaborative way in which they worked with me in what were pretty difficult circumstances given that we are doing something we have never done here before.

To the best of my knowledge, South Australia will be the first jurisdiction to have responded to the recommendations of the royal commission around transparency, in particular, regarding students with disability and students with disability who are being excluded from sites in a trisector fashion, meaning that what is proposed in this bill is the culmination of a lot of negotiation, and subsequently agreement, that was made between the three sectors. A lot of that was conducted in person with Dr McGoran, Ms Dunstan and myself.

If not for the relationship that we share between us as two sector heads and minister—and of course I acknowledge the work of the Department for Education, Martin Westwell, Darren Humphrys and his team as well—I do not think we would have been able to come to this landing. I think that is, from what I can ascertain, probably the reason that is holding back other states and territories from making a commitment like this where all three of those sectors share data in a public way on students who are not enrolled or are excluded from schooling in any way due to disability.

So I want to acknowledge the collaborative way in which the sectors have worked together on this and I am proud that it is our state that is making a real effort to do it in, as I said, a sector-blind fashion. It is, of course, true to say that students with disability face the same challenges, for the most part, regardless of where they go to school.

The intent of the disability royal commission, I think, was a noble one. It is certainly pushing us all, as those who run education systems, to make big change. South Australia has not agreed to

all those recommendations, but a lot we have. Our response—insofar as it is encapsulated within this bill that we are here debating today—I think shows that South Australia shares the intent of doing better, not just in the public system but in the Catholic system and the independent system too, and that was absolutely borne out in the many conversations I had with Martin Westwell, Anne Dunstan and Neil McGoran. We all said, 'We can do better. We should use these disability royal commission recommendations, as difficult as they may be for us to accommodate, as motivation to do better for those students.'

Yes, it is true that the way we educate and care for young people with disability has come a long way in the last 50 years, but I think there is still further work that we can do. I also acknowledge many of our educators and schools—and I have visited a number in my time as minister, and I know that the member for Morialta and the member for Port Adelaide did also in their time as Minister for Education.

Recently, in fact just last week, I went to Ceduna Area School with the member for Flinders where we opened up the new disability unit. That was a great occasion and I was really pleased to be joined by the member for Flinders and Andrew Gravestocks, the principal of that fantastic school. The new facility that has been built and is open there now is wonderful and it is going to serve that community really well.

I am going to butcher the name that the member for Flinders reminded me how to pronounce the other day, but I got the opportunity to meet Mr John Duregon, who was the builder—and also was the parent of a child who went through Ceduna Area School—who did the work on the \$4 million upgrade to the disability unit. I commented on my way around, when I got a little bit of a tour, that it seems the school got amazing value for the \$4½ million, which is something that we do not often see because the cost of things has gone up by so much. Too often we are explaining to sites why they have not got all the things they wanted to have, but at Ceduna Area School it was a different story.

I said to John, 'You have done a fantastic job on this, but can I acknowledge you have done a great job in getting value for your school,' and John said to me, 'That's because I approached it from the point of what can I give the school, not what can I get out of this contract for myself,' which I think deserves to be noted on *Hansard* in this place. The kind of community spirit and spirit of giving back that Mr Duregon showed means that what they got at Ceduna Area School, for the money that this government has put in, is a lot more than it would have ordinarily or otherwise got, and that is a really wonderful thing.

I also visited recently Adelaide West Special Education Centre, the South Australian School for Vision Impaired, Kilparrin Teaching and Assessment School, Adelaide East Education Centre, the St Morris Unit at Trinity Gardens School and Adelaide North Special School, so I have made my way around the state, including regional sites as well and many schools that might not be classed as a special education setting but are mainstream schools that have a disability unit or disability classes.

I have spent time talking to students and to staff at those places, around the challenges that they face and what we can be doing better as a system. The people who work in special education settings are indeed special people. The bond that they have with their students is, I think, as strong as you would ever see between two people who might not be related by blood, if I could put it that way. It is a very special connection, and I know so too is the relationship between those educators and the parents of that child as well.

I think what we are proposing in this bill will have the support of those educators as well, in terms of us putting ourselves forward as a state that is willing to be more transparent about the way that children with disability are educated and cared for in our state. If that sometimes shows that things have happened that should not have happened, so be it. We should use that as reason for reform and for change instead of being scared of that, because the lives of these young people, who are often battling incredibly difficult circumstances—as are their educators and their families—deserve to be put first. If that sometimes comes with the risk of a bit of discomfort for the minister of the day or the government of the day, then personally I am okay with that, and I think that my two predecessors in this role would have been okay with that as well.

I do want to acknowledge the work that is happening right around the state in educating and caring for students with disability in all schools, regardless of the sector—preschool, primary school

and high school. We are very lucky to have that workforce, particularly at a time when it is harder to attract and retain staff than it has ever been and in light of the fact that their jobs are often so complicated.

I hope, if we are successful with the passage of this bill through this place and then subsequently through the other place, that it will give a bit of encouragement to those staff about whom I did pick up, I must say, that sometimes they feel like they are ignored, I think. I did pick up on the fact that sometimes those who work in our special schools or sites feel like they are kind of not the main event—that all the attraction, when ministers go and visit places and do things, is in mainstream sites and that they tend to get forgotten, which is a terrible thing that we need to address.

Hopefully the priority we have put on this bill and the work we have done across sectors to come together and address some of those recommendations in a tripartite way gives a bit of comfort and encouragement to all those staff at our sites—that we absolutely do prioritise and value the work that they do, that we do acknowledge that we can do better in these areas as well, and that we are committed to doing that.

That commitment, I hope, is shown to be bipartisan in this place. We have had a very good bipartisan approach across successive governments on issues around students with disability. I acknowledge the support I have had so far from the current shadow minister and also the member for Morialta, and from the member for Port Adelaide before him. I think I have always sought to keep politics out of issues around students with disability—how they are funded and how they are cared for—and that is a very good and noble thing. It is something that I will seek to maintain as long as I do this job, and I know the member for Flinders would agree as well.

I will close my remarks by again thanking all those members in this place who made such thoughtful contributions to the second reading, including the member for Flinders. As I said, I could see on his face, last week at the Ceduna Area School, his own sense of pride in what was being done there. He knows, as someone who represents an enormous seat—where, to be perfectly frank, we have routinely, in years gone past, failed as governments in providing the adequate level of education and care that students with disability deserve. I could see how happy he was that his community was getting a facility that was going to remedy that.

There are a couple of country cabinets that I have attended in my 3½ years in this role, one at Naracoorte and one at Victor Harbor. At both those country cabinets staff from our own schools stood up to ask me a question that was essentially holding me and the government to account to do better in terms of providing disability options at those places. I am pleased to say that, in terms of Naracoorte and Victor Harbor, we have been able to do that.

There is more work to do; there are more places that do not have that. But I think in the same vein, as has happened in recent years with regional communities speaking out about a lack of childcare and childcare deserts and saying, 'Enough's enough, you've got to do something, we're not going to cop it anymore,' so, too, are regional communities and schools who have not had disability options for their families and who are instead being forced to travel hours or move out of the area entirely to get that education care. They, too, are standing up in public forums and holding ministers like myself to account by saying, 'It's time you did something.'

We are trying our level best to do that, but I would point out that in the case of Naracoorte and Victor Harbor, I am pleased that we have been able to do something. But there is a lot more work that needs to occur. Again, thanks to all those who have made contributions to this bill, and I commend it to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr TELFER: It will not be an extensive committee stage, but I think there are some important aspects which we seek some clarity on. With your indulgence, sir, in my contribution in the second reading debate, when we bumped up to the lunch break, I had not had the opportunity—and I thank

the minister for bringing it up in his closing—to talk about the Ceduna Area School and the important work there that has been done.

Prior to this term, when I was a candidate and community leader, I went to the then education minister highlighting the importance of investment into our regional areas like Ceduna and that special education class in particular that the community had been calling out for. Can I thank and congratulate the minister on recognising, upon taking that role, that even in an area as far away as Ceduna it is really important to be investing in what is such important community infrastructure, really, given what it means for the whole school community to have strategic investment like this.

Can I echo the congratulations of the minister to the principal, Andrew Gravestocks, and to his whole team, because in a school like Ceduna the whole team take ownership of a facility like that. And they have been along the way helping to deliver such a high quality facility. Thanks also to the builder, Johnny Duregon. He's so well loved within the school community of Ceduna because he has delivered not just this facility but previous facilities as well either on or under budget and to a high level. What that means to the whole Ceduna Area School community is transformational, and it frees up the space for the school community library as well to continue to thrive. Thank you for your attendance minister, last week. It was a really special time that I certainly would not have missed. I made sure I was there and made it a priority.

Here on clause 1, I am talking generally about what this means for the education sector as a whole. Will the government be providing sector-specific training on applying the disability standards for education and managing enrolment decisions?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I thank the member for Flinders. No, that will be up to each sector to do that. I understand that we have got agreement that that is what will need to happen. But the three sectors do come together regularly across sector heads—so Mr Westwell, Ms Dunstan and Mr McGoran—to talk about things. And I will certainly be open, as long as I am doing this job, to having discussions about any assistance we need to provide centrally to help people understand those new standards.

Mr TELFER: Are there any plans to develop a standardised decision-making framework for schools?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I just might need a few more specifics—in relation to anything in particular?

Mr TELFER: Obviously, with this additional responsibility to try to create some consistency around—and I will unpack a little further on what you spoke about in the second reading speech around refusals and the like. So it is to provide the basis for decision-making: a guideline, standardisation, to try to make sure there is a level of across-sector consistency.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Fair question, member for Flinders. I understand that the bill requires that all sectors will have policies in place around exclusionary discipline. In terms of exclusion, I think the wording is that it will be commensurate in terms of how they apply to students. Within this bill we are moving towards not only a system where we are providing some transparency around those students with disability who might be captured within it but also, as you have said, more standardisation in terms of how an independent, a Catholic or a public school deals with matters of exclusion of a student with disability.

Mr TELFER: In your second reading speech you spoke a bit about capacity-based refusals. I am curious and would appreciate an explanation. You spoke about how they are treated separately from unjustifiable hardship. Can you give an explanation as to why? In answers at the committee stage, it would be a good way to be able to frame out what the expectation and the view of the minister is at the time.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Yes, member Flinders. In the first instance, in terms of enrolment capacity, that one is a little more straightforward than the second one, which I will get to in a moment. The first one is in regard to literally the school site being totally full, so no enrolment capacity whatsoever. In that case, a school is able to say, 'Sorry, we can't accept the enrolment because we just don't have enrolment capacity.'

In terms of unjustifiable hardship, that language is drawn from the Disability Discrimination Act. Section 11 of that act talks about some things that can be considered in terms of what might amount to unjustifiable hardship for a site, separate to enrolment capacity. I am reading from that act here at section 11(1):

- (a) the nature of the benefit or detriment likely to accrue to, or to be suffered by, any person concerned;
- (b) the effect of the disability of any person concerned;
- (c) the financial circumstances, and the estimated amount of expenditure required to be made...
- (d) the availability of financial and other assistance to the first person;
- (e) any relevant action plans given to the Commission under section 64.

I think those are some examples on what I accept is a somewhat subjective test. You would have to make an assessment of whether or not the lengths that that site would have to go to and potentially the expenditure that they would have to undergo would amount to unjustifiable hardship in terms of trying to accept that enrolment. It is a pretty stringent test. A site would want to be careful in terms of trying to make a case that they could not take a child with disability under unjustifiable hardship unless they were willing to defend it under the Disability Discrimination Act.

Mr TELFER: I will certainly reflect on that in clause 7 shortly. Specifically around the capacity, what safeguards are in place to ensure that schools do not use the reasoning of capacity to avoid complex enrolments?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: In terms of the enrolment capacity question, I think that one is an easy test. If a student was told, 'Sorry, we can't take your enrolment because we are full,' and that was proven not to be the case, which is not a very difficult thing to do—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Yes, that is correct. In terms of unjustifiable hardship, I am just checking, but I am pretty sure if you made a case for not accepting an enrolment based on unjustifiable hardship and that was tested under the Disability Discrimination Act—also, there is crossover with the Australian Human Rights Commission as well. A complainant could very easily take it to that body and say, 'We believe that this education institution has not complied with that provision,' and I think there are potential penalties that flow from that. I think those two things amount to some pretty good safeguards.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

Mr TELFER: Minister, we will just unpack that a little bit, the unjustifiable hardship stuff, because I think that is really important to understand. Can you confirm that the legal burden for justification or proving unjustifiable hardship sits with each individual school?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Yes, I can.

Mr TELFER: Following on, what financial support or staffing support do you envision, if any, will be available to help schools meet this evidentiary burden?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: That support will need to be found from within each sector, but I do not really envisage there should be any. It is really around transparency and reporting more than it is around any of the sectors needing to actually change their practices. I think that the spirit of the recommendations from the royal commission was in this case really around some accountability and transparency, which I think has been missing.

I do not envisage a situation where there would need to be more resources put in to, as you say, accommodate that evidentiary burden. I think it is simply a matter of schools doing what they are currently doing but providing information around any of those students who might not be able to get an enrolment, providing it into the public domain, which is not currently done.

If I could, member for Flinders, I will just add that, although the unjustifiable hardship clause is new to this bill—and, I must admit, was new to me in terms of dealing with it in this place—it has been in the Disability Discrimination Act I think since 1992. So that model and that test I think has worked quite well. I am hoping that means that supplanting it from there and moving it or copying it across into this bill should not cause any problems, because there have been many decades of it being used.

Mr TELFER: There is that, but when you are transposing it into an education sphere, there is potential for complication. What legal protections or indemnifications, perhaps, do you envision schools will have against legal costs if their refusal is challenged?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Member for Flinders, in terms of legal indemnification, there will not be any and I do not envisage that it will be needed because any legal matter around challenging a refusal to enrol under the amendments here would be treated in the same fashion they would be treated by that educational institution if they were being legally challenged on an enrolment of any type or basically any other matter.

But I am reminded also that schools, or I should say more likely parents of a child with disability who has been refused an enrolment on what they believe to be unjust grounds, are currently able to challenge that decision through the Disability Discrimination Act. I am sure that might beg the question: so why are we moving that into this act? That is because the royal commission recommended that it be brought into this act. I might add that it is that recommendation and the conversation that has followed from that, that has led to us making these decisions and commitments around transparency of data as well.

Mr TELFER: Specifically on 63B, which talks about the reporting aspects, how will the government ensure that schools are not unfairly penalised or publicly criticised for what they would say are legitimate refusals?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I think in terms of the data that we are publishing, it is de-identified data, and I support that for a couple of reasons. One I know that you will understand all too well as the member of your seat, because it would have been true of the school where I went to primary school, is that if you publish the name of the school—in terms of the primary school I went to—everyone in the community would know who that person was. You have a number of schools which, of course, you know would be in that case as well.

I think the de-identification of data meets the test and finds the balance between more transparency but not unfairly putting a burden on schools and communities and, even more importantly than that, the child or family itself in terms of them being identified. I am reminded, too, that the data is only published in relation to sectors. I think that provides a bit more protection as well.

Mr TELFER: Just on that aspect in particular, will those sector level reports include any context to avoid misinterpretation perhaps of refusal data, or will it just be the raw numbers?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: It is raw numbers, but I am sure that if we are successful in passing this bill and then we get to the end point where data is published, and it is de-identified raw data and questions might be asked of the public or the media, I am sure more context can be given by the sector from which that came. The sector itself may know the school in question, it is just that it is not identified in the raw data. But I would be confident we could go back and provide, as you say, a bit more context to say, 'Listen, on the face of it this might sound like a terrible thing but there is a bit of local data and context you're not aware of.' I understand the intent of your question and it is an important one.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9.

Mr TELFER: Will there be any additional funding or support provided to help schools to manage the increased reporting and documentation workload? This is something that I highlighted in my second reading contribution. We do not really know as to what level those additional resources

are going to be required at this point, but will there be consideration from the government for extra funding support or resourcing to be able to help individual schools manage that?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I do not envisage that that will be necessary, although I will keep a very close watch on it should it come into effect. As you know, workload for our school staff is something that we are speaking about a lot and for very good reason, and I do not want to unnecessarily add to that. I am pretty confident that the way that schools currently keep data around an enrolment that has been refused should enable them to pull that from their records management system, whether it is EMS or whatever the sectors might use, and then pass it on to, in this case, the Department for Education for publishing. I will watch that closely and seek feedback from the sectors about whether or not they are seeing an increased workload and whether it is something we need to address, but I am hopeful that will not be the case.

Mr TELFER: So you do not envision there being an additional obligation? You think the existing systems will have enough capacity within the detail of what is already recorded to be able to provide that as justification or communication of refusal or otherwise?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: What I am saying is I think that the current mechanisms, in terms of how schools record data about an enrolment that has been refused, should quite easily enable that data to be passed on and made public. Almost no workload increase would be my expectation. That is the sort of reassurance I have had from the sectors too. Having said that, we have been down this path before with other things and have run aground, so I think it is important that we watch it very closely. If that is not true, we would need to address it. We have done a lot of work to get to this point and I am confident it can be done without too much increased obligation, as you say.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

Mr TELFER: On clause 10, one of the aspects that provided us with some encouragement—and trying to understand on our side the engagement with the different sectors: public, Catholic and Independent—was making sure that there is consistency and also the understanding within the sectors of what the ramifications will be for them, especially around resourcing. So that commitment from the minister around keeping a watching brief on this aspect to ensure that there is not that additional reporting cost, whether that is a financial cost or a resourcing cost, will be really important, individually in each sector as well as overall. That is more of a statement than a question, but I think that that is something that was really pertinent in the debate of this bill in particular.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I agree. As I have said, there is almost not a day that goes past when I do not think of ways that we can reduce workload for our staff. I am not one to add to that lightly. I am confident that the changes we are making here will not do that, but they will position South Australia in a positive light, internally and nationally, in terms of us showing that we are willing to be transparent about the treatment of students with disability, even if it means some criticism is to flow to us, because we are committed to doing better.

I am proud that we have got to this point before any other state or territory, where I can stand with the Independent and Catholic schooling systems and say, 'We are all committed to this together.' No other state has been able to do that. But we will keep a watching brief. If we are successful in passing this, I am not going to say, 'Right, that's done and we can put that off to the never-never'. We will have to keep looking at it and ensure it is working and that it is not adversely affecting schools.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (16:18): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CLAIM FARMING) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (16:19): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Claim Farming) Bill 2024. The bill will prohibit claim farming in relation to personal injury claims. Claim farming is a process of collecting and selling the personal information of a person who has suffered an injury. The information is often collected in inappropriate or exploitative ways, such as cold-calling or unsolicited approaches. High-pressure sales tactics are used and deceptive promises of quick and easy compensation might be made. The injured person's details are then referred to a law firm or claims manager provider who pays for the referral and makes a profit providing services to the injured person.

Whilst all persons with an injury are vulnerable to some degree, claim farmers often target people with vulnerabilities additional to the injury, including prisoners or residents of remote Aboriginal communities. Most alarming are reports from multiple sources that claim farmers are targeting victims of child sexual abuse in the wake of reforms to establish the National Redress Scheme and to remove time limits for personal injury claims in relation to child abuse. This bill will outlaw such practices entirely.

Claim farming is inappropriate and exploitative. Cold approaches by claim farmers to an injured person disrespects their autonomy and wellbeing, and they may not be ready to speak about the events leading to their injury. The sale of claims by claim farmers to legal firms disrespects the best interests of the injured persons and may be motivated by which firm will pay the highest fee rather than which firm is the most appropriate to represent the injured person in all of the circumstances.

This bill is intended to proactively prevent widespread claim farming practices within South Australia. While it does occur, it is thankfully relatively infrequent. However, we do not want South Australia to become a destination of choice for claim farmers, particularly as other jurisdictions begin to take action against it when they have the opportunity to stop it at the start. The bill will create two new offences in the Summary Offences Act 1953 to prohibit claim farming practices in relation to personal injury claims.

A personal injury claim is a claim for compensation for physical or mental harm or death. Therefore, the ban will cover claim farming practices against the relatives of a deceased person who may have a wrongful death claim. The first offence will cover the actual sale of claim referrals. It will be an offence to give or receive, or to allow another person to give or receive, a benefit in exchange for a claim referral. A benefit includes money, goods or services. However, it does not include gifts exceeding a prescribed value. This will ensure that a gift or favour to thank someone for referring a client, such as taking a professional contact out for lunch, will not be considered illegal claim farming.

There will also be some limited exceptions for claims referred from one law firm to another as part of the sale of the law firm or because the referring firm has a conflict of interest or insufficient expertise in the subject matter. In these circumstances, paid referrals will be permitted, although legal practitioners will still be required to disclose the payment to their client under the South Australian Legal Practitioners Conduct Rules.

The second offence will cover one of the main tactics used to collect the personal information of injured persons by outlawing unsolicited approaches towards potential claimants. It will be an offence to personally approach or contact a person to induce them to make a personal injury claim or to cause or allow someone else to make such a contact. Contact is prohibited regardless of whether the person contacted would actually be entitled to make a claim. For example, it would

prohibit the practice of claim farming businesses cold-calling large numbers of persons to ask if they or someone they know has recently been in a motor vehicle accident.

There are several circumstances in which the unsolicited approach offence will not apply. It will of course be legal to contact someone at that person's request. If an injured person is interested in making a claim and requests contact, for example by placing an inquiry with a law firm or claim management service, they can of course be contacted to talk about the potential claim.

Additionally, altruistic approaches where the person making the approach does not expect or intend to receive, and does not receive, a benefit as a result of the approach are permitted. It will certainly not be unlawful to approach an injured friend or family member and encourage them to consider seeking compensation where the intent of the approach is not the ultimate profit from the referral of the claim.

Law firms may also approach their existing or former clients unsolicited to talk about a personal injury claim, as they have a pre-existing relationship with that person. However, the lawyer must reasonably believe that the client would not object to the contact. Law firms may also approach persons at the request of a community legal centre or industrial organisation, or other organisation of a kind prescribed by the regulations, and may also approach persons that they believe may be eligible to participate in a class action for which the law firm is responsible.

As well as creating these new criminal offences, the bill also amends the Legal Practitioners Act to provide that the conduct covered by the offences is capable of constituting unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct when engaged in by legal practitioners.

If a lawyer pays for a claim referral, or if they make an unsolicited approach to a person to try to convince them to make a claim, this can be reported to the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner. The commissioner can investigate the alleged misconduct and this could lead to disciplinary action against the legal practitioner, including reprimand, fine, restriction or suspension on entitlement to practise law.

For the purpose of disciplinary proceedings under the Legal Practitioners Act, allegations of claim farming made against legal practitioners need only be proved to the civil standard of proof on the balance of probabilities. The same exceptions will apply as are available in relation to the new criminal offences. Disciplinary action may be commenced against lawyers regardless of whether criminal charges for claim farming are laid against the claim farmer or the legal practitioner.

The bill creates additional financial consequences for lawyers who engage in claim farming. If an associate of a law practice is convicted of a claim farming offence, the law practice is not entitled to any fees in relation to the farmed claim. They may not collect any outstanding fees and must repay any fees already received. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Legal Practitioners Act 1981*

3—Amendment of section 70—Conduct capable of constituting unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct

This clause amends section 70 of the principal Act to provide that a contravention of the claim farming offences proposed to be inserted into the *Summary Offences Act 1953* by this measure is conduct capable of constituting unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct. The clause also provides that, for the purposes of determining whether a legal practitioner has engaged in unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct, the question of whether a person has contravened the Act, the regulations, or a claim farming offence is to be determined on the balance of probabilities.

4—Amendment of Schedule 4—Investigatory powers

This clause amends clause 5 of Schedule 4 of the principal Act to extend the protection against self incrimination in the Act to the proposed claim farming offences. It also amends clause 19 of that Schedule to allow information relating to an investigation into the conduct of a legal practitioner which relates to an offence against the proposed claim farming offences to be shared with a body prescribed by the regulations.

Part 3—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

5—Insertion of Part 8A

This clause inserts a new Part into the principal Act.

Part 8A—Personal injury claim farming

42—Interpretation

Proposed section 42 provides definitions for terms used in proposed Part 8A.

42A—Giving or receiving a benefit in exchange for claim referral

Proposed section 42A creates an offence of giving or receiving a benefit, or allowing another person to give or receive a benefit, in exchange for the referral of a personal injury claimant. The section creates exceptions for situations where the referral occurs as part of the sale of a legal practice, or occurs because the referring practice has a conflict of interest or insufficient experience or expertise in the matter.

42B—Approaching or contacting person to solicit or induce a claim

Proposed section 42B creates an offence of making an unsolicited approach or contact to a person to solicit or induce them to make a personal injury claim. Exceptions are provided where the approach or contact is at the request of the contacted person, if the person making the approach or contact does not expect to receive a benefit, if the person making the approach or contact has previously provided legal services for the person approached or contacted, and in relation to community legal centers, industrial organisations and class actions.

42C—Imputation of state of mind of officer etc

Proposed section 42C provides that the conduct or state of mind of an officer, employee or agent of a person acting within the scope of their authority will be imputed to that person.

42D—Additional consequences for law practice

Proposed section 42D provides that if an associate of a law practice is convicted of a claim farming offence the law practice is not entitled to recover any fees or costs in relation to the provision of the services to which the offence related.

42E—Extraterritorial application of Part

Proposed section 42E provides for the extraterritorial application of proposed Part 8A.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:26): I indicate I am the lead speaker and indicate that the opposition is not opposed to the bill just at the outset.

Also at the outset on this significant day in the house, I do want to acknowledge the service of the Deputy Premier to the state of South Australia. The fact that this is a serious moment for personal and professional and public service of the Deputy Premier, I want to acknowledge that.

Notwithstanding that significance, the Deputy Premier has fronted up here late on a sitting Thursday to read the government's speech on this bill. I hope, in due course, she might be amenable to responding to some questions in the course of the committee process which might follow this second reading debate.

Can I also say relatively close to the outset, I might be not the only one to just take a certain amount of umbrage at the title of the bill. I have the good fortune to be on my feet just presently, and without reflecting on the presence of members in the chamber, the member for Finniss is one of many members, particularly on this side, who has a proud nation-leading history and legacy of commitment to farming in this country and that is something very different to what is being described in this bill. There may be people who will take more particular umbrage, and so I raise in all seriousness that, while it is a term that sort of kicks around, it could not be further from the farming that is recognised as stitched into the carpet of this place, which is, of course, industry and activity that is right at the heart of the state of South Australia.

The kind of activity that is the subject of this bill is a wholly undesirable activity that has been on its way, happening, as I understand it, particularly interstate and particularly in the Eastern States. Unlike as often is occurring here in the parliament where we are legislating to deal with a problem that has caused a response, this is a set of circumstances in which there has been certain undesirable activity going on elsewhere and the purpose of this bill is to head that off at the pass so that it actually does not end up happening in South Australia.

I say all of that also—and this might flag some level of curiosity at the committee stage—in the context of a debate in which we are here on 18 September 2025. I have been fortunate to have received a briefing now some months ago, and that is very much the characterisation that we have all been working on, going back to then. The second reading debate was completed in another place about six months ago, and that followed it having been introduced and addressed for the first time by the government more or less exactly a year ago.

If I go back even further, the Law Society's engagement with this issue tells the story of the society's, the profession's, engagement with government on this matter going back a year and a half earlier than that, at least. I might just take the chance while we are working through a chronology to refer to the Law Society's letter to the Attorney by its then-president Alex Lazarevich dated 21 March 2024, by which Mr Lazarevich referred to the Law Society having raised the matter at least in this way, and I quote from paragraph 6:

In April 2023, the Society provided its views to you—

that is, to the Attorney—

in relation to the prevalence of claims farming in South Australia and the possible value of legislative reform in addressing it. As you will be aware, the Society noted its understanding that whilst claims farming practices may presently occur in South Australia, it had limited knowledge as to the extent—

and there is emphasis in italicisation of that word 'extent'—

to which they occur. Accordingly, a qualified view of support was put that the Society would be open to potentially supporting a legislative approach if there was evidence that such practices are currently occurring on a sufficiently wide basis.

All of that is to identify that the awareness of the notion of this—and I note with some regret there that the Law Society has also adopted this rather unfortunate vernacular of 'claims farming'—is that there is an appreciation of its prevalence going back to at least early 2023, and no doubt it goes back a bit further than that. Yet at that stage, still, the Law Society was saying, 'It might be happening in South Australia. We don't know about the extent of it'—a sort of qualified bringing to attention of an issue that is around the place.

To the best of my knowledge—and I think I can bring this to the house as we stand now—the bill has been live, as it were, formally for about a year-and-a-half, and it has presumably been in the works for a year or so before that. I am not, in my second reading contribution just now, bringing to the house any particular greater awareness of the prevalence in South Australia having accelerated in that time, and that is good news.

The fact that the bill has taken its time reaching the house, and that here we are, at this time in late 2025, debating the second reading in the house, hopefully tells a story, because the government will have had its finger on the pulse as well, that there has been no emergent fresh crisis of such activity in the state.

Sometimes, where there has been a relatively long passage of time from the issue being addressed by government to it being introduced, debated and making its way through the chambers, there is the opportunity for a story to be told. I think it just might underscore a proposition that in South Australia we are still dealing with legislation that is designed to head off what might be anticipated as something that might come to affect those people who might be on the receiving end of inquiries and other undesirable activity undertaken for profit by people who are looking to take financial advantage of those who are injured and otherwise in circumstances that we have seen elsewhere. I think South Australia has therefore still got a relatively clean bill of health in this regard. If anything, that might lead us in this place to retain the kind of reticence that the Law Society has expressed about the reach of the legislation.

Without referring to the debate in the other place, I note that the reasons for the opposition amendments in the other place came from a position of taking on board the Law Society's concerns. It was an expression of that qualified support that the Law Society had for something to be done about this but also reticence about it going too far, in an anticipatory sense, in this state. Those amendments have not found their way to the house, and all of that speaks for itself.

I will indicate where the Law Society's concerns have reached their high watermark in terms of the proposed new section 42B. That arises out of a concern that new section 42B might present an unnecessarily broad and therefore chilling effect on professionals themselves being able to appropriately approach, engage with and refer those who might have a legitimate claim.

The government has obviously seen fit to include 42B in the bill, and it is still there as it comes to the house. The opposition maintains its reticence about 42B. While I am not moving the same amendments—even more against the wind in this place—I just make clear that the Law Society was particularly thoughtful in its engagement in highlighting that risk that the new section 42B poses, and that ought to be recognised. That is all set out at considerable length also in the Law Society's March 2024 letter to the Attorney that I have already referred to.

To do justice to that concern I will just refer to that briefly as well. The Law Society makes the observation:

The intention of the reform appears to be preventing an entity that is not a law firm, or does not provide legal services, from collecting personal information from a potential injury claimant and selling it onto a third party, such as a law firm.

The difficulty, which extends to section 42A as well, is that it might have further reaching and unintended—or perhaps undesirable, anyway—implications for the profession. I do not want to spell this out at any particular length, but I just make the observation that the Law Society put it this way:

The Society considers this reform would be achieved by proposed section 42A alone (despite concerns raised as to its [potentially broad implications]...and thereby alleviate the need for subsequent proposed section 42B entirely. Proposed section 42B provides for an offence insofar as the alleged claims farming conduct relates to a person approaching or contacting a person to induce or solicit them to make a personal injury claim...

Two themes that arose from consideration of the Society's Accident Compensation and Civil Litigation Committees was the relative ambiguity associated with the concept of claims farming and 'benefit'.

It goes on to note the definition of benefit and the fact that the notion of claims farming is perhaps insufficiently defined as well.

The resultant submission from the Law Society for present purposes—and those who are following the debate can read the balance of that for themselves; I would welcome the prospect of the entirety of what is a fairly long contribution from the Law Society being tabled so that that can be part of the record—boils down to doing away with section 42B altogether. That is the state of affairs in circumstances where the situation so far as conduct in South Australia remains a threat in the future and by reference to conduct that has been observed elsewhere.

We are soon going to see whether or not, by prohibiting certain conduct that might already be part of professional practice, that potential for unintended consequence and overreach might be realised ahead of the problematic conduct of third parties seeking to profit from such referrals. If that happens, I expect that we will hear fairly promptly from the profession and, again, they will not be slow to speak up again if they are going to be impacted by this change.

In the same way that it might be said the government has been steady and taking its time in progressing the legislation in the first place, if on commencement there are concerns about its effect on practice then I hope the government may be ready to be nimble in responding to any acknowledged overreaching impact on the profession.

With those words, I again indicate that the opposition has made its position on this clear in the other place and is supporting the passage of the legislation. As a whole, I am hopeful that this will be of some assistance to those who otherwise might be at risk of the sorts of invasions of privacy and inappropriate profiteering by third parties for inappropriate reasons. I hope that there is an avoidance of that becoming any kind of established practice in South Australia and that we keep a close eye on those possible unintended consequences that might unduly affect the profession.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (16:48): I rise in support of the Statutes Amendment (Claim Farming) Bill 2024. It is not just a technical bill to adjust statutes, it is a statement about what we stand for as a community, that we will not allow the suffering of injured people to be turned into someone else's business opportunity. When someone is hurt on the road, at work or in any circumstance, they are already vulnerable. They may be facing uncertainty about their recovery, their job and their future. The last thing they need is to be treated as a commodity, with their personal details bought and sold behind their back, yet that is exactly what claim farming is.

For me, this is not in abstract. My own son is currently recovering from a workplace accident. He is doing well and I am proud of his resilience, but I can tell you, if one of these claim farming businesses came near him at this vulnerable time, they would not like to come up against his mother. I say that not just as his mother but as someone who has worked as an industrial advocate. In that role, I saw firsthand the importance of protecting workers when accidents happen. Injured workers deserve proper support, not to be hunted down and exploited. That is why I am passionate about this legislation.

Businesses involved in claim farming can gather potential claimant information in several ways: running ads that target people with certain injuries, for example, promoting hearing checks to those who may have work-related hearing loss; cold-calling individuals to ask if they have suffered an injury, either by dialling random numbers or using contacts from related industries, like a mechanic passing on details of a car accident; collecting data online, such as through booking platforms where patients with work-related injuries provide their details when arranging medical appointments; and approaching people directly within specific communities.

If it is not happening now, it is not happening ever. This needs to stop, and this bill takes strong, necessary action against this kind of behaviour. It makes claim farming a criminal offence under the Summary Offences Act 1953, punishable by fines of up to \$50,000. It bans unsolicited personal contact designed to induce people into making personal injury claims, and it bans the buying and selling of claimants' personal details.

For lawyers, the standards are even clearer: under the Legal Practitioners Act 1981, claim farming will amount to professional misconduct. That means the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner will be able to use their existing investigation powers to investigate as well as require investigated legal practitioners to produce documents or written information. To preserve the privilege against self-incrimination, the purposes for which these documents can be used are limited. The LPCC can also search premises with the consent of the occupier or under a warrant issued by a magistrate.

At the same time, the bill recognises the need for balance. It does not interfere with legitimate practice. Law firms can still refer clients between them for genuine reasons, contact their own existing and former clients and run class actions where outreach is required. Approaches made at a person's request are not prohibited, and advertising legal services remains lawful. This is a carefully targeted bill that clamps down on exploitation without punishing legitimate work.

The bill has also been improved by amendments in the Legislative Council. Amendment No. 1 ensures claims under the National Redress Scheme are captured—that is vital. Survivors of child sexual abuse must be protected from claim farming just as much as anyone else, and perhaps even more so given the trauma they have already endured.

Amendment No. 2 defines 'industrial organisation' in line with the Fair Work Act 1994, ensuring clarity and consistency. This is an amendment I particularly welcome. Having worked as an industrial advocate, I know just how important industrial organisations are in standing up for workers. They are trusted, they are accountable, and they act in the best interests of their members. By drawing this clear distinction between legitimate industrial organisations and exploitative claim farmers, this bill reinforces the right kind of advocacy, the advocacy that protects, not preys upon, injured people.

Amendment No. 3 defines 'legal services' consistently with the Legal Practitioners Act 1981, closing potential loopholes and making the law watertight to ensure consistency between the two acts. Amendment No. 4 allows referrals to law firms at the request of other not-for-profit organisations, such as the Returned and Services League. This is sensible because organisations

like the RSL and others in our community are trusted voices who act in the best interests of the people they serve.

Taken together, these measures mean that claim farming will no longer be tolerated in South Australia. Police will be able to investigate, the LPCC will be able to act against practitioners and the law will have the clarity and balance it needs to protect injured people while preserving legitimate support. For me, this comes back to a simple principle of fairness. Injured people—workers, survivors, families—deserve to know that the system is there to help them, not to cash in on their hardship. This bill draws a line. It says to claim farmers, 'You are not welcome here, your behaviour is not welcome here.' I commend the bill to the house.

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) (16:53): I would like to thank both members who have spoken on the Statutes Amendment (Claim Farming) Bill 2024 in support of this important reform that aims to protect victims of personal injury in South Australia. As we have heard throughout contributions on this bill, claim farming is a practice that targets victims of personal injury, often those injured in a motor vehicle accident or survivors of childhood sexual abuse, and is motivated by profit. The unsolicited contacting, garnering of personal and often highly emotional private information, then selling and buying those personal details is all part of the claim farming process, and this bill seeks to stop it at all stages.

Among the most distressing instances of claim farming that have been shared with the government by groups such as Knowmore, the national provider of legal assistance through the redress scheme for institutional child sexual abuse, are cases where victims of child sexual abuse who are incarcerated at the time of the unsolicited approach are approached while in prison and, some of the time, have never even spoken about the traumatic abuse suffered as a child, let alone want to share those horrific memories with a total stranger out for a quick buck.

Claim farming is inappropriate and exploitative. Tactics of retrieving this personal information from an already vulnerable person often take a harassing tone, with many claim farmers willing to do whatever it takes to get a potential claimant's information. These methods of persuasion can turn to deceptive promises of quick and easy compensation being made, failing to advise the victim about the free legal service on offer through the redress scheme provided by Knowmore Legal Service.

This bill strikes an appropriate balance between victim protection and allowing legitimate legal services and victim advocacy to continue. While creating offences for both the buying and selling of potential claimant details and for unsolicited contact in pursuit of benefit, the bill provides for the lawful giving of gifts not exceeding a certain value given as a professional courtesy, generally advertising of services, and of course it remains lawful to contact someone at that person's request.

Altruistic approaches, such as from family and friends without the contact being made in the expectation of receiving a personal benefit, will also remain lawful, as well as law firms being able to approach persons at the request of a community legal centre, industrial organisation or for a class action.

Cold approaches by claim farmers to potentially highly vulnerable injured persons displays a total lack of respect for their autonomy and mental health. The sale of personal details to lawyers is plainly not in the best interests of the injured persons, and any person engaging in this type of conduct will soon be committing an offence. An equally important aspect of this bill is the disciplinary powers that it will confer on the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner for any lawyer who pays for a claim referral or makes an unsolicited approach to a person to solicit a claim.

It is the hope that these professional disciplinary powers will act as a deterrent for all legal practitioners before they engage in any claim farming and, in turn, the claim farmers collecting the claimant details will be run out of business, stamping out this process in its entirety in South Australia. With Queensland and New South Wales now both having outlawed claim farming, it is time that South Australia followed suit to ensure that claim farmers are not attracted here in pursuit of vulnerable victims of personal injury.

I would once again like to thank members who have contributed to this bill and the stakeholders who first raised the phenomenon with the government. In particular, thanks to Knowmore Legal Service, namely Jackie Mead and her team, who will continue to be fierce advocates for victims of child sexual abuse as they navigate through the redress scheme. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Personal Explanation

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:58): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yesterday, in the other place, the Hon. Ben Hood MLC made an allegation that on 6 September I made a direction to the Mount Gambier hospital regarding its treatment of patients. The allegations were also published by the Hon. Ben Hood MLC on his public social media. This is an outright lie. It is completely untrue. It is defamatory.

I invite the Hon. Ben Hood to withdraw and apologise for this allegation, both in his chamber and on social media. If he will not do so unequivocally I will consider my further options.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CLAIM FARMING) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr TEAGUE: As I hope I flagged fairly thoroughly in my second reading contribution, the Law Society in its March 2024 letter/submission to the Attorney referred to concerns or some qualified support for a response dating back to at least around a year earlier about this trend having been on its way in the east, and there has been some reference to Queensland and New South Wales having legislation now to deal with that actual activity. Taking whatever time punctuation point as a reference, has the government got any up-to-date indication to share with the committee about where we find ourselves in September 2025 vis-a-vis evidence of this kind of activity in South Australia?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: There has not been a measurement taken, therefore there is none that would indicate an escalation; it does not mean there is not escalation. What has happened is there have been various organisations who are victim advocates broadly, who have raised that they have been contacted by victims or are aware of victims who have experienced this, and also that Knowmore has been in touch with a very solid example of a particular legal practitioner who has gone to Mobilong, Yatala and Port Augusta—three jails that have quite a high proportion of Aboriginal people—where the tactics that have been described appear to be claim-farming approaches: pressure applied to people who are incarcerated to share details in order to see if there can be a claim made.

The feeling from the government and the Attorney-General was that there are sufficient examples, albeit anecdotal in the sense of individualised examples, to say that it is occurring and therefore ought to be banned. Whether in fact there is a move across the border because of banning interstate could be theorised but has not actually been measured.

Mr TEAGUE: Has any of that anecdotal or other evidence of such conduct been brought to the government's attention by the Law Society? Has the government received any further submission or assistance from the Law Society post that March 2024 submission?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised no.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Mr TEAGUE: Clause 5 contains, if I can put it that way, the impugned new what would be section 42B. If I can by way of question or example seek some sort of assurance for concerned practitioners as to the confidence that those in the profession ought to retain to engage in activities, of the nature of information seminars and what might be described as professional outreach or engagement, that might be on some interpretation regarded as at risk of being caught by section 42B?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The advice is that the use of the terminology 'personally approach' is sufficient to guard against advertising or a seminar where people are invited generally to trip this clause or this section of the bill.

Mr TEAGUE: The question that might then follow, in terms of the context that the Deputy Premier has provided, is that there is a circumstance in which there is a seminar that is provided to a group inevitably or ordinarily, and at the conclusion of that kind of more general engagement there is the possibility of a more immediate personal engagement. Can the Deputy Premier provide to the committee any further specific indication that activities connected with such engagement of that kind would not run the risk of being similarly caught?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am sorry—it is very rare that the Prime Minister rings you, so I felt that I needed to answer the call. I am so sorry, because I would never normally breach protocol like that, from the way that we conduct ourselves here, but it did seem, given the news of today and the fact he chose to thank me for my service, that I needed to answer that call. I do apologise for appearing to be very rude. I answered the call saying, 'I am in the chamber, Prime Minister,' and he is such a delightful human he found that amusing.

My understanding is that the member's concern is at what point does what could be characterised as a conversation where someone is seeking advice turn into the practitioner really cajoling the person into providing information so that they can create some wealth for themselves. Of course, that circumstance has been aired. During consultation, that came up, and there has been effort to address that.

So the bill, as a result of the consultation, now contains an exception for a person who approaches or contacts the second person at the request of that second person or reasonably believing that the approach or contact is at the request of that second person. There may at some point be a grey line, I can understand in theory; not being an expert in claim farming, I suspect that, in fact, you know it when you see it, that it is very much seeking to gain information in order to take advantage of that information. Given that this is legislation that exists in other states and is effective, I see no reason why that would not be the case here.

Clause passed.

Long title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (17:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMUNITY AND STRATA TITLES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 November 2024.)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for King, this is probably the last chance I will get to call the member for Port Adelaide Deputy Premier and minister, so thank you for your service. Member for King.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (17:14): I rise today to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Community and Strata Titles) Bill 2024. This is a bill that makes long overdue changes to how we manage and oversee community and strata title properties here in South Australia, and I really want to emphasise just how important that is. If you have ever lived in a community or strata-titled property, you will know how much the day-to-day management of shared spaces—from shared car parks to driveways, gardens, maintenance funds and meetings—can impact the time and quality of your life. Whether it is a leaking roof, a delayed repair, a disputed vote at a meeting or unclear financial arrangements, small matters can escalate very quickly. With over a quarter of South Australians now living in strata or community-titled properties, these issues are far from niche.

As our state continues to grow and more South Australians choose to live in townhouses, in apartments and shared developments, the systems that support these forms of housing need to be strong, they need to be fair, and they need to be future-focused. That is why we have this bill here before us today.

This bill is a result of a comprehensive review by the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, extensive public consultation, feedback from stakeholders and residents, and a growing list of problems and challenges, including some that have been brought into the spotlight by media in recent times.

One of the strongest drivers for this reform is the need for greater transparency and accountability in how these properties are managed. You may remember a recent ABC *Four Corners* investigation into body corporate management and strata insurance. It revealed deeply concerning conduct, including managers receiving commissions without disclosing them, self-dealing through related companies, and quietly adding fees to invoices under the radar. The truth is, these kinds of practices erode trust and make people feel powerless in their own homes. This bill responds to these concerns.

We are tightening disclosure obligations so that body corporate managers must clearly declare any commissions, benefits or financial interests, particularly when they are dealing with businesses that they have a stake in. That also includes disclosing any shared directorships or referral arrangements, the expected dollar value of services provided by related entities, and why the manager believes this is in the best interest of the owners. Importantly, managers will need to report back if the figures change after the AGM. If they fail to disclose commissions, that money may need to be paid back to the corporation.

This is about bringing these dealings out of the shadows. If there is a commercial relationship, fine, but owners have a right to know about it and make an informed decision. This is about transparency, not hidden markups or cosy arrangements that benefit the manager more than the residents. These are not just abstract issues. We have seen the very real consequences when the current system falls short.

Take the Felmeri Homes development at O'Halloran Hill. This was a community-titled development where the builder went under and critical infrastructure like access roads and utility connections were never completed. Families who had bought in good faith were left stranded. Why did this happen? Because under the current rules, when land is divided by Torrens title, council is able to step in and make sure infrastructure is delivered to standard, often requiring guarantees from the developer. However, under community title that oversight was not triggered because the future community corporation was deemed responsible for the infrastructure. That left new owners effectively inheriting unfinished developments with no clear path forward. We are addressing that in this bill.

It makes explicit that planning authorities must assess whether community titles are appropriate, particularly when there are no genuine shared facilities. That means no more gaming the system and no more risky developments slipping through a loophole because they were structured the wrong way.

We are also tackling another practical problem: what happens when a body corporate manager disappears or simply refuses to act. Unfortunately, this is not rare, and when it happens communities can be left paralysed, unable to access trust accounts and records or make essential decisions. This bill gives the Magistrates Court more flexibility to step in and terminate contracts where needed and ensure a smoother transition to a new manager. It is about giving communities a pathway forward when the manager they rely on becomes the problem.

Beyond these structural reforms, this bill also makes a range of commonsense improvements—practical changes that reflect the real needs of owners and residents today. Some of these include:

- giving corporations clear powers to set by-laws on smoke drift, including from tobacco and vaping;
- preventing proxy voting abuse, especially where financial conflicts exist;
- making it easier for owners to add agenda items at meetings and for corporations to achieve a quorum—a real problem in smaller or less engaged groups;
- doubling minimum public liability insurance from \$10 million to \$20 million, which is in line with other states;
- extending maintenance planning from five to 10 years to encourage longer term budgeting;
- removing outdated requirements, such as needing a common seal to sign documents; and
- requiring that prospective buyers receive clear information up-front, such as the plan of division and a sinking fund budget, before signing the contract.

These are the kinds of things that can prevent disputes before they start and make ownership more straightforward and secure.

We are also strengthening the enforcement side. This bill gives the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services new powers to issue expiation notices for breaches, providing more flexible, faster enforcement options. We are also increasing penalties across the acts to reflect inflation and align with other consumer protection laws. If someone is doing the wrong thing, the consequences should be meaningful.

At its heart, this bill is about fairness, transparency and modernisation. It returns power to the people who live in these developments. It strengthens protections for buyers, owners and residents, and it gives communities the tools they need to manage themselves with confidence. South Australia is changing. We are planning for more housing, greater density and smarter urban development. We need to make sure our legislative frameworks support that growth and not lag behind it. That means clear rules, fair protections, transparent processes and stronger enforcement. This bill delivers on all of that.

I would like to acknowledge and thank everybody who has contributed, from the ERD Committee and departmental staff to the many residents, strata experts, advocacy groups and industry professionals who have engaged so constructively with this work. I would also like to thank the minister very much for all her efforts in this space. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (17:23): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Community and Strata Titles) Bill. This bill makes a range of changes to the laws that govern community and strata-titled properties in South Australia. They are important changes that will make these systems work better for the people who live in them.

I would like to focus on one reform in particular, something that I know many in our community have been asking for, and that is tackling the problem of smoke drift—something that causes ongoing distress. At the moment, if you live in a strata property your corporation already has the power to make rules about smoking, but if you live in a community-titled property the law has been silent. That has meant that, too often, people living in apartments or townhouses have had to

put up with tobacco smoke coming into their homes from common areas or even drifting across from their neighbour's balcony. It is not fair and it is not safe.

Everyone deserves the right to breathe clean air in their own home. Second-hand smoke is not just unpleasant, it is unhealthy. It can make people sick. It particularly harms children, older people and those who already live with health conditions. This bill fixes that gap and makes it clear that community corporations can put by-laws in place to regulate smoking on common property and to stop smoke drift between homes. It is about giving residents the power to make decisions that keep their communities healthier and safer. Importantly, this is not about parliament telling every development how they must operate; it is about giving people the choice, the legal backing they need if they decide as a community they want to protect their shared spaces from smoke.

This is a practical, commonsense change. It brings community titles into line with strata titles. It responds to the concerns we have heard directly from residents and, above all, it puts people's health and wellbeing first. For those reasons, I support this reform and I commend the bill to the house.

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (17:25): I rise today to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Community and Strata Titles) Bill 2024. This is an important piece of legislation that will deliver stronger protections, fairer rules and greater transparency for those living in community and strata title developments across our state.

Before I go into detail about the bill, I want to briefly digress just for few moments. Today marks a significant day in our state's political history, with both Deputy Premier Dr Susan Close and Treasurer Stephen Mullighan announcing that they will retire from parliament. I had the privilege of working for Dr Close when she first became education minister, and I was struck immediately by the lightning pace with which she mastered her portfolio and the deep care she placed into every facet of it. While this will be a deep loss to the Labor Party and the parliament, I am sure it will be a great gain for life beyond these walls, and I wish both members for Lee and Port Adelaide every success and happiness in whatever lies ahead.

Turning now to the bill before us, it represents a wideranging update to the Community Titles Act 1996 and the Strata Titles Act 1988. Put simply, it strengthens the rights of people living in units, townhouses and other shared developments and ensures that meetings are fairer, disclosure requirements are stronger, sustainability is supported and, most importantly, that managers and developers are held to account. It is about modernising the law so that it matches the realities of how more South Australians are living.

This is especially important in the community that I am privileged to represent in Adelaide's north, where we are seeing a notable rise in subdivisions and townhouse developments. For many locals, these properties represent the first step into home ownership, while for others they are a way to downsize and remain connected to family and community. As these developments increase, the laws that govern them must provide protection and confidence: this bill does exactly that.

One of the key areas addressed is the issue of conflicts of interest among body corporate managers. Recent revelations through an ABC *Four Corners* investigation exposed troubling practices in the strata insurance and management industry, including undisclosed commissions, re invoicing and steering business towards related companies. This behaviour is not only unethical but it directly harms vulnerable South Australians. It adds unnecessary costs for people already stretched thin, from first-home buyers to retirees.

The bill tightens disclosure requirements so that managers must openly declare their interests, detail the value of related party goods and services and explain why those arrangements are in the best interests of the corporation. In singling out certain elements, I am deeply relieved that at each annual general meeting managers will now have to disclose commissions and benefits received, keeping the process transparent and accountable.

I also welcome that the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission is looking into these issues at a national level, but it is right that we act here locally first to do all we can to ensure strata residents are protected. This is not an abstract matter for me. On two occasions in my life—in Darlington and Mount Barker—I lived under strata arrangements. Both times came in the early stages

of me stepping into the property market, and I remember the strain of high fees that were never easy to manage. Those experiences impressed upon me how vital it is that residents know their money is being directed exactly where it should be.

This bill goes some way towards stamping out unethical practices and addressing those concerns, ensuring greater honesty in how people's money is managed. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:30 the house adjourned until Tuesday 14 October 2025 at 11:00.