

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 15 October 2025

The SPEAKER (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell) took the chair at 10:30.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, we acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia and their connection to land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures and to elders both past and present.

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Bills

ELECTRICITY (VEGETATION CLEARANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electricity Act 1996. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Electricity (Vegetation Clearance) Amendment Bill 2025 is intended to effect discrete amendments to the Electricity Act 1996 to ensure that orchardists in the Adelaide Hills receive adequate notice of vegetation clearance works.

Members will recall that the contractor to South Australia Power Networks engaged to clear vegetation under powerlines recently entered into a commercial apple orchard in the Adelaide Hills and cut sections of apple trees before harvest and while they were heavily laden with apples. It might be observed that no professional or competent arborist acting reasonably would carry out any works on apple trees immediately before harvest. It may well be suggested, if only by South Australia Power Networks, that they must enjoy an unfettered right to conduct clearance works because of the risk of bushfire in my community or elsewhere.

Setting aside for a moment the commonsense observation that, first, the works could have been carried out competently at a time other than before harvest and, second, verdant apple orchards represent one of the lowest bushfire risk profiles of any vegetation in the Hills, entities which enjoy significant legal protections to enter into and remain on land for vegetation clearance purposes, and who cannot exercise those rights competently themselves or through a contractor, will naturally be the subject of legal reform. A sound public policy response is required to cast on South Australia Power Networks or its contractors a legislative obligation to engage in effective consultation before works are carried out.

Far from imposing any new cost or burden on SAPN, this legislation is intended to ensure that a company which enjoys every protection under the Electricity Act acts reasonably when dealing with other commercial interests in my community. Given the small number of commercial orchardists in the Adelaide Hills, and indeed in other parts of the state, including the Riverland, I would be particularly unsympathetic to the idea that this change would impose any unworkable administrative burden on SAPN should it be extended to other regions of the state. All commercial entities, including those who enjoy monopoly-like protections under the Electricity Act, must always be mindful of the commercial risks being taken by unregulated companies who do not enjoy regulated monopoly protection, such as small orchardists.

Should this legislation not be taken up by this parliament, I understand that Matt Schultz, who is standing as an Independent candidate in Kavel, intends to take up the matter in the next parliament, should he be elected.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 April 2024.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:37): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes19
Noes.....11
Majority8

AYES

Andrews, S.E.
Clancy, N.P.
Dighton, A.E.
Michaels, A.
O'Hanlon, C.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.J.

Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Pearce, R.K.
Savvas, O.M.

Champion, N.D.
Cook, N.F.
Hutchesson, C.L.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Piccolo, A.
Thompson, E.L.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cowdrey, M.J.
Hurn, A.M.
Telfer, S.J.

Batty, J.A.
Cregan, D.R.
Pratt, P.K.
Whetstone, T.J.

Brock, G.G.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Teague, J.B. (teller)

PAIRS

Hughes, E.J.
Fulbrook, J.P.
Malinauskas, P.B.
Szakacs, J.K.

Tarzia, V.A.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Pisoni, D.G.
Pederick, A.S.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (ADELAIDE PARK LANDS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 October 2023.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:42): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes19
Noes.....11
Majority8

AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Boyer, B.I.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Dighton, A.E.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hutchesson, C.L.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
O'Hanlon, C.C.	Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Savvas, O.M.	Thompson, E.L.
Wortley, D.J.		

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A. (teller)	Brock, G.G.
Cowdrey, M.J.	Cregan, D.R.	Hurn, A.M.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pratt, P.K.	Teague, J.B.
Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.	

PAIRS

Hughes, E.J.	Tarzia, V.A.
Fulbrook, J.P.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Malinauskas, P.B.	Pisoni, D.G.
Szakacs, J.K.	Pederick, A.S.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

HERITAGE PLACES (ADELAIDE PARK LANDS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 June 2025.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:48): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	19
Noes	10
Majority	9

AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Boyer, B.I.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Dighton, A.E.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hutchesson, C.L.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
O'Hanlon, C.C.	Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Savvas, O.M.	Thompson, E.L.
Wortley, D.J.		

NOES

Basham, D.K.B. (teller)	Batty, J.A.	Brock, G.G.
Cowdrey, M.J.	Cregan, D.R.	Hurn, A.M.
Pratt, P.K.	Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.

Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Hughes, E.J.
Fulbrook, J.P.
Szakacs, J.K.
Brown, M.E.
Malinauskas, P.B.

Tarzia, V.A.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ASSAULTS ON POLICE OFFICERS) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 March 2025.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:52): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	20
Noes.....	10
Majority	10

AYES

Andrews, S.E.
Clancy, N.P.
Dighton, A.E.
Michaels, A.
O'Hanlon, C.C.
Picton, C.J.
Thompson, E.L.

Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Pearce, R.K.
Savvas, O.M.
Wortley, D.J.

Champion, N.D.
Cook, N.F.
Hutchesson, C.L.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Piccolo, A.
Stinson, J.M.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B. (teller)
Cowdrey, M.J.
Pratt, P.K.
Whetstone, T.J.

Batty, J.A.
Cregan, D.R.
Teague, J.B.

Brock, G.G.
Hurn, A.M.
Telfer, S.J.

PAIRS

Hughes, E.J.
Fulbrook, J.P.
Szakacs, J.K.
Brown, M.E.
Malinauskas, P.B.

Tarzia, V.A.
Pederick, A.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Pisoni, D.G.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Motions***ALGAL BLOOM**

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (10:59): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes with concern the scale and duration of the harmful algal bloom affecting South Australian waters, including the Coorong Ramsar wetlands;
- (b) recognises the ecological damage, including depleted fish stocks, loss of marine biodiversity, and long-term risks to coastal ecosystems;
- (c) acknowledges the severe economic impact on commercial fishing, aquaculture, recreational fishing, and coastal businesses, and expresses support for affected families and communities;
- (d) condemns the delayed and inadequate response of the state and federal Labor governments;
- (e) calls on both governments to—
 - (i) extend and broaden eligibility for financial relief;
 - (ii) increase the fishing licence fee waiver to twelve months;
 - (iii) introduce a tourism voucher scheme to support affected tourism businesses;
 - (iv) release real-time and historical monitoring data;
 - (v) establish a coordinated, rapid-response framework;
 - (vi) institute a royal commission into the causes, impacts and government response; and
- (f) affirms the need for transparency, accountability, and genuine engagement with industry and communities in responding to marine environmental crises.

It is interesting that when I first gave notice to move this motion devastation was running rampant through our state. I know there are some in government who want to try to reinvent history, but the fact is that Labor was warned about the risks of such an algal bloom in 2023, and a request was made of Labor at that time for \$40 million. That was denied.

Whether or not we like to dwell on it now, the fact is that was denied. Now here we are, over six months into this devastating algal bloom, and unfortunately it is the residents of many coastal communities, it is the businesses along those coastal communities, it is the businesses that rely on those businesses along those coastal communities, that continue to suffer.

The response by this government—the lack of response by this Labor government—has been nothing but lacklustre, flat-footed and completely inadequate. We have seen multiple ministers now who are supposedly responsible for this bloom. We know there was the retirement of a minister, and we know that the Premier sat on the news of that retirement for several weeks before he appointed a new minister, and we saw evidence yesterday of how they are still playing catch up. They are still playing catch-up, and it is a real travesty and a real shame that communities, residents and businesses along our coast continue to suffer.

We have brought this motion forward, and it is interesting that, since putting pressure on this government on behalf of people and businesses who are affected along the coast, the government has now, finally, implemented some of our suggestions. I can remember exactly where I was: I was actually with the member for Frome and we were on a boat ramp. It was a very windy Sunday morning, and we were there with a charter provider who said to us at the time that the phone had not rung for several weeks, the emails had stopped coming in, and he was wondering whether he would literally have to give up his livelihood, his business, that he had run for over 10 years. At that time we were demanding some sort of JobKeeper-type relief, because we know that this algal bloom will pass but these people need some help, they need a bridge that gets them to that next point.

This Premier and this government have been completely inadequate and underwhelming when it comes to lobbying the federal government. You would think, with such a strong majority in Canberra, that if there were a political will there would be a way; you would think that this Premier, who is supposedly winning the awards he is winning at the moment, if he had that much courage, conviction and political capital he could pick up the phone and call Murray Watt, call the Prime

Minister, and to get this declared the natural, national disaster it should be declared as. But instead, no, that has not happened, and we still see no JobKeeper-type relief and we still see businesses that are continuing to suffer.

Coming to the boat charter operator, we are finally now seeing the Coast is Calling-type vouchers. This type of thing is something that we have been calling for for an extended period of time. Yesterday there was a significant package announced, and while we do acknowledge that the sum of over \$100 million was announced yesterday, unfortunately it has washed up a little bit too little and a little bit too late. A lot of this devastation could have been avoided had this government actually had its house in order.

Do we welcome the extension and the broadening of some of the eligibility for financial relief? Yes, we do, but I quoted yesterday an example of a gentleman who operates multiple tackle shops in and around Yorke Peninsula. He is one of the probably dozens of affected businesses that still cannot qualify for relief because they cannot jump through the hoops that this government continues to set.

When it comes to fishing licence fees, I have been in the member for Flinders' electorate—he would say the best electorate—in Port Lincoln on the West Coast, I have been in the member for Frome's electorate and I have been in the member for Chaffey's electorate. Whether it is the recreational fishing community or the commercial fishing community, the community has been decimated right across the state because of this harmful algal bloom.

Let's remember where we were only a few months ago when we saw this play out in public. We had this argument, this petulant argument, about whether this started in state waters or federal waters. Those opposite were basically mocking the opposition for doing their job, and that is to shine a light on the inadequacy of the response to this harmful algal bloom. We had ministers saying things like, 'Tell them to go to their insurers'—give me a break.

When it comes to real-time and historical monitoring data, the member for Finnis provided an exceptional example, a real-life example, on air this morning of the failure in adequate information being readily available having an actual financial impact and also a social impact, because now events are being cancelled when they should not be cancelled, and people who are then relying on those events to occur are experiencing a financial impact on their business.

Then we see this thought bubble that the government announced on the weekend where volunteers—and they are very good volunteers and they are capable volunteers, and often very young volunteers—are being asked and pressured and given responsibility to basically see what you cannot see in the water. How is that an adequate response to addressing this harmful algal bloom?

We still do not see adequate investment in terms of real-time and historical monitoring data. We asked the Premier. We gave him every opportunity yesterday—we actually asked the environment minister, but the Premier had to come in and rescue her—to provide an adequate timeframe in terms of how long it takes to get some of this testing done, and still it is the case that despite us being in basically a disaster situation, over six months later some of this testing is still done overseas.

They want to talk about the facility at Thebarton and how they are still going through accreditation. What point is there in having this done when the algal bloom, hopefully, will have subsided by then? It just shows you how flat-footed this government has been. It is not just the state government; it is also the federal government. We are still calling for that real-time and historical monitoring data.

Last night on Channel 7 news we saw another example of how people are coming forward—and these are not political players, these are real people—and saying that when they go out into the water, despite people telling them that it is okay, they are getting particular symptoms and their dog is getting particular symptoms. What does not help is when we see these lacklustre responses from this government and they do not release proper, thorough, real-life, real-time information.

We have also called for a coordinated rapid response framework and a royal commission. People say, 'Why do we need a royal commission?' Because a royal commission is the highest form of probing such an issue under no illusions, where people can be basically subpoenaed and required

to deliver only honest and holistic answers to questions that are put to them. These could be questions around: who knew what when? What are the causes of these blooms? How likely are they to occur? What can we be doing as a state to ensure that these types of blooms—firstly, hopefully, they do not happen again but, if they do happen again, what can we do to be more resilient as a state?

We also affirm the need for transparency, accountability and genuine engagement with industry and communities in responding to these marine environmental crises. We know that the harmful algal bloom is unprecedented in its scale and duration. It is not just an environmental issue; it is a catastrophe for our marine ecosystems, our fishing industries and the livelihoods of too many South Australians, and it does demand urgent attention, accountability in action. The house must note with grave concern the devastating impact of this bloom.

We know that the Coorong, a Ramsar-listed wetland of international significance, has faced significant threat. We have seen that fish stocks have plummeted, marine biodiversity is in decline and the long-term health of our coastal communities now hangs in the balance. These are not abstract losses: they are a direct assault on the natural heritage that we should be protecting for future generations.

The economic toll is equally as severe. It is our commercial fishers, aquaculture operators and coastal businesses that are reeling. Families have built their lives around these industries and some of these families are struggling to make ends meet. I have been visiting them for over six months now. I have met with these operators, met with the fishermen and tackle shop owners who are all contending with some of the toughest business conditions as it is that they have ever experienced as a result of this algal bloom crisis—and it is a crisis. It is a disaster on a national scale, and it should be declared as that disaster of that scale, which is why we have joined the community in demanding that the federal government declare this a natural disaster.

Recreational fishing, which is also a cornerstone of our coastal culture, has also been decimated. Tourism, as we know, is a vital economic driver for our regions, and that is suffering as events are cancelled and visitors stay away from affected areas. While we welcome the government supporting our idea to introduce this type of voucher, there is certainly more that can be done. The stories I have quoted are stories of hardship, of businesses on the brink and also of communities fighting to survive, yet what is perhaps more galling is the slow walking of response, or lack thereof, from both the state and federal Labor governments.

I think that the government has woken up to this. I think they finally are starting to realise the impact that this is having, but the public will not forget. The public will not forget the lack of urgency, the lack of leadership. This government seems to be more interested in PR than lasting solutions. We have seen that time and time again, just like you saw on the weekend with their press conference on Saturday, which was postponed because of the foam in the water at Glenelg. I mean, this is information that we have been provided; we did not make this stuff up. They have come to us and told us this.

It is time for decisive action to support our communities and protect our environment, so this motion calls on the government to step up. We demand that they do extend and broaden eligibility for financial relief to ensure that no affected family or business is left behind, and we are calling on the government to ease the burden on our fishers. These are practical, immediate steps to provide relief where it is desperately needed, but it must go further. Transparency is non-negotiable, and the public deserves access to real-time and historical monitoring data to understand the scope of the crisis but also to hold decision-makers accountable.

We need a coordinated rapid response framework to ensure that future environmental crises are met with swift, effective action, not the dithering that we have seen to date. Most critically, the house must call for a royal commission into the causes, the impacts and the government response to this algal bloom because South Australians deserve answers, answers that they can trust. What led to the disaster? Could it have been prevented? Why has the response been so woefully inadequate? A royal commission will provide the transparency and the accountability that our communities demand and ensure that we are better prepared for the future. It will provide independent answers.

This motion is about standing up for South Australians. It is about affirming our commitment to our environment, our industries and our communities. It is about demanding better from those in power. I urge all members of this house to support the motion to send a message that we will not stand idly by while our coastlines suffer, our ecosystems degrade and our people are left to fend for themselves. So let us act with the urgency and resolve that this crisis demands. I commend the motion.

Mr DIGHTON (Black) (11:14): I rise on behalf of the government to oppose the motion from the Leader of the Opposition. What my coastal community, what the people of this state, want is for members of parliament to work together to respond to this unprecedented harmful bloom and not to play politics over this devastating issue.

The scale of the state government response to the harmful algal bloom is unprecedented, as the algal bloom itself is. From the first signs of the bloom in March, the state government has worked to understand the bloom, its causes, movement and impacts. To be clear, the algal bloom could not have been prevented and cannot be eradicated. To say any different is to deny science. Unfortunately, this is what we have seen from the opposition as they seek to politicise this issue for their own benefit, sometimes directly at the expense of those they claim to be representing.

The algal bloom has evolved, and our understanding of it has evolved with it. This is what happens in an event as unprecedented as this. The state government is guided by the science and research and the needs of communities and industries that are feeling the impacts of the bloom—not by political pointscoring, not by trying to sow distrust of the science.

The motive of the Leader of the Opposition is to support misinformation and disingenuous motive, wrapped up as concern about the people he has done nothing to help. Nothing could make this clearer than the Leader of the Opposition outsourcing the opposition's response to the algal bloom to the Hon. Frank Pangallo. Even he has gone quiet since he was exposed pushing fake research and theories on desalination plants, having lazily relied on AI to do his work for him.

It is misinformation that causes people not to buy South Australian seafood. It is this misinformation that causes people not to travel to coastal locations. The state government recognises the ecological impacts, the effects on fish stocks, marine diversity and the coastal ecosystem. The government acknowledges the impact on commercial and recreational fishing and businesses who rely on it as well as the broader impact to coastal communities through fewer people travelling to them and participating in marine activities.

I have clearly seen the impact of that harmful algal bloom in my community. The bloom has had a devastating environmental impact on marine life. Like many of my constituents, it has been traumatic to witness the scale of fish loss and marine life that has washed up on the beaches of Hallett Cove, Marino, Kingston Park, Seacliff and Brighton, along with many other impacted parts of our state. This is why yesterday's announcement, along with earlier announcements in July, is so important. The government has and is investing in advancing our science and protecting the environment, including:

- water monitoring, forecasting, analysis and bloom mitigation;
- a national office for algal bloom research, which will be based in South Australia;
- trials of cutting-edge AI-powered live algal detection cybotots;
- native shellfish limestone reef restoration—at one stage we had 150,000 hectares of shellfish and limestone reefs throughout South Australia, which have been removed, and they would be critical for supporting our environment;
- reef projects, seagrass restoration and blue carbon trials; and
- a breeding conservation program for endangered and threatened species.

Because of its impact on the environment, it has had a big impact on the lives and lifestyle of people who live in my community. We love the beach—and we are so lucky in my community to live next to some of the most spectacular beaches—yet, because of this bloom, a large number of people have

spoken to me about how they have chosen to avoid the beach and the impact it has had on their wellbeing.

This is why the government is investing in measures to provide people with information they need so that they can return to the beach when it is safe. This includes seven-day (weekly) patrols at eight locations—Semaphore, Henley Beach, Glenelg, Brighton, Port Noarlunga, Moana, Aldinga Bay, Goolwa—and the launch of the Beachsafe app, which provides guidance about beach conditions at 23 locations across the metropolitan and southern coasts.

I joined with the Premier, along with the Minister for Environment and the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing and Surf Life Saving SA, last Sunday to announce the release of this Beachsafe app and between-the-flags patrols. Many people in my community have warmly received this information to assist them to access the beach when it is safe.

In addition, the government is coordinating daily beach clean-ups and has announced free entry to coastal national parks over the summer, sporting club grants—particularly for those that are aquatic sporting clubs—and a mental health support program. The government is also investing in supporting the recreational fishing sector, including support for fishing competitions, promotion of the sector and other initiatives. As a recreational fisherperson myself, albeit a very time-poor and skill-poor one, I understand how many people enjoy recreational fishing and what it means for their wellbeing, and so does the government.

The algal bloom has particularly impacted the commercial fishing sector, along with the tourism and hospitality sectors. The state government has worked side by side with impacted industries, particularly in the fishing sectors. The marine scalefish fisheries' peak bodies, the Marine Fishers Association and the South Australian Professional Fishers Association, have provided advice and guidance to the government on the kinds of assistance needed across their membership, who of course, are some of those most impacted by the bloom.

As a result of this and broader consultation and consideration, extensive support is now in place for businesses across a range of marine-related sectors and those who rely on them, with significant assistance available to fishers and aquaculture businesses. Since the commencement of this support, the guidelines for accessing the assistance have been monitored and changed where necessary and in line with the advice we received from those impacted industries.

The state government understands that impacted industries are doing it incredibly hard, and this is why support on offer often surpasses the kinds of support we have seen during COVID-19. Even with these guidelines in place, the state government recognises that not all businesses will fit neatly into a box in terms of the impacts they have experienced, as it varies between regions, industries, sectors and communities. This is why such care has been taken to explore the individual circumstances of these businesses and ensure every possible piece of information is considered to get as much support to these businesses as we possibly can.

Let's highlight in particular some of the supports for the fishing industry: additional \$10,000 small business grants to support that; \$125,000 grants to support the aquaculture and fishery industry; fee relief for commercial fishers until July next year; and grants of up to \$150,000 for industry resilience and diversification.

In terms of our tourism and hospitality sector, we are extending the Coast is Calling campaign, including 30,000 expanded and extended travel vouchers—which will include the KI ferry, registered Airbnbs and more tourism experiences—and 300,000 dining cashback vouchers. I am lucky to have some of the most fantastic restaurants and cafes in our state in my electorate, such as the Boatshed Cafe, the Marino Rocks Cafe, Nest, the Cove Tavern, the Seacliff Hotel, Cativa Cucina and many others. These businesses, I am sure, will benefit from the vouchers, which will encourage many people to visit our area.

For the benefit of the opposition leader, who, it seems, has come late to this issue, let's talk a bit about the motion in particular. Firstly, paragraph (e) of the motion talks about extending and broadening eligibility for financial relief. This has occurred throughout the period of the bloom, with the criteria for the initial grants changed in line with industry feedback in August, and significant

further announcements around financial relief made as part of the summer plan. The second point is:

- (ii) increase the fishing licence fee waiver to twelve months;

Fee relief has been in place for the April to June and July to September quarters, and now it has been extended until June 2026. The third point is:

- (iii) introduce a tourism voucher scheme to support affected tourism businesses;

A total of 20,000 vouchers were made available in time for the October school holidays and 30,000 more vouchers will be available in early December, as well as 300,000 half-price dining vouchers so that South Australians can support coastal hospitality businesses. The fourth point is:

- (iv) release real-time and historical monitoring data;

Guess what? SARDI, DEW and other agencies have worked hard to establish real-time monitoring, and the capability for this has expanded significantly. We are already doing it. That is what is happening in recent months, with water testing results on the DEW website and extensive data available via the algalbloom.sa.gov.au website. The fifth point is:

- (v) establish a coordinated rapid-response framework; and

The algal bloom taskforce meets weekly.

The SPEAKER: Member for Black, I draw your attention to the clock. Your time is up.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:25): It is my absolute pleasure to rise to talk about the algal bloom and how it has been completely mismanaged, particularly in the early days. When I say 'early days', I am talking about the first four months. This algal bloom has been going for seven months in the known world, as we saw the surfers report to social media back in mid-March, and it was not until the Premier came back from school holidays in July that we saw some action finally being taken.

Interestingly, the Minister for Primary Industries, the Hon. Clare Scriven from the other place, made some comments in early July calling on the opposition to stop basically making things up, because at that point in time we were calling for fee relief for fishermen, and she was saying that the industry had not even asked for it. We are fully aware of emails, etc., that had already gone in to that minister requesting fee relief. So, yes, they had already asked for it and, surprisingly, when the Premier came back from leave only a few days later, five days after that report was printed in *The Advertiser* online, the Premier announced fee relief for the fishermen.

It is really disappointing that the government is trying to spin and tweak the story. We heard this week where the Premier has tried to move away from the word 'toxic' in relation to referring to this bloom. His own scientists have made comments about it being toxic. At the Senate inquiry, a member of the Department of Health who gave evidence to that inquiry referred to it being toxic. That was when we learned that they had previously changed the health advice a week earlier without actually communicating widely to the population, and particularly to asthmatics, the change that was made.

It is really disappointing that that advice was not made clear. When health advice is made, the people who are vulnerable in this space need to know so that they are able to follow that advice. The government was relying effectively on a few journos in a room. That particular press conference was not live streamed, so there was no ability, apart from the two or three journos who were in the room, to pick up that one of the SARDI scientists actually issued a change in health advice. That is not normally where you would hear that from, so this has been a complete mismanagement.

In the last couple of days, since the Beachsafe app has come into play, we have seen the unfortunate circumstance where a local school down on the Fleurieu has cancelled its surf lessons for next week with a surf school based on the advice that was on the app. Amazingly, if you did a little bit of research, dug a little bit deeper and went to the government's website where they have the sampling—which is not a simple thing to read; the general punter is not necessarily going to understand; it is very scientific in its reporting—if you delve into those samples and look at the closest area to where the surf school operates, which is a sample point at the Murray Mouth, the *Karenia* species count for 6 October, 28 September and 22 September have all been zero.

There has been no algal bloom recorded at that location since mid-September, which is the only data that is up on the site, so you have to go there. However, their app yesterday was reporting foam and discoloured water, which has led to people interpreting, as the Premier stated in question time yesterday, that that is a strong indicator that brevetoxin is present. No, in my part of the world, where the River Murray flows out, that means there is some fresh water in the river water mixing with the seawater and that often looks brown and sometimes creates foam. It is really disappointing we are not getting clear messaging going out there. It is hurting businesses. It is leading to a really problematic circumstance, particularly in my electorate.

As the Premier said on radio, and I agree with him totally, it has been clear for months in our area but the message is not getting out there. I know that local councils have asked for government support to promote that our area is clear. It is certainly not something that has been forthcoming to the local councils, giving them assistance to do this. It is really important that we get this messaging right. It certainly has not been right all the way through from the start. We have seen failure to act for a very, very long time with a four-month delay before the government acted and it only really acted when it reached the metropolitan beaches, which is really disappointing. There were the complaints that the Eastern States were not listening: from my perspective, the issue was that the city was not listening either. The city politicians were not listening and we needed to keep raising it and we need to keep raising it because there are huge issues as well in even the packages.

I have done as much research as I can in relation to the announcements of the new funding arrangements with travel vouchers and dining vouchers, trying to find out what businesses in particular need to do, so I can help my community: I cannot find any detail. There are press releases out there saying it is available but I do not know what the details are. There are dates about how and when people need to apply, yes, but where do they need to apply, how do they need to do it? It is really confusing for businesses.

We have also seen the addition this time around of something I very much support which is the introduction of B&Bs as part of the travel voucher scheme. Accommodation along the south coast in my electorate has been very much based around B&Bs for well over 50 years. There was a real estate agent who built his business on it: Philip Dodd. Sadly, Philip died not that long ago but his business was 100 per cent built from the ground up by entering the holiday rental market and he has been operating that for years. We do not have huge numbers of motels and hotel accommodation that people can use. We rely on B&Bs to have the population turn up to the electorate to support our community. It is really good news that it is there but again there is very little detail about what these people need to do to get their businesses registered going forward. I am sure it will come but it would have been really good if it was up and running.

In the first two hours on Monday morning after the announcement of the new travel vouchers, the government's website still was only talking about the previous vouchers. Even after they had made public announcements, they had not updated their pages in a timely fashion to help people understand. The first people who want to have a look at that are those businesses, and they want to understand what they need to do because they have other things in their business that they need to manage and they need to be out there making sure that their business is being looked after. They do not have time to keep going back and waiting for the government to get the detail right.

So it is really important that we keep pressure on the government to make sure that they actually deliver what our communities need in this space. Sadly, it has been very late in coming. Yes, it is great that there is money on the table for support, but the opposition had been asking months ago for most of the things that have now been delivered by the government. They have had to be dragged and screaming into this space to make sure that they deliver.

Sadly, my community has just had the third lot of school holidays go past without decent support. We are seeing that the criteria for getting the \$10,000 grants for those businesses is for them to have a 30 per cent downturn in a three-month period. I suspect there are many of those businesses who would have had a 15 per cent downturn for the seven months. If you do those sums, that is actually more money. They may not have had 30 per cent over the three months but they certainly would have had the same sorts of losses over a longer period of time.

It is really important that the government makes sure they communicate well and make sure they actually get the data out that is accurate, because inaccurate data from the government is the worst sort of data. Yes, there are people out there spreading things on social media that are not necessarily appropriate but we need to make sure the government's stuff is accurate and, sadly, it has not been.

Ms PRATT (Frome) (11:34): I rise to speak to the motion that has been brought to this chamber and moved by the member for Hartley, noting a number of issues that this house notes with concern: the scale and duration of the harmful algal bloom affecting South Australian waters.

It will be clear from the opposition's contribution today that we do not come empty handed to this natural disaster, this coastal calamity. From the early quarter of this year it was clear that there were warning signs happening in our oceans and along our beaches and that a response was going to be required.

It is a glass jaw response from those opposite that they shriek that the sky is falling in and the opposition have contributed to talking down an issue that needs to be talked up and highlighted as the coastal disaster it is, if for no other reason than it was the federal Labor government that had a tin ear to this issue and has been dragged kicking and screaming by the public, by the media, by citizen scientists to get on a plane and come on down to a beach near you in South Australia to see the calamity that has been taking place on our coastal shoreline.

So we have not come empty handed. I think we will wear as a badge of honour the role we have played from opposition, not blaming the government for a natural disaster but challenge this government on its slow response, its flat-footedness to yet another environmental outbreak in a primary industry. We have seen this government take a very slow response to the tomato virus outbreak in the Adelaide Plains in my own electorate. I will touch on that again shortly.

We know that grapegrowers have been affected by drought and frost. We know that our grain producers and livestock growers have also been impacted by environmental factors that hurt their business. Collectively that is our primary industry and it is one of the most significant economic drivers that the Treasurer of the day benefits from when that revenue flows back in. So it is our duty to challenge this government on its disconnectedness from the environment, from its role in responding as the government of the day to pull those levers, as the Premier has said this week, 'Pulling all the levers'. I think they have missed a couple.

We have not come empty handed and in fact we have remained positive, we have remained productive in the suggestions that we have been putting forward and that is evident in no less an example than the successful, popular, productive and proactive initiative of the tourist voucher scheme. We called for that in July because it was our responsibility to put forward a suggestion, not just concern.

This tourist voucher scheme has been validated and vindicated by the response from South Australians. It was a suggestion that we felt would allow South Australians to help South Australians. Separate from grant schemes that are dependent on taxpayer funding, this was going to be an initiative that activated South Australians to get excited about a lottery idea, putting yourself, your family forward for something that you could win. For the 20,000 vouchers available, we have seen the response of 120,000 South Australians in that first round and we welcome the second round.

I put a question to the government yesterday on something close to my heart and embedded environmentally in my electorate of Frome, and that is the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary. I have written to the minister. Successive environment ministers have been given an opportunity to inform my community, through the task force that this government has established, exactly what progress and what initiatives are being undertaken through the millions of dollars the government is now allocating in its response to the ecosystem that extends beyond the marine life to the migratory birds that feed on that marine life.

We know that there has been a reduction in the fish stock and I continue my challenge to not just the department and the former environment minister but the incoming Minister for Climate, Environment and Water to take seriously the question I am putting to them, regarding the five million migratory birds that fly between Siberia and Port Parham, Thompson Beach. When they land, they

are so depleted of energy they are going to die without that food stock, so there needs to be evidence within that task force that there is a plan for preserving the food stock that they are going to be reliant on.

In fact, they have come up with their own campaign, calling the campaign 'Give us room in the bloom' because these birds are so precious and at risk environmentally that any disruption in their natural habitat by humans or dogs, if their food stock is diminished, would put them at further risk.

From a tourism point of view, for many of us, because we represent regional communities with coastlines, it has been concerning to receive so many phone calls from tourism operators around the state, including from the member for Finnis's own electorate, where reports were coming in about jetties that were closed. We knew at the time that regional tourism managers, at least seven out of 11, had given up their post, that there was not a response from the government, that the voucher scheme was a bit opaque at the beginning, that the grant scheme was not going far enough.

The threshold for 30 per cent was a barrier for many. Many, in fact, did not put forward their costings or apply because they knew they would not meet the threshold, only to find through the media that the Premier's own opaque language suggested that the government had some discretionary powers and that maybe 25 per cent or 20 per cent would get you across the line if you made a direct approach. That is not how business operates. The mixed messages that have come from the government are fairly and squarely of their making, and it is for them to look themselves in the mirror, I think, and reflect on their own contribution to this process.

I called in to the Ardrossan Caravan Park and caught up with Shane and Sonja, who at that time were experiencing cancellations well ahead of the summer plan. This was a winter catastrophe. The challenge to the government is that they have had all winter and part of spring to develop their summer plan. It has required three days this week to get the outcome that we have all been waiting for. We are not going to pat the government on the back for doing its job. The question is: what has taken it so long?

From conversations with commercial fishermen like Andrew Pisani and Bart Butson, we know the impact that this algal bloom has had on their business, their industry. If you are a charting operator, you know that the cancellations have come in. Their quotas, their boat licences, their fishing licences have been compromised and those boats are now in dock.

I challenge the government's self-congratulatory approach to investing in establishing a lab testing facility here when it is in fact two strikes and they are out. We saw with the tomato virus that we had no lab capacity through PIRSA and those tests were having to be sent to Victoria for analysis, which meant we had to get in line behind those tomato growers. The same has happened here again. The testing swabs that were taken have been sent to New Zealand. We should not be proud that we are now having to invest money back in our own workforce. It should exist already. I think the public servants in that industry know that and have not been able to make too much noise there.

I want to thank the citizen scientists, the people who have every day been out on our beaches, from Kangaroo Island to the Fleurieu, city beaches to Yorke beaches. They are the people who have come across dead marine life in a confronting way. Young kids have been a part of that, and they are the heroes of this story. I commend the motion.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:45): I also take the opportunity in parliament to support the leader's motion that notes with concern the scale and duration of the harmful algal bloom affecting South Australian waters; recognises the ecological damage, including depleted fish stocks, loss of marine biodiversity and long-term risks to coastal ecosystems; acknowledges the severe economic impact on commercial fishing, aquaculture, recreational fishing and coastal businesses, and expresses support for affected families and communities; and also condemns the delayed and inadequate response of the state and federal Labor governments.

When you think about the timelines of this algal bloom that others have spoken about, it first came to the fore for South Australians back in March this year, coming into the Easter period. It affected the member for Finnis's electorate specifically. People were warned, 'Don't go swimming. There's algae in the water.' Hundreds of metres off the shoreline, people reported reactions to their

skin from algae. The effects of sea spray that was blown up at the time were felt even at Goolwa football club.

The advice that came out was that we will just wait for a winter storm and it will dissipate. Certainly, that advice from government departments really seems to have caused a bit of a laissez-faire attitude and the government thinking it will all go away and there is nothing to worry about here. What we have seen is that it has not gone away. What became apparent is that the River Murray floods back in 2023 pushed megalitres of water out into the Coorong, which put tonnes of nutrients into the ocean systems. Scientists recognised this and made requests for funding from the federal Labor government, that this needed to be monitored because there was a high potential that the big Murray River floods could manifest into an algal bloom.

At the time, the then environment minister was on holiday during the flooding of the River Murray, the biggest flood since 1956, if I am correct. Again, it speaks to just letting things rip. We found that the effects of letting things rip presented themselves, unfortunately, on the beaches of Glenelg, Glenelg North and Somerton Park in July, when we saw thousands of dead marine animals wash up onto the shores.

Amongst them were so many different species, species that you would not normally see because they are in the gulf. They are not fish. They are just there as part of the ecosystem, and all of a sudden they are being affected by this algae. Of course, we had those southern fiddler rays, one of the bigger marine animals, wash up. Other beaches even had seals and dolphins as well. They were washing up and causing huge concern amongst my community. While it was increasing in intensity, as I said, the state government's response had been slow and fragmented.

I was there inspecting firsthand these marine animals and seeing the devastation. Meanwhile, the Premier was on holiday, of course, presumably enjoying an algae-free beach in the tropics while my community was having this unfold in front of them. I think all of a sudden people began to realise this was a real problem here. The federal government was missing in action. The state government was missing in action. There was a kneejerk response. Obviously, the Premier came back and said, 'We better start doing something.' Murray Watt was summoned to South Australia. He flew in to Adelaide Airport, made the quick taxi ride down to Glenelg North Beach, probably five kilometres. He spent 11 minutes there, packed up and left.

So that was the regard that the federal Labor government had for South Australia. It was disgraceful, and it caused so many questions for my community. My community had many questions, fielded in my electorate office, about what is going on with the algal bloom and what we should do: what can we do, what is happening to my dog, is it safe for pets to walk on the beach, is it safe for my kids to walk on the beach, and should I be swimming?

There were all these questions, and unfortunately there was a sparsity of information. People were bewildered about what to do, and the government was not providing that information. So I hosted an algal bloom community forum in August for my community, to give them information and to provide them access to experts to understand what is going on. I had speakers—including marine biologist Anita, sustainability systems scientist Andrew, tourism operator Tony, and fisher Bart as well—giving different angles on what was going on.

I do note that, a few days before my forum was meant to run, the government quickly put up on social media that they were going to run a forum in Brighton. Their guest speaker was going to be Peter Malinauskas, to manage the message—no experts, just political spin to try to reassure everyone. Well, what was explained in my algal bloom community forum were some serious issues. The experience identified by Anita was that overseas, when these algal blooms get to this size, they really become endemic and that the algal bloom in South Australia is replicating not only by splitting cells but also by reproducing with eggs. So there are two methods, and of course the eggs are sitting there, waiting to come back when the conditions are right, leading to a continuation of it.

As was remarked, the experience in Ireland, back in the eighties, was that there was an algal bloom there for five years. It went away for a bit and then came back in the nineties. That was certainly sobering and really reinforced why this needs to be taken seriously and why it needed to be acted upon early, not just with 'let it dissipate via a winter storm'.

Sustainability systems scientist Andrew said that you cannot have these algal blooms without a lot of nutrients being present; for example, nitrogen. So there is a land management issue as well. He did make a prescient point when he said that algal blooms happen around different parts of the world and that if climate change is blamed as the only reason for this it basically lets governments off the hook. We know climate change is a global problem, and it gives them the opportunity to not put focus on when focus is required. Andrew made the point that algal blooms are treated around the world as local issues and therefore are acted upon locally.

So the government is again seeking to blame others instead of taking action themselves. It really was at this time quite evident that this needed to be declared a natural disaster, yet the government worked on semantics and the like and there was no progress from either the state or the federal Labor governments. The federal opposition leader, Sussan Ley, came to Glenelg South, such was her concern to view this firsthand. She also reiterated the basically quite obvious statement that this needs to be declared a natural disaster. Unfortunately, that has not occurred yet. The federal Labor government and the state Labor government have had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, to the table to give answers.

The federal Senate has instead run an inquiry into the causes of the algal bloom, and this state parliament is also running an inquiry. I attended the hearing that the federal Senate inquiry had at Seacliff to hear from experts there. Also, just recently, we have had a hearing in the South Australian parliament. The hearing here really just showed that the Malinauskas Labor government has dropped the ball and has fumbled its response from day one.

In the meeting it was revealed that the harmful algal bloom was first detected in March but the state Labor government waited until late July to formally request commonwealth government help—a four-month delay that left local communities and small businesses in limbo. Unbelievably, the state Labor government never saw a disaster declaration from the commonwealth government, despite the event being one of the largest marine die-offs in Australia's history.

So there we have just two examples, and there were many more put on the record, of the government's slow and fragmented response to this. South Australians really deserve better. The algal bloom is devastating the coastal parts of the community in Morphett, it is strangling businesses and it is harming locals, while just killing immeasurable numbers of marine life. I will continue to be a trusted local voice for my community, advocating on their behalf in the midst of this natural disaster.

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (11:54): I rise to speak on this very important motion, and I want to especially highlight the impact that this algal bloom and the resulting brevetoxin levels within the water are having on aquaculture businesses, in particular, in my electorate.

I was worried yesterday when the Premier in his answers to questions spoke about the impacts on the oyster industry. He spoke about American River in your electorate, sir, he spoke about Stansbury, but he did not mention at all the impact that this algal bloom is having on the Franklin Harbour, Cowell oyster industry. No offence to those other two that the Premier may know about and has mentioned, but they are insignificant compared to the output of the Franklin Harbour area and the impact that this algal bloom is having on them.

These oyster growers within the Franklin Harbour area have not been able to sell their oysters now for several months and have not been able to move their oysters out of the bay to other areas. For the sake of the chamber, I wish to just let members know about the nuance of the oyster industry on Eyre Peninsula, in that Franklin Harbour is a significant area for growing oysters and there are a number of growers within that area. But it is also a significant nursery area for oysters; that is, oysters spend their early years within Franklin Harbour and then get shifted out to other higher energy, higher nutrient bays across Eyre Peninsula to grow out and get bigger to a point of sale.

Franklin Harbour is a significant aspect of the oyster industry, even above that which comes directly out of their waters. For those oyster growers to have not been able to actually sell or move oysters now for several months, it is having a significant financial impact on not just those growers but the whole of the Cowell economy.

It is having a really detrimental effect and these oyster growers are calling on the government to be proactive in investing in the science which is necessary, because at the moment, with elevated

brevetoxin levels within their oysters, they are having to send oyster samples from Franklin Harbour all the way over to New Zealand without the capacity to actually do that here in Australia.

They are waiting somewhere between 10 to 16 days between test samples to actually know whether the brevetoxin levels are high in their oysters or not. They do not even know if they can sell with that delay, that lag that they are facing at the moment. This is a significant issue financially for the people of Cowell and Franklin Harbour and for the Eyre Peninsula oyster industry as a whole.

The government need to be proactive in putting energy and effort into trying to see if there is opportunity to be able to fast-track some of those quick testings that we know are available for other types of *Karenia* species and also brevetoxins around the world. This needs to be something which PIRSA and SARDI have significant interest and involvement in, because at the moment the oyster growers of Franklin Harbour are really hurting and they do not know when they are going to be able to either move their oysters or sell them.

We also need to put effort into the science to work out at what level the oysters actually purge that brevetoxin out of their system so they know when it can be moved. The government cannot continue to be flat-footed on this; they need to listen to the oyster growers of Franklin Harbour and they need to act and act now.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the minister I would like to welcome members of the Robran family here to parliament today. It is wonderful to see you all on such a special day.

Motions

ROBRAN MBE, MR B.

The Hon. L.P. HOOD (Adelaide—Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (11:59):

I move:

That this house—

- (a) expresses its deep sadness at the passing of Barrie Robran MBE, a legend of South Australian football and one of South Australia's most revered sporting icons;
- (b) acknowledges Mr Robran's extraordinary career, including 201 games for North Adelaide, 17 games for South Australia, three Magarey Medals (1968, 1970, 1973), and his role in premierships in 1971 and 1972;
- (c) recognises his induction into the Australian Football Hall of Fame in 1996 and his elevation to 'Legend' status in 2001, the first South Australian and the first player without AFL/VFL experience to receive this honour;
- (d) honours his humility, courage and lifelong service to football as a player, captain, coach, selector and mentor, including his contributions off the field to the North Adelaide Football Club and the broader football community; and
- (e) sends its sincere condolences to his wife Taimi, sons Matthew and Jonathon, and all who knew and admired him.

Today we honour the life and legacy of Barrie Robran, a footballer whose name is etched not only in record books but in the hearts of South Australians. Barrie Robran was not just a champion of the game; he helped define it. He emerged from Whyalla with extraordinary talent, joining North Adelaide in 1967 and rapidly becoming one of the most influential players in SANFL history.

Barrie was a country boy, as so many of our great footballers are. He was born in Whyalla in 1947, and his sporting prowess came out during his time at Whyalla South Primary School and Whyalla Technical School. At the age of 17 Barrie took to the field with the North Whyalla Magpies A-grade team before catching the eye of the mighty North Adelaide Roosters. North Adelaide boldly named Barrie in their reserve side during the 1966 finals. Some would perhaps consider it trial by fire, but this was no mean feat for Barrie, whose performance left an unforgettable mark and changed the course of the club for decades to come.

In 1967 Barrie relocated to Adelaide to kick off his career with the Roosters, tying with one of his football heroes, Don Lindner, for club best and fairest in his very first season. Across 201 games for the Roosters he achieved what few could dream of: three Magarey medals, two premierships and seven consecutive best and fairest awards. He also wore the South Australian state guernsey with pride on 17 occasions and captained the team twice.

Yet Barrie's greatness was never just measured by accolades, and his values and attitude transcended sport. He was a footballer of rare elegance—balanced, brave and brilliant—with an uncanny ability to read the play and lift those around him. He was also known for his humility and sportsmanship, earning admiration from opponents and adoration from fans. His 1972 best-on-ground performance against VFL premiers Carlton in the Championship of Australia stands as one of the greatest displays ever seen on an Australian football field, a moment that continues to inspire generations.

Barrie's younger brother Rodney played alongside him for much of his playing career at North Adelaide and was a well-regarded player in his own right. Barrie's sister was, as Barrie said, the unheralded champion of the family. She was an all-Australian netball captain.

Barrie married the love of his life, Taimi, at the Enfield Methodist Church in January 1970, and together they had two sons, who shared Barrie's love for football. Matthew played in Adelaide's 1997 and 1998 premiership victories—go Crows—while Jonathon represented Hawthorn and Essendon.

Even after a career-altering knee injury, Barrie Robran remained devoted to his sport. He coached for his beloved Roosters, including whilst his brother Rodney was captain. He mentored up-and-coming players and volunteered at club headquarters giving back to the sport that had given him so much. He later served as state selector, shaping South Australian football long after his playing days had ended.

In 1996 Barrie was inducted into the Australian Football Hall of Fame. In 2001 he became its 17th official Legend, the first South Australian and the first never to have actually played in the VFL or AFL. That speaks volumes. In 2002, he was an automatic inclusion into the inaugural Football SA Hall of Fame.

Barrie was deeply connected to our North Adelaide Football Club community, often seen at Prospect Oval quietly enjoying the game, just another fan in the crowd, humble and unassuming, as always. His bronze statue at Adelaide Oval, the first to ever be given to a SANFL player, is a fitting tribute to his stature in the game and in the hearts of South Australians. I firmly believe AFL Chief Executive Andrew Dillon put it best:

While fans in other states may argue over who were their best-ever players, that same debate has always been absent in Adelaide as any South Australian who saw Robran play simply defers to him as the greatest.

To his wife, Taimi, to sons, Matthew and Jonathon, and all who loved and admired him—many of whom join us in the gallery today—we offer our deepest condolences. Barrie Robran was more than just a footballer. He was a symbol of elegance, humility and South Australian pride, and his legacy will endure through every child who dares to dream big on a footy oval. May he rest in peace.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:04): I also take this opportunity to express our deep sadness at the passing of Barrie Robran and to note his legendary status in the game of Australian Rules Football, but also his impact as a sporting icon across South Australia and Australia. He is certainly in the top echelon of the very best that Australia has ever had in sport.

If you reflect back, Barrie played in a golden age of football in South Australia when state rivalry was at its greatest and when the feats of these great players transitioned from black-and-white footage to colour footage. I think all of us would agree that Barrie really brought the colour to football in South Australia. We have had some legends of the game play during that period and, unfortunately, lost some of those legends in the past four years. Russell Ebert has passed on, as has Neil Kerley and, just recently, Max Basheer. They all had a very influential role in South Australian football in their own right, but on 16 July this year we were met with the very sad news that the very best of them all, Barrie Robran, had passed on and really left what can only be described as a hole in the hearts of all those who love football in South Australia.

Barrie was born in Whyalla in 1947 and played at a time when football, as I said, was much more suburban. It was not the domestic competition that it is now. Certainly, players of Barrie's ilk—the players who are playing now—stand on his shoulders, much as he stood on many other players' shoulders while taking marks. He went to school in Whyalla and excelled not only in football but other sporting endeavours as well. His childhood hero, Don Lindner, played for North Adelaide, so that was where Barrie wanted to find himself.

Another legend of our game who I spoke of earlier, Neil Kerley, also came from Whyalla and he was giving the heads-up to West Adelaide, his club, that there was a fantastic footballer in Whyalla and saying, 'You should go and have a look at him. His name is Barrie Robran.' Of course, as clubs started to see Barrie's exploits, all the other SANFL clubs started showing interest but Barrie was determined to play for North Adelaide.

Funnily enough, especially when you think about where AFL football is at now, where you get kids drafted when they are 18 and going across the country, as an 18 year old Barrie stayed in Whyalla to continue to work and play for his local football club and was not drawn to the big smoke. Again, it was a different time from what we have now. Barrie played in the finals series in 1966 in the reserves for North Adelaide, and dominated. It was quite apparent that he would certainly have been able to play in that 1966 season, and that was emphasised when he did eventually come to play in Adelaide in 1967.

His league debut was against Sturt, the reigning premiers. They were the 1960s powerhouse of the SANFL, winning, I think, five premierships. Barrie basically was best on ground in his first game and led North to victory. He was a fantastic player and that would play out for the remainder of his career. What we saw on game day was a magnificent player but Barrie was renowned for his work ethic, coming to training an hour early and practising his skills probably in the day when a lot of the pre-training preparation for some of the players would have been to knock off, go to the pub and then turn up for training and have a cigarette.

Barrie really honed his skills and had great skills kicking with both left and right feet at a time when people did not have a non-preferred and he was a great overhead mark as well. He went on to win North Adelaide's best and fairest seven times in a row. For the 1967 best and fairest he tied with his hero, Don Lindner, and was awarded that best and fairest retrospectively, but went on to win seven times. He came third in the Magarey Medal in his first season, which is just a mark of what a dominant player he was to become, and then went on to win the Magarey Medal in seasons 1968, 1970 and 1973.

He was more than just a footballer; he also was very dedicated to his family. In 1970, he married Taimi and then went on to have two sons. Matthew was born in 1971, and you would have to say that this was really a time on which Barrie would have reflected fondly. Being married in 1970, his first son, Matthew, was born in 1971, and Barrie went on to win the premiership against Port in 1971 by 20 points. Anyone who has played SANFL footy knows there is nothing better than beating Port, and certainly nothing better than beating Port in a grand final. Barrie was able to do that, and in 1972 follow up that feat, beating Port again in the grand final, this time by 56 points.

That led to what would have to be another of the highlights of Barrie's career, and I think something on which all South Australians could look with pride. On 15 October—today is 15 October, so 53 years ago today—North Adelaide was crowned champions of Australia. Back in the day, the premiers of WA, SA, Victoria and Tasmania came together after their grand finals and played off to determine which was the champion club of Australia. The VFL of course had been a dominant force in Australian Rules Football, and no South Australian club had won the Champion of Australia title since 1914, that being Port Adelaide.

In 1972, Carlton came over here. If anyone has any knowledge of Carlton, they would know that they are reasonably big-headed. They would have come over here thinking they were doing the job, and they have come up against not only North Adelaide but Barrie Robran. The game was very close and Carlton threw everything at it, to the point where North was behind going into a strong wind in the last quarter. Led by Barrie in that last quarter, North was able to keep Carlton to only one goal and was able to kick two goals to come out victors by one point against Carlton. Barrie was named best on ground, and that certainly would have to have been one of the highlights of his football career.

Other highlights would be his representation for South Australia: he played for SA 17 times and was captain for two of those. I should also add another highlight of 1972 was that only six days later, after being crowned champion of Australia, his second son, Jono, was born on 21 October. He packed a lot into those three years of life.

In 1974, he was named captain of the South Australian team, played against WA at Football Park—the first state game at Footy Park—and then travelled to the SCG to play against Victoria and suffered a career-altering knee injury from what could only be described as a late Leigh Matthews clash, which really cruelled Barrie's impact as a player. He continued on playing until 1980, but unfortunately was not the player he was before that. In physical stature and certainly in spirit, what he gave to North Adelaide and to South Australian football never waned. He was the coach of North Adelaide from 1978 to 1980 and then also was a state selector from 1984 through to 1998.

I got to meet with Barrie and his sons, who played with Norwood. He was never about the limelight and you could tell, from seeing him come along to watch his sons play, that he was never there trying to tell them what to do. He let them tread their own path, and you would have to say they did it well. Matthew won two premierships with the Crows and Jono played for Hawthorn and Essendon—both very good players, playing very well at SANFL level as well. Time defeats me, but I just point out that of course Matthew had to sit out the 1992 season because Hawthorn would not let him play here for Norwood when he wanted to come back and play in the South Australian league.

Finally, as was noted, Barrie was of course recognised both in the AFL Hall of Fame as a legend and in the South Australian Football Hall of Fame as a legend. He sits beside Don Bradman and Bart Cummings as the very best of sporting greats here in South Australia. I offer my sincere condolences to his wife Taimi, sons Matthew and Jono, and all the family. He was a true legend. He was very humble and is respected by all.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:15): I rise just briefly to commend the motion moved by the member for Adelaide and spoken to so eloquently by the member for Adelaide and by the member for Morphett. Just to underscore, there is a reason why we say in South Australia that Aussie Rules runs through the veins. It does that because of Barrie Robran and his like. It is true to say Barrie stands as a symbol of what is great about South Australia. We can talk, as we should, about those extraordinary feats, those extraordinary sporting achievements. This is a man who defines our state. We say Aussie Rules runs through the veins because of Barrie Robran.

These days, it is a great game and it attracts great athletes and players who get paid brilliantly well for their services, and good luck to them, but it is good to underscore that Barrie's playing of the game, his being drawn to live his life's achievements on that stage playing the great game, was about doing something bigger than money, bigger than the playing contract, bigger than the professional side of all of that. It was about displaying those magnificent skills as a display of heart and soul and belief in something so much bigger and more human.

So the rewards to Barrie, I hope that we can express in this parliament, that run throughout his life way beyond his playing time and then indeed beyond his passing as an example for how we all ought to do what we can in our lives in this state, speak as a tribute down the ages. So I commend the motion, and let us all do what we can to emulate that great legacy.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:17): I, too, would like to support the motion moved by the member for Adelaide and relay a little story about the impact that Barrie unknowingly had on our lives. Coming from a family that was double blue—generational double blue—whenever Barrie was near the ball, it was hold your breath and 'oh no'. My son, I would have thought, would have been a Sturt supporter as well. He was four years old and Sturt and North were playing at Prospect Oval. I got out the family scarf that was given to him at birth and we headed down to Prospect Oval.

Barrie happened to be on a stall. I think it might have been a caravan or something, and they had scarves and footballs and membership forms. So we were standing there at the beginning of the game, and our four year old said he wanted to go and have a look, so we went across and got talking to Barrie. Barrie was delightful and the four year old, our son, said he wanted to be a North Adelaide member, and it was just horror from our family. Barrie looked at me and he said, 'What about mum?'

because I had my double blue scarf. Anyway, Barrie signed him up as a junior North Adelaide member, and he remains a member to this day.

Barrie was just delightful in the way he was talking to all of the kids who were there and the young people who were around. On a number of occasions that I did meet him, he was always most personable and someone who was just a genuine person. So my sincere condolences to the family. Know that Barrie's memory lives on in many memories here, not only in our parliament but in people who are football followers around South Australia. He well and truly earned his place in the Australian Football League Hall of Fame.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Elizabeth I would like to say that I concur with all the comments made by the speakers on that motion, despite being a supporter of Port Adelaide.

Mr ODENWALDER: A somewhat sour note to end on, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It was not a sour note.

ALGAL BLOOM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. V.A. Tarzia (resumed on motion).

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:20): It gives me great pleasure to reconvene and discuss the motion put by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the algal bloom and what it means for South Australia. As the member of MacKillop, covering most of the Limestone Coast coastline, I can advise that we are not immune from this algal bloom and the effects it is having on our community, coastline, sea life and the like.

As a member of parliament, a representative of everyone in my electorate, and probably for the greater good of South Australia, I find that this algal bloom potentially does not have what I would call the greatest of bipartisan support in what is being done at this stage, and that perhaps it is being blown out of proportion beyond what it really means to the whole of the South Australian economy. That is not to take away from the effect it is having on areas along our coastline, including the greater metropolitan area, Yorke Peninsula, Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island, even down into my neck of the woods in MacKillop, the Coorong Lakes, the Murray Mouth and the like, and also on consumption of seafood in general in South Australia—maybe even further abroad.

I would hope that this house unanimously sits behind the science, sits behind the facts, and absolutely wants the best outcome for everyone around this algal bloom, that we are bipartisan in finding a way forward; it is no political party's responsibility for the algal bloom turning up and what it is now doing to our coastline, sea life and the like. It is sad, in a greater degree, that we have areas of our coastline, society, businesses and seafood businesses, whether they be restaurants or producers of seafood, all suffering under this natural phenomenon, yet we are not bipartisan in finding a solution—and we would all be better off if we could.

This comes to my strong point that we have seen fishers around Meningie—scale fishers, small fishers—suffer from the lack of demand, perhaps even suffer a lack of the resource due to a die-off in the lower lakes and Murray Mouth area. However, we are also seeing a threat to and concern about the coastline where there is no algal bloom. This is why I stand here right now.

We have a town in the Limestone Coast—and there are several of them—that really has a boom time come December, January, February, and maybe even nearly March, for attracting tourists from South Australia, Victoria and probably all around Australia. They should still be coming to these towns because there is no algal bloom on the Limestone Coast down near Kingston, Robe, Beachport, Southend, Port MacDonnell and around to the Victorian border and coastline as well.

These towns—and there are probably ones on Eyre Peninsula of very similar nature as well—are not suffering the algal bloom, and I do not want them to be branded because they are South Australian coastal communities or towns and there is an algal bloom in South Australia. This language is not helpful; it does not help anyone at all in the whole state in terms of what the next

three or four months might look like for all businesses concerned around the summer holidays, Christmas and New Year's Eve, and for South Australians in general.

This does not take away from the request by the opposition that we do need good policies around the support that is going to be needed for businesses that are suffering from this algal bloom to be able to manage and survive, if that is the intent and the goodwill of the government and this place—and I mean unanimously by the 47 members of this lower house.

I am really asking the government and the opposition to be steadfast and honest, with integrity, in sorting out what the algal bloom means for those communities and areas that are suffering, but also in highlighting those communities and coastlines that are not suffering this algal bloom. It needs to be clearly highlighted that these coastal towns and areas are not suffering the algal bloom. We have to start defining it. You might want to have a warning process if they did start to suffer.

What I see governments sometimes do is be overzealous and overreach—and perhaps cover their backsides, in a rough form of speech—and say, 'The whole of the coastline could suffer an algal bloom at some stage, but it's not there yet.' That is not helpful to anyone, and it is certainly not helpful to those towns that do not have an algal bloom and potentially may never have one because they are exposed to massive tides, massive currents and massive swells, and may always be getting their waters from cleaner areas rather than the trapped waters of the gulfs, such as Adelaide beaches and the like, where it cannot get away as we would like to see and there have to be other means.

This gives me a little bit of impetus here to support the government. I hope that the opposition is on board around oyster reefs, artificial reefs and the like. It has been talked about why they do not exist anymore: they were harvested, raped and pillaged over 100 years ago. We need to re-establish these. I am hoping that the government does not think about these types of reefs just for where the algal bloom is.

I think the artificial coastal reef idea has many merits for not only being a filter for an algal bloom but also for coastal erosion, and perhaps even the opportunity to create surf and surf beaches on artificial reefs that may attract people to surf the brilliant waves that could be created by an artificial reef structure. It would also protect our eroding coastline from the current storms and sea surges that are larger and more frequent than we are used to.

So there is an opportunity that I really would hope the state government takes up, and they should be working with the federal environment minister around artificial reefs. There is a program in the environment minister's portfolio federally that is solely looking at artificial reefs and how they will help our coastline. There are millions, maybe even hundreds of millions, sitting in there that I am hoping South Australia is looking at considering to, let's say, be bipartisan and use those funds for what I think is a crisis in regard to the algal bloom.

It is not only the algal bloom but the erosion issues we are seeing that are being dumped and put on local government. They are really seen to be hamstrung by the lack of moneys that they can collect and the cost of coastal erosion and dealing with seawalls, rock walls, sand replenishment and the infrastructure losses that we are seeing down in our neck of the woods on the Limestone Coast and no doubt elsewhere around the state.

Thank you to the opposition leader for this motion. I am not picking on the government or any side of politics of this house, or saying that anyone has the worst intentions. What I would say to this house is: let's try to find the best intentions around what this algal bloom means. The language should be more positive. Hopefully, the whole coastline does not have to suffer this algal bloom when there is no algal bloom being found in many other places than have been described.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	12
Noes.....	22
Majority	10

AYES

Basham, D.K.B. (teller)
Cowdrey, M.J.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Teague, J.B.

Batty, J.A.
Cregan, D.R.
Pratt, P.K.
Telfer, S.J.

Brock, G.G.
McBride, P.N.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Andrews, S.E.
Clancy, N.P.
Dighton, A.E. (teller)
Hutchesson, C.L.
Mullighan, S.C.
Pearce, R.K.
Stinson, J.M.
Wortley, D.J.

Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Koutsantonis, A.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Picton, C.J.
Szakacs, J.K.

Champion, N.D.
Cook, N.F.
Hood, L.P.
Michaels, A.
O'Hanlon, C.C.
Savvas, O.M.
Thompson, E.L.

PAIRS

Hurn, A.M.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.

Hughes, E.J.
Fulbrook, J.P.
Brown, M.E.
Malinauskas, P.B.

Motion thus negatived.

R U OK? DAY

Ms PRATT (Frome) (12:33): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that 11 September 2025 is R U OK? Day, a national day of action that reminds all Australians to check in with one another and support those who may be struggling;
- (b) acknowledges the vital role of meaningful conversations in suicidal prevention and commends R U OK? for empowering individuals to connect and offer support;
- (c) encourages all South Australians to take the time to ask, 'Are you OK?', and to listen with empathy and without judgement;
- (d) recognises the many local organisations, volunteers, health workers and community leaders across the state who work every day to promote mental wellbeing; and
- (e) recognises that mental health is a shared responsibility and calls for continued investment in accessible, community-based mental health services across regional and metropolitan South Australia.

Of course, R U OK? Day (11 September) is well behind us, and we are now in the middle of October when we mark Mental Health Awareness Month. I note that the member for Elder has put forward her own motion recognising World Mental Health Day. We have been cut short today, but I anticipate that across the chambers we will all take the opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to invest in mental health, thanking those who work in the mental health sector and recognising the challenges that people living with mental distress experience.

I, too, take that opportunity. While we are discussing a motion that recognises R U OK Day?, I think we have collectively moved or evolved to understand that that is not one question for one day out of 365, but in fact a question we want to put to people any day of the year. So it is 'are you okay?' at any time, but the message must go further than that; it is not just in the asking of the question. If we are prepared to ask that question, we are also prepared to hear the answer whatever it may be, and make sure the person we are asking knows that we are there to listen and to support and demonstrate compassion for those who experience and live with anxiety, depression and other mental illnesses.

The month of October allows every member in here within their own communities to reach out and connect with those services that are currently available. It is important to recognise that services do exist, but there are opportunities that I will continue to take to ask of the government what more can be done. What more funding can be allocated beyond the government's commitment to investing in mental health beds in hospitals? When that person is discharged and returned to their home, to their community, to their family, to their lifestyle, what supports exist and what supports are required at the community mental health level?

I was very fortunate, last week, to have been invited and included in my community of Clare by the mental health services sector to join them in the expo, having a table and being available at Ennis Park, a very public square in Clare that is a main thoroughfare between the businesses and retail sector, to demonstrate in a very visual way what services are available for people who live through the Clare Valley and Gilbert Valley district and catchment. It is important to note that, as I travel the state meeting with different groups who want to talk about opportunities for policy or investment in mental health, in regional communities there is sometimes a refrain that suggests there are no services in regional South Australia, and that is not correct.

I do observe the duplication of those services, and I see that particularly in Port Pirie. But I think that what they have a sense of is, in fact, they do not know where to start. Some of these services are invisible, difficult to find and difficult to navigate. The bilateral agreement that we have with the commonwealth around funding has existed for a long time but it starts to be a handbrake on how that money flows through, where it goes and the visibility that we need mental health services to have.

At the expo, obviously many more experienced people than I were available. It had the feeling of a family fun day, with balloons and the Clare Lions group cooking a barbecue. At the heart of it, what we were all trying to do was to demonstrate the volume of services that are available and to build awareness but to come out of our offices and to be amongst community as they walk around.

I want to recognise and thank those who were there on the day, including the Clare Community Mental Health Services clinicians, in particular Vanessa and Kiraleigh, who organised this expo. I mentioned the Clare Lions Club, who cooked up a storm on the barbecue. The Lower North Clare community mental health team and the lived experience Rural and Remote Mental Health Service team were present.

The Clare Medical Centre was present. We had mental health nurse Bronwyn Lane and, in particular, Dr Michael Nugent, who made himself available for quite a long time. We had a great chat about GP services more broadly and, of course, the concern about the medical team's inability to service on-call support to the hospital at the moment because of a GP shortage. Here is a busy GP already under pressure but hanging out with the kids and community members at the expo to make himself available. I cannot thank him enough for that.

Rural Living Psychology was represented by Chloe Nunn and Maggie Hentschke. Riverflow Psychology was represented by Julie Cutten. When it comes to the Lifeline Connect Centre, I have a soft spot. I think that is known not just locally but in the chamber. There is no apology for referencing as many times as I can those who go above and beyond—beyond their role, beyond their paid role—to invest themselves and their expertise in a community.

I continue to revere and admire Lorna Woodward, who continues her connection to the Lifeline Connect Centre in Clare. There is another one in Port Pirie, and it has been important to see that model roll out. Lorna and all the trained volunteers that are associated with the Connect Centre were there. I give a shout-out to Hilary Adlam and Tina Maynard in particular, some favourites who have been on the journey from day one.

I also want to recognise that Neami National were present at the expo, as well as Careers and Disability Link, who have a presence in Clare; the SA Intellectual Disability Health Service; Sureway; Hill Shed community garden, represented by Rae Bartholomaeus; and, very importantly, Pipsta face painting, Pip Laver, who created an environment that was family-friendly.

Last week, the member for Hartley, the Hon. Vincent Tarzia, and I attended the inaugural gala for the Breakthrough foundation, supporting John Mannion's work in continuing to fundraise for

the essential research that we need to deliver evidence-based services when it comes to addressing mental distress and mental illness and demonstrating support for those academics who invest their entire careers towards understanding the neurological mechanics of how our brains behave and drive some of the behaviours that can dysregulate so many people. We want to thank John Mannion and pay respects to the work that he continues to do. His leadership and advocacy in that space is very important, and it was a great event.

I also was able to attend this week an event hosted by the Mental Health Coalition, which was not just recognising lived experience but hosting a carers' round table. I had the joy of meeting Kerry Hawkins, who is the CEO of Community Mental Health Australia. Her plenary speech, her delivery and address to us this week, really was an honest and frank account of the barriers that we continue to see in how funding flows from the commonwealth to the states and makes its way to those who need it. It is separate from the NDIS for those who live with a mental illness outside of any NDIS package. I thank Kerry for her research and her years of advocacy and expertise in this space.

Geoff Harris does an extraordinary job advocating for the work of our state peak body, the Mental Health Coalition. It was wonderful to catch up with Paul Creedon again of Skylight and to see our state-based non-government services coming together to host a carers' round table to highlight the difficult, sometimes lonely and heavy journey that carers walk alongside those who live with mental distress.

Outside of the city, we have amazing people who volunteer and donate their time in connection to our suicide prevention networks. In my own community of Jamestown, I want to again recognise Greg Boston, Emma Scharkie and others who belong to the Mid North Suicide Prevention Network. They worked out early on that exercise would drive improved wellbeing and that Parkrun was the way to go. I know, Deputy Speaker, that that is a preferred pastime of yours, and I commend anyone who participates in Parkrun on Saturday mornings. It is an extraordinary activity that people can be involved in.

I look forward to catching up with the girls from Mentally Fit EP, who continue to make their way from the West Coast to keep coming to the city and setting up or creating relationships with the government and the non-government sector. To Lain Montgomerie and Emma Gale, I cannot wait to catch up with you when you arrive. So much talent exists in my own electorate for those who continue to bring awareness to the plight of the drought and its unintended consequences when it comes to the mental health and mental wellbeing of our farmers.

There are women leaders like Steph Schmidt, who in her unassuming way has used every platform available to her. She won an AgriBusiness Rural Women's Award, and she continued through COVID to find avenues to build awareness, to build literacy around mental health and to promote positive practical ways that farmers, men and women, can be aware of and address some of those signs. She does that in such an extraordinary way. She is in huge demand. As a farmer, Steph is always going to be torn between actually living that life and sharing her expertise with others.

Finally, I want to mention Kate Gunn, who established the ifarmwell website with practical resources. There is a business relationship between ifarmwell and Kick off ya Boots, which was a John Gladigau initiative. We saw John Gladigau last night addressing the friends of the grain producers association. There were a number of country MPs who spent some time with those farmers. They came to hear John's everlasting positive approach to the trials and tribulations of farming. I know that all too well. The Kick off ya Boots initiative, which has travelled around the state using music to create awareness, has been so important. With that, I conclude my remarks.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (12:48): I begin by indicating the government's support for this motion recognising R U OK? Day, and I thank the member for Frome for bringing this motion before the house. Held every year on the second Thursday of September, R U OK? Day is a national day of action that reminds everyone to check in with those around them, to take the time to ask if they are okay and to listen with empathy and without judgement.

R U OK? Day is a national suicide prevention organisation and registered public health initiative that has changed how we talk about mental health. It encourages open, meaningful conversations that remind us all we are not alone. There are people who care about us and help is available. These conversations can and do save lives. They remind us that mental health affects

every family, every workplace and every community right across our state. While 11 September this year was an important reminder, it is important that we remember every day can be an R U OK? Day. Asking that question and listening with empathy only serves to make our state a better place.

In supporting this motion we also acknowledge the incredible work of community groups, leaders, volunteers and individuals who consistently uphold and promote mental wellbeing in their communities. Your contribution is often quiet, too often unseen but it is life-changing and, in many cases, life-saving.

The member for Frome spoke about Kick off ya Boots and John Gladigau, and it was lovely to see him last night for a grains producers' event in the house. Last year I had the privilege of being able to drive up to Loxton—I had to go up and back one night which probably was not the safest—but I saw Kick off ya Boots 2. It was an incredible performance. It was an amazing opportunity to bring people together, particularly from the Riverland, and see a musical written by a local, someone who understands what it is like to work on a farm, to work in these smaller communities and to struggle with mental health. It really opens up those conversations in a really relatable way. It is incredible and I cannot wait to see what John Gladigau gets up to next.

I also wanted to commend the R U OK? campaign and the network of organisations providing mental health support in both the government and non-government sectors. Campaigns like R U OK? Day encourage regular, open conversations that help reduce stigma, increase social connection, enhance community awareness and enable friends, families and colleagues to be really alert to the people around them, connecting someone with appropriate support long before they are in crisis.

Mental health and suicide prevention, as I have said multiple times in this house, are a shared responsibility. It is not only a whole-of-government responsibility: it is a whole-of-community responsibility. This approach helps every South Australian think about how they care for themselves and those around them, whether at home, school, work or in the community.

As always, I am very proud to be part of the Malinauskas government and we are a government that is investing in mental health and suicide prevention. We need a comprehensive health system supporting every South Australian from prevention through to care and recovery. Since our election in 2022, we have invested \$1.7 billion to deliver mental health services right across the state with total investment to reach \$2.5 billion during this term. That is a 30 per cent increase, funded, compared to the previous state government.

Investment though is not just about the dollar figures, it is about delivering real tangible outcomes for South Australians in need. That is why we are bringing more than 130 new mental health beds online including new rehabilitation units at the Queen Elizabeth, Modbury and Noarlunga hospitals. I do want to thank everybody who was involved in the establishment of the rehabilitation unit at The QEH. The minister and I were joined by the Premier, the fabulous Aria Bolkus, our candidate for Colton, a few weeks ago at the opening of this rehab unit and it looks incredible and it has had so much input from people with lived experience. It was really special to have Brooke, who is one of those consumers, present at the press conference as well to hear her input and her views on the service.

Last week we recognised World Mental Health Day and celebrated another construction milestone on the Northern Crisis Stabilisation Centre. That service is on track to deliver mental health support services from early next year. It is a 16-bed service that will enable people to have up to three days of support, to be able to feel more settled when they have been in mental health crisis or in suicidal distress, and enable them to get support from both mental health clinicians as well as people with lived experience—those peer workers.

It will be co-located with the Medicare Mental Health Centre which will be on the floor beneath and it is going to be a really great place for people to get the support they need while also diverting people from emergency departments.

We have also expanded the mental health co-responder model, which I am a big fan of. It pairs a mental health clinician with a police officer responding to mental health 000 call-outs. Following the successful trials in the Central Adelaide and Northern Adelaide local health networks, which saw more than 2,400 presentations to emergency departments avoided, the Malinauskas

Labor government's most recent state budget secures funding for this program over the next five years and expands its reach into the southern suburbs of Adelaide.

We are also building a brand-new 12-bed mental health ward at the new Mount Barker hospital, which will be the first mental health inpatient unit in the Adelaide Hills. As the member for Frome rightly has pointed out in her motion, we know the investment needs to extend beyond metropolitan Adelaide. That is why the Malinauskas Labor government is investing in mental health services for regional and rural South Australia. We have recruited three additional psychiatrists across three regional local health networks and recruited eight additional mental health nurses across regional local health networks to deliver specialist mental health services for older South Australians.

Lifeline Connect centres are continuing in Clare and Port Pirie with the support of a \$250,000 investment from the Malinauskas Labor government. We have also opened the Mental Health Alternative Care Service in Port Pirie, which is based at the hospital. In partnership with the Albanese government, we have opened Medicare mental health centres in Mount Barker, Mount Gambier and Port Pirie. We are also building a new six-bed mental health subacute ward at Mount Gambier hospital, which would double the number of mental health beds in the Limestone Coast. We have also introduced one of the first paediatric virtual mental health services in Australia by expanding the Child and Adolescent Virtual Urgent Care Service at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

In closing, I would like to again thank the member for Frome for moving this motion recognising R U OK? Day. South Australians want the state government, regardless of colour, to provide robust and meaningful investment and support to a public healthcare system that they can be proud of. Our state has a proud history in this space, being the first state to enact legislation dedicated specifically to suicide prevention, legislation that established formal mandated mechanisms for ensuring a focused and coordinated approach to suicide prevention. South Australia now has a really active Suicide Prevention Council and state Suicide Prevention Plan, as well as 41 suicide prevention networks.

Over the last three years, I have had the immense privilege of meeting with many of these suicide prevention networks, run by incredible volunteers, seeing firsthand the work they do in their communities to reduce stigma, foster connectedness, and empower their communities to intervene early and support those affected by suicide. We see you and we thank you so much for asking that question and listening with empathy and going above and beyond every day to support your communities and suicide prevention. Let's all make every day an R U OK? Day. I commend the motion.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (12:57): Just quickly, I want to compliment the member for Frome for bringing this motion to our attention. The R U OK? Day is an absolutely fantastic thing, but one of the things I have found since becoming a member of parliament is that you also have to follow up. You ask people, 'Are you okay?' and they will say yes, they are.

I have had personal experience with a family member. We thought he had a bit of an issue. We asked, 'Are you okay?' He said he was great, fantastic. Unfortunately, he did the drastic act just after that. When I was the member for Frome, I was a great supporter of holding health forums in Clare and Port Pirie. I was an instigator, in collaboration with the councils, in establishing the Lifeline Connect centres at Clare and Port Pirie.

One of the things we need to do is make sure we talk to people to get them to accept that they need some assistance. As a local member and as a member of this chamber, I will give 110 per cent support and I hope that everybody in this chamber endorses this motion. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:02): I bring up the 70th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr ODENWALDER: I bring up the 71st report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome to parliament today a friend of mine, Mike Holden, who has Kangaroo Island Brewery and The Pick and Shovel bar in Kingscote. If you are heading over to the island, make sure you pay a visit to Mike and Erin—great to see you as well in here today. They are guests of the member for Frome. Welcome to Parliament House. It is good to see you on the mainland.

*Question Time***HYDROGEN POWER INFRASTRUCTURE**

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Why has the government spent more on its failed hydrogen experiment than the algal bloom crisis and drought response combined? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The Auditor-General's Report reveals that \$285.2 million has been spent so far on the Premier's failed vanity hydrogen project.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:07): It's interesting that the Leader of the Opposition is characterising the purchase of generators as a waste of money when he just announced he is going to purchase generators. There really is this issue, this sort of foot-in-mouth issue that he has, where he asks a question criticising as a waste of money the purchase of generators only weeks after he himself announced that, if they are elected in March of next year, they will purchase 200 megawatts of generation. So I don't know how you can—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett and the member for Flinders, I can't hear the minister, so if you can keep your interjections to yourself, that would be great.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I don't know how with a straight face you can get up in the House of Assembly and say the purchase of these generators is a waste if you have just announced the very same policy yourself.

The interesting part about what members opposite are refusing to accept is that an audit does not include any potential proceeds from the disposal of the generators. Members opposite, who announce policies and then criticise a policy that is identical to their own, now realise why they have no credibility. You can't have credibility on energy policy if you are criticising the purchase of generators.

Of course, like any project, what has occurred here is that we have invested in infrastructure that is alongside and opposite the steelworks, which will not be lost or redundant and would actually be used for the upgrade.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Indeed. There is \$1.9 billion of money on the table for an electric arc furnace, direct iron reduction, which requires greater access to power. Upgrade to transmission lines and substations are not a maybe, they are a win, and either way that would have to be done. What we have done is invested government money in public infrastructure for the public good.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You can yell out 'hydrogen' as much as you like. The one part they aren't criticising about some of the costs revealed in the Auditor's report is the Bonython Hydrogen Hub. Remember that? Oh, it's quiet. It's just like after the grand final, it's gone very quiet. The hydrogen hub, which was something that was championed by the previous government, is now something that they have forgotten. I have to say that the investments we made are value for money. We will have a generator, an additional 200 megawatts of generation here in South Australia, providing power and competition in the South Australian market, which is something members opposite have called on us to do. The idea that somehow this is a loss is ridiculous. It is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And fake laughter won't change any of that. I've got to say, the desperation in the fake laughter makes it sound worse for the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, the member for Morphett and the member for Flinders, you are on your final warnings. I did ask you to keep your interjections to yourself, and all I heard were your voices above the Treasurer's. The Leader of the Opposition.

HYDROGEN JOBS PLAN

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Will the Hydrogen Jobs Plan reduce the wholesale electricity cost to industry by 8 per cent? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Labor's powering new jobs and industry policy document released before the last election states:

South Australia's hydrogen plant will reduce the wholesale cost of electricity to industry by 8%.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:11): A lot has happened, which I think the Leader of the Opposition hasn't caught up with. I will give my young friend a quick history lesson. Remember Sanjeev Gupta?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I said three words and they start screaming—three words. The Leader of the Opposition nearly pulled a hamstring running towards Sanjeev Gupta. The idea that we would let those jobs in Whyalla go, that we would let that blast furnace close, that we would let Whyalla suffer a minute longer under the underinvestment by Sanjeev Gupta, and the idea that the Leader of the Opposition has forgotten what has happened between February this year and now, is remarkable.

Obviously, when the state government placed Sanjeev Gupta's company into administration, what we did is we stopped this project and invested that money into the recapitalisation of Whyalla. Members opposite might not like us investing in Whyalla, they might not like us saving structural steel manufacturing in Australia, but don't pretend you don't remember it. Don't pretend you don't remember it. The idea that members opposite think they can shout their way through question time rather than ask questions that make sense, the idea that all of you have forgotten about Whyalla, speaks volumes about what your policy will be on manufacturing in regional South Australia.

We won't let Whyalla go down. Whyalla is too important to fail. Structural steel means something to this state and this country, and we are going to invest in it. So we cancelled that project and we have put that money into Whyalla. The reason we have done that is for a couple of reasons. We want to recapitalise Whyalla. We found a partner in the commonwealth government, and we are

investing \$1.9 billion with the commonwealth government to get a reinvestment into Whyalla. The thing about members opposite interjecting about this, it says to me that they do not support that investment in Whyalla. It says to me they do not care about the Eyre Peninsula—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and I would have thought any local member from regional South Australia, especially one in the Eyre Peninsula, would like to see \$1.9 billion being spent on Whyalla instead of complaining about it. So, of course, we deferred the project and we're not building the Hydrogen Jobs Plan; we are investing that money now in Whyalla and we are putting up the generators for sale. We will recover a large part of those costs. Members opposite are trying to forget that. I have to say, the fact that they can announce a policy to buy generators, then criticise us for having generators as a waste really does take quite the spin.

Perhaps members opposite can stick to a coherent policy from start to finish and remember that Whyalla needed this investment and remember that Whyalla is the reason why we intervened. And remember the people of Whyalla are watching and listening. Members opposite who showed no regard for the people in Whyalla should be ashamed of themselves. These are hardworking people who deserve to have the Australian and state government standing alongside them. So I hope members opposite take a long, hard look at themselves about the way they are treating the people of Whyalla and the way they are treating the regional people, because they deserve this investment and their criticising it really is unbecoming.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders can leave question time for the next 15 minutes. It was nonstop; nonstop interjections after two warnings, including a final warning. We will see you when the big hand is on the 6.

The honourable member for Flinders having withdrawn from the chamber:

HYDROGEN JOBS PLAN

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): My question is to the Premier. How much will the state government have spent all up on the shelved Hydrogen Jobs Plan? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The Auditor General's Report reveals that \$285.2 million has been spent thus far, including \$85.7 million of written-off expenses.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:16): The Leader of the Opposition again has probably not entirely read the Auditor-General's Report. He's talking about accounting standards, accounting treatment, and the way the Auditor-General refers to these things. I will give you an example. You might remember the previous Weatherill government deferred the extension of the Port rail spur, and we had purchased concrete sleepers and we had purchased rail lines, and members opposite criticised this as, 'They're being written off,' forced as an accounting treatment. But when we did ultimately get re-elected in 2022 and deliver the Port rail spur those same assets were used and they were put back on the rail line.

Members opposite were silent about that. But of course the Auditor-General looks at things in snapshots in time in terms of projects, and this is an accounting treatment. For members opposite to say that these are impairments or are so-called losses, as they would say, without taking into account the fact that the government has announced the policy to sell the generators, to make sure that they are available in the South Australian market and without taking into account any of that revenue and then pretending that somehow it is lost is disingenuous. It is just not accurate.

What they are attempting to do is confuse people about what is really going on. The fact is we have an asset and that asset is the generators and those generators have a value. The other asset we have is the upgrade to energy infrastructure that we did on the Upper Spencer Gulf. Members opposite were bemoaning that investment in ElectraNet's infrastructure. What they do not

mention is they spent \$400 million on upgrading an extension line to New South Wales that was meant to cost \$1.2 billion and is now costing well over \$2 billion and it's still not operational.

When they invest in energy infrastructure it's okay and it's prudent but when we do it it's a waste. When they invest in hydrogen, it makes sense, but when we invest in hydrogen it makes no sense. When they do a hydrogen hub, it's all okay, but when we invest in hydrogen it does not add up. They put out tweets and SMSs that talk about hydrogen, hydrogen, hydrogen, but when we invest in hydrogen they claim it's a mistake. Members opposite should take a long, hard look at themselves about the inconsistency of their policy positions. Their commitment to Project EnergyConnect has required this state government—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order from the deputy leader.

Mr TEAGUE: I hesitate to interrupt the minister really, but it's standing order 98(a). He really does need to answer the question. It is a straightforward question about how much was spent on this particular abandoned project.

The SPEAKER: We've still got a bit over a minute. I think the Treasurer is coming to that part of the answer now.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Ultimately, the question that the opposition are trying to get at is: what will the value be of the generators, what will be left and what is the liability that the state has accrued? The truth is that from my perspective the investment in Whyalla, the investment in the energy infrastructure and the investment in the assets and the generators are all tick, tick, tick. They are all good outcomes for the people of South Australia. We will get an extra 200 megawatts of generation. We will get upgrades to energy infrastructure in Whyalla. We have spent money on intellectual property and engineering reports that will be valuable to anyone who purchases those generators. They are not lost assets.

I go back to my original point: when members opposite invested in energy infrastructure that is still not connected five years later—five years later—don't tell us about wasted money on infrastructure.

HYDROGEN JOBS PLAN

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Does the state government have any outstanding commitments for the shelved Hydrogen Jobs Plan and, if so, what are they? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The Auditor-General's Report reveals there is \$125 million in remaining contractual commitments and an \$87.4 million contingent liability for the shelved Hydrogen Jobs Plan.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:21): We are buying generators. Congratulations. Welcome to the party. Do you understand now? Yes? Members opposite announced a policy to procure a generator. That requires purchasing it, investing, signing contracts to buy something—right? When you buy a generator, you sign a contract. We haven't cancelled buying the generators.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: What are you going to do with them? Where are you going to get the money from?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is remarkable that the Leader of the Opposition refuses to listen and learn. Even Frank Pangallo has a greater understanding of what's going on here than my young friend. Let me lay this out for members opposite: we are purchasing four units of 50-megawatt generation. That equals 200. We are going to then sell those generators to have them enter the system so we can have 200 megawatts of existing generation.

The shadow energy minister said the purchase of those 200 megawatts of generation is embarrassing. What policy did he announce just four weeks ago? To buy 200 megawatts of generation. Which one is it: is it embarrassing, or is it Liberal Party policy, or are they the same thing? Again, I don't think the opposition has quite grasped what their own policy is. I will roll it out for them again. Their first policy was that they would want to keep AGL in the system. We have done that. The second policy was to procure 200 megawatts of generation. We are doing that right now. They are the things that they are criticising us on right now, and then they have the audacity to complain about it. The truth is that we have invested in infrastructure that will benefit South Australians over the long term.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

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

The honourable member for Morphet having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The infrastructure we have invested in will benefit South Australians, especially the steelworks and the new owners of the steelworks. They will inherit an energy system that is capable of taking an electric arc furnace and direct iron reduction facility at their site—which would have, if we hadn't spent the money it, been pushed onto consumers across all of South Australia. So what we have done, in effect, is put a social component into that infrastructure cost for a community service obligation for anyone who purchases the steelworks. That is a good investment in the future.

Those generators will be operating in South Australia. That is a condition of any sale. If you want to buy these generators, they must be purchased and be operational here in South Australia. That is a good outcome for the people of South Australia. All of the investment we did in engineering and technology for the electrolyzers and the generators can be utilised by the owners of the steelworks and, of course, the ultimate owners of the generators.

Members opposite have made investments in the hydrogen hub at Port Bonython that have not come to fruition—tens of millions of dollars. What we do is we want to make those try to work, so we are investing, with the commonwealth government, to try to get that hydrogen hub off the ground. It is difficult, especially when there's no longer any bipartisan support for a project that they started.

The other aspect of this is the \$1.9 billion that the commonwealth and state have got on the table for any potential new purchaser of the steelworks. They need to know that the infrastructure is there to be able to have investor confidence, and that is what we are doing.

NARACOORTE HOSPITAL

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister provide an update on the \$750,000 commitment to develop a master plan for the Naracoorte Hospital? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: One million dollars in total was committed to both the planning of the hospital and the draft Clinical Services Plan for the Limestone Coast. The draft Clinical Services Plan has now been completed at a cost of around \$250,000, but there's no word on the master plan for the Naracoorte Hospital.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question and his very strong advocacy on behalf of his community, in particular the Naracoorte Hospital. As members may know, the Naracoorte Hospital—being a particularly important regional hospital for the area—needs a lot of work. It is an ageing piece of infrastructure. One of the commitments that we made upon coming to government—where we cancelled the \$662 million basketball stadium and committed at least \$100 million into country health services—was an \$8 million commitment to the Naracoorte Hospital, so we are delighted that those works are now underway. But we made very clear at that time that we always had regard for that \$8 million investment in the Naracoorte Hospital, with stage 1 of what would have to be inevitable future stages of work to Naracoorte Hospital, understanding the need there.

Those stage 1 works are underway and will deliver very important clinical and patient spaces for the community, including improvements to accident and emergency services, a state-of-the-art resuscitation room for the community, three refurbished close observation bays, new consulting rooms, a new patient area and refurbishment of existing utility rooms. There are works underway on site, including the installation of mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems for both the resuscitation and close observation bays, works on the waiting room, as well as finalisation of the installation of the medical gas piping. I know those works underway at the hospital were very well received by both the community and the staff, and I thank people for their patience while we are undertaking those works on that busy hospital site.

As the member noted, he was very successful in gaining an additional \$1 million in one of the budgets that this government has delivered subsequently for future works of which we dedicated \$250,000 to that clinical planning work across the region. As the member noted, that has now been completed, and that Clinical Services Plan provides a 10-year road map for what, where and how hospital and community services will be delivered across the Limestone Coast. It forms part of our commitment to ensuring safe, high-quality services, including developing and expanding care models to improve sustainability, utilising the entire capacity of the Limestone Coast and particularly looking at where we have growth in terms of the capacity that can be offered into the future. That will be useful for informing the services that will be delivered at the Naracoorte Hospital into the future.

The other part of that \$1 million was specifically devoted to Naracoorte Hospital and the future plans there. As part of the Clinical Services Plan that has been finalised, we are now progressing to update the master planning works for the Naracoorte Hospital. That involves reviewing the master planning works that have been previously completed, ensuring the infrastructure works required align with the future clinical services that would be needed at the hospital.

We are engaging architects and engineering services through the Limestone Coast Local Health Network to review the previous concept designs and update them in line with the Clinical Services Plan. They will commence developing detailed designs for future infrastructure upgrades and also provide updated cost estimates for future works at future stages. There will be continued stakeholder engagement throughout this process to ensure alignment and collaboration in developing these detailed designs. So that \$250,000 investment in clinical planning was really necessary so that we can get this next piece of work of having the architects and engineers onboard to make sure that we can deliver that.

I know of particular interest to the member was part of the future planning, for Naracoorte to have renal dialysis capacity, which no doubt will be something that we will be planning as part of these future stages of works.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Gibson I acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of Gay Thompson, the former member for Reynell. Welcome back to parliament. Great to have you and your sister, Jane, with us today, for question time.

Question Time

COAST IS CALLING

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:29): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the house of the benefits of the \$50 dining cashback program and its Coast is Calling campaign for small and family businesses?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:30): I am the son of a proprietor who used to own a business in a coastal community. My father and mother owned a little small business on Jetty Road, Glenelg. I can tell you that seasonal retail is very, very difficult: it's tough. It's tough work for these small businesses and during a natural disaster it is even worse. Passing foot trade is something these coastal communities really rely on.

Today the environment minister and I were at Henley Square talking to the manager of a great restaurant there, Stella. It was a beautiful day—it is about 28° today—and there were families out and about with their young children; it was beautiful to see. There were people on the grass, having picnics, getting fish and chips from across the road. There were people at the cafes, Estia was getting ready to open. It was a beautiful sunny day in Adelaide. It almost made me want to 'do a Telfer' and stay there and do a bit of shopping, sit back with a glass of wine. It is a beautiful place. The member for Colton knows how beautiful it is. It is a great place, a great place to be.

Businesses there are aching for people to come along. They are aching for people to turn up and do their shopping, so the voucher campaign for coastal communities is vitally important. Up to \$50 off, half your meal for a family—especially my family of four don't get kids meals anymore, they get the main meals and it can be very, very expensive, especially at those smaller shops.

I have to say when you have people who are meant to be the party of small business going out and saying it is not safe to be at the beach, it was safer during COVID to be at the beach, saying that the sea is full of blood—

The Hon. C.J. Picton: Disgraceful.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is disgraceful.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member opposite who is interjecting has a fine history of saying inappropriate things at inappropriate times. I have to say I went to Jetty Road on Sunday and I have seen what the Liberal Party has done to small businesses down that stretch, choosing spring and summer for a vanity project, stopping foot trade, and then having one of their candidates and members in the upper house say to coastal communities and people who want to go to the coast that it's not safe. How do those small businesses feel? How do they feel hearing that from the party of small business?

Do members opposite know what it is like to have a mortgage on their home to run a small business? Do they know what it's like? Go down to Jetty Road, go to Henley Square, go down to Grange, go down to coastal communities and tell those businesses that have mortgages on their homes to run their businesses that what Frank Pangallo and the Liberal Party are doing is the right thing: to try to stop people going down to the beach. In fact, while we were doing the press conference, he did it again. He said, 'Fact: going to the beach was safer during COVID.' During COVID seven million people died. South Australians died during COVID. Using people's deaths, using a global pandemic to equate that to a natural disaster? Those small businesses need encouragement, they need us together saying, 'Visit coastal areas, visit Kangaroo Island, visit the coast, spend your money,' not this rubbish.

TRANSGENDER WOMEN IN SA PRISONS

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Are any transgender women currently being held in female prisons, and is the government considering reviewing its position on this issue? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BATTY: *The Advertiser* reports today that the state government is under growing pressure to ban transgender women from female prisons after revelations that a prisoner was allegedly attacked at a Port Augusta jail.

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:34): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will come to order so we can hear the minister.

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE: I thank the member for his question, as well. In terms of the case the member has referenced, that was an assault that occurred in 2019 that, at the time, was

investigated by SAPOL and no charges were laid. Whilst I cannot go into the specifics, I will advise that the Department for Correctional Services takes any allegations of assault extremely seriously. It is something that is thoroughly investigated—often by SA Police as well, as has happened in this case.

In regard to the policy being referred to, it is a longstanding policy, and I understand that this particular policy was reviewed and updated in 2018 under the previous Marshall Liberal government as well. Of course, these policies are guided and bound by what is set in place by the Equal Opportunity Act.

REHABILITATION PRISON

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Will the minister release the business case into a new rehabilitation prison in South Australia and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:36): I am very proud of the investments this government has been making into our correctional services. We have a proud record here in terms of having the best rate in terms of recidivism in the nation, and a lot of the investments we are making are to continue to ensure that prisoners and those who work in Corrections continue to remain safe, and that we continue to reduce those rates in our state to help keep our community safe.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Can I just ask the leader, the Premier, and the Minister for Trade to stop yelling out across the chamber, because I can't hear the minister's answer.

ADELAIDE WOMEN'S PRISON

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:37): My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Has new contraband perimeter fencing been installed in the Adelaide Women's Prison and, if not, why not? With your leave, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BATTY: Over four months ago it was reported that drug-filled tennis balls were being thrown over the fences at the Adelaide Women's Prison.

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:37): I thank the member for his question. As recently as this most recent state budget we announced further funding to help increase security at our prisons. That is something we are continuing to roll out and invest in to ensure we have the best supports possible in our prisons and correctional systems.

PETERBOROUGH GP SERVICES

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister please update my Peterborough community as to the progress that might have been made regarding their having access to a GP? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: As members know, the Goyder's Line Medical clinic ceased being operational on 8 August, withdrawing their GP services to Peterborough people but keeping their clinics at Jamestown and Orreroo, where we still have a GP present. There has been correspondence to the minister's department and also to the federal Minister for Health; however, the community is still not aware of any improvement in their access to a GP without having to travel long distances, which many in this community do not have the ability or the means to do.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:38): I thank the member for Stuart for his question and his advocacy on behalf of his community—in particular, in this case, Peterborough. As we have talked about in this house before, the GP services in the Peterborough community have been provided for many, many years by the Goyder's Line Medical

clinic. They recently made a decision that they were going to consolidate their services in both Jamestown and Orroroo and not provide those services in Peterborough. That is obviously something that is concerning to the Peterborough community, but I would not want to critique Goyder's Line, which has provided services to that community for a very long period of time. GP services, Medicare and primary health care are predominantly the area of responsibility of the federal government, but obviously it is something that everybody in the state is concerned about.

I know the member himself, as well as myself, have written to the federal minister about this issue, and we have received responses from Mark Butler about this issue. Obviously, the federal government are making a number of investments in terms of primary care to try to address issues not just in Peterborough but across all of regional Australia in terms of where there are issues of shortages.

However, of course we want to see this continually try to be addressed as soon as possible in terms of Peterborough. From our perspective of the state government, our primary responsibility is providing the hospital services. Those GPs were providing the services to cover the Peterborough hospital. We have now had to step in and engage locum services to provide coverage for the Peterborough hospital, which is obviously something we would rather not do, but we need to keep that hospital open and providing those critical services to the Peterborough community.

I have been very regularly engaged with the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network in terms of this issue. They have been talking, of course, to Goyder's Line to try to investigate any other ways in which we could look at how we could get these services re-established. One area that we are examining at the moment is an application that we could make to the commonwealth government to seek to make an exemption under the Medicare rules for what is called a COAG section 19(2) exemption.

This would enable the state government to be able to provide those Medicare billable services to the community. This is something that we use in a number of places across the state already, particularly in the member for Flinders' electorate, a lot on Eyre Peninsula where we have particular shortages of GPs. This is something that we are actively working on looking at making an application to the commonwealth at the moment.

We are currently in consultation, which is necessary under the processes for a 19(2); it is an application process requirement. That will be subject to federal government approval for that to happen. We have been working with the commonwealth on this matter already and liaising with them leading up to the finalisation of that submission. We are also exploring any other opportunities that we have to support primary care in the Yorke and Northern region.

One area that I have previously raised to the member but also to the house is that we have got a primary care pilot program that has enabled us to invest in some nurse practitioner roles across the state, which has been successful so far. We are seeing whether some of the funding that we have been able to achieve from the federal government for that program we might be able to use in a useful way in the Mid North to be able to support Peterborough services, but those services obviously have to be supervised by a GP. Whether there is a mix of services or support that can enable that to bolster services through Peterborough we are currently involved in exploring as well.

The good news is that there are now more regional GPs being trained. All of our GP training places across the state are full and Flinders University has now got regional doctors being trained as well, so there is a future pipeline there coming down the track.

SMALL AND FAMILY BUSINESS SUPPORT

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Small and Family Business. Can the minister update the house on how the Malinauskas Labor government is supporting South Australia's small and family businesses?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:43): I thank the member for Badcoe for her question, because I am always very happy to stand in this place to talk about the importance of small and family businesses to South Australia and, in particular, the importance that small and family

businesses have to the Malinauskas government and to talk about the great things that this government has already delivered for them.

It is hard to believe it has been nearly two years since the Premier and I launched our \$22 million Small Business Strategy, and it has been an incredible two years. I am incredibly proud to say that we have supported over 15,000 businesses through our programs under our strategy—15,000. That includes 650 CALD business owners and 300 First Nations business owners. We have had more than 4,000 women in business participate in our \$7 million Women in Business Program. We have had over 5,400 business owners strengthen their core capabilities through training and mentoring in our fundamentals program, and more than 400 business owners have accelerated their growth, improved their cyber security and embraced sustainability through our specialised programs.

We have also injected an extra \$3.2 million in the last state budget to cut red tape and drive growth. Beyond that, we have also approved more than 1,000 small businesses to share in over \$23 million in our first round of energy efficiency grants, which has saved them \$24 million each and every year in their energy costs. Because of the success of that program, we have backed it with another \$20 million in the round that is open now. This, of course, is all in addition to the very generous supports that we have in place for our small businesses that are impacted by the algal bloom, by the drought, by floods. These are some incredible results.

Unlike those opposite, I can back this up with legitimate evidence; I just confirmed this was not done by ChatGPT. Our Women in Business Advisory Program found that 44 per cent of participants grew their revenue by more than 10 per cent, and 88 per cent increased their workforce. The SA Business Chamber found that 30 per cent of businesses in the fundamentals program improved their cash flow, boosted profits and expanded staffing.

Since the Malinauskas government came into office, we have gone from being ranked fifth in the economic rankings to the second best in the country, but those opposite do not seem to like good news. We had the highest number of hospitality openings ever in the 2023-24 period, and the Business Council of Australia has named us the best place to do business. Why? It is because those of us on this side of the house back South Australian small businesses.

Let's not forget that under the former Liberal government there was not even a Minister for Small Business. These are the backbone of our economy. We have 160,000 small businesses, countless small family businesses. They had no dedicated voice under the former government, but today and through this term of government, we have a voice at the cabinet table and a government that prioritises them. That has been a significant change under the Malinauskas government.

In fact, we had our second Small Business Week just a couple of weeks ago. We had a whole week dedicated to celebrating our small business community. We had Bernard Salt and leading business leaders at our expo. We had over 250 people at that. We had over 800 attendees throughout the week in our own hosted events and 26 other events throughout the regions. This week, and what we have done with our Small Business Strategy, shows exactly why this kind of government support is important to our small businesses, the benefits that they are gaining from this policy.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I give the member for Bragg the call, I just want to single someone out for their very good behaviour, the best behaved person in here today. I have been looking at the young fellow in the gallery. I just sent a message to the member for Schubert. I said, 'Do you know who that kid is?' It's Harrison from Tanunda primary. It's his 12th birthday today, and to celebrate his birthday, he has wagged school to come in here and see some people behave probably worse than how his classmates behave. To Harrison, happy birthday from all of us. I see that you are taking notes and everything. One day, we might see you in here on the benches as a member of parliament. It is great to see your dedication to civics.

*Question Time***YOUTH CRIME ROUND TABLE**

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:48): My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Does the minister sit on the government's youth crime round table?

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:48): I thank the member for his question on this matter. We certainly are very passionate about doing what we can to help reduce the rate of crime in myriad ways, focusing on myriad different groups to help have the maximum impact that we can have out in our local communities.

It is something that we are all incredibly passionate about because we know that we have to have a holistic approach when we are looking at dropping the rates in that place as well. I am involved in lots of different conversations, lots of different task forces, to help address and drop that rate. I am more than happy to have conversations about it with the member when he pleases.

ABORIGINAL LIAISON OFFICERS

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can Aboriginal liaison officers access all prisoners at Yatala? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BATTY: It has been reported that a recently resigned Aboriginal liaison officer had been denied access to certain prisoners by the Department for Correctional Services.

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:49): I thank the member for his question. I am happy to get more information and bring that back to the house, but I do want to reiterate: we are doing a lot of work in this space because we know that Aboriginal people within our corrections system proportionately are much higher than other cohorts that we have.

We are working in myriad ways to improve the rates in that area, which includes more engagement with community, focusing on the mental health components, as well as better understanding and incorporating culture into our corrections because at the end of the day we want to see better results through our corrections system so that when people are returning into community our communities are safer and all the better for it.

PRISONER NUMBERS

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. What is the state's current prison population and prison capacity?

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:50): I thank the member again for his question. I am advised that our capacity across all prisons for the 2025-26 financial year is sitting around 3,663. That is our capacity. In terms of where we are hovering around on the day-to-day, it is around 3,400 on average.

MURRAY BRIDGE SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Health. Could the minister inform the house if the stoma nurse is no longer visiting the Murray Bridge hospital? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: Previously, a stoma nurse would regularly visit the Murray Bridge hospital and attend the support group meetings, providing essential care and guidance to patients. That service is no longer available, leaving stoma patients, many of whom travel from my electorate, with no access to the specialised support they need.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:51): I thank the member for his question and acknowledge the important work that stoma therapy nurses provide, not just to his community but right across the state. As many people would be aware, a stoma therapy nurse supports patients who have undergone a procedure to develop a stoma such as colostomy or urostomy. Those nurses provide important pre and post-operative education, stoma management, guidance, skin care guidance, counselling, and support with medical supplies.

As the member has outlined, the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network has had a position for a stoma therapy nurse based at the Murray Bridge Country Health Connect office. I understand that the person who was in that role has recently taken up another opportunity for employment and so a recruitment process was immediately begun to hire a new stoma therapy nurse. Advertising for that role commenced on 18 September and applications closed last Thursday 9 October, and shortlisting of applicants is due to commence this week.

Hopefully, with that recruitment process underway, we will soon have that position refilled and people in the member's community will be able to receive that support from the stoma therapy nurse again. Whilst the recruitment process is underway, the community nurses within the local health network are able to support clients with general support and advice about stoma care, and for any patients who require further specialised support, Country Health Connect are assisting with referrals to other nursing staff in the interim. But, of course, we hope to have that position filled very quickly.

Country Health Connect Murray Bridge are also seeking interest from nurses within the existing workforce to be supported to upskill to their specialist area of practice to minimise further future interruptions of service delivery down the track as well. So we are getting that position re-recruited with shortlisting underway at the moment, but also going out to our existing nurses to upskill them to make sure they can be there to provide that support into the future as well.

WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Women. Can the minister update the house on how the Malinauskas government is supporting women's economic participation?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence, Minister for Women) (14:53): Thank you very much to the member for her question. I acknowledge her ongoing support for the empowerment of women in our state. Investing in and empowering women benefits our economy and our community. South Australia is strongest when we enable equality of opportunity for all. By empowering women to equally and actively participate and thrive in careers in industries and roles that they choose, we harness the skills and capacity of more than half the population.

Our government is progressing programs and initiatives which advance equality and increase women's involvement across a range of sectors and is focused on taking action to grow women's leadership, economic participation and financial stability. We are grateful to those in various industries across our state who are providing vital advice about the way forward.

In the first five years of parenting their first child, a woman's earnings are reduced by 55 per cent. Our record \$1.9 billion investment to deliver universal three-year-old preschool and broader early-years reform is crucial to increasing flexibility that enables more primary caregivers, predominantly women, to re-enter the workforce.

We are helping more women to run their own businesses with continued investment in Women in Business grant programs to support, as the Minister for Small and Family Business said, over 4,000 female business owners so far to expand their skills and, through an investment of \$3.2 million to expand our highly successful Small Business Strategy, to support small and family business owners to accelerate their growth and profitability.

To address the gap in access to early-stage capital for women, we invested in the Fearless Innovator Grant Program, delivered in partnership with Women in Innovation, which supports female-led businesses to grow and scale with new products and services, this year providing six grants

totalling \$100,000. Skills Shortage Solutions grants have directly encouraged women into trades to help address skill shortages in priority areas.

We also know that over 60 per cent of women experiencing violence perpetrated by a current or former partner are working. The experience of domestic, family or sexual violence, of course, has terrible impacts for women in many ways and on their economic participation. Also, the impact of domestic violence costs Australian employers \$175 million annually in direct and indirect workplace costs. That's why, since 2023, we have ensured that South Australian employees employed pursuant to the state Fair Work Act have a right to 15 days paid family and domestic violence leave and why our government has passed legislation to enshrine the experience of domestic violence as a ground of discrimination in the Equal Opportunity Act.

These initiatives are making a real difference. Labour force data released in August shows there are 25,000 more women in full-time employment in South Australia this year than February 2022. The female participation rate is at an historically high level, and the South Australian gender pay gap is at 8.5 per cent as of August 2025, down from 10.1 per cent, now one of the lowest percentages in our country. Can I thank those incredible industry leaders on our Gender Pay Gap Taskforce who helped provide advice on strategies to drive crucial change that grows women's economic participation.

BEACH VOLLEYBALL WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing. Did the state government sponsorship or other funding agreements on the Beach Volleyball World Championships include obligations on the event to prevent the participation of convicted rapists and other serious criminals? If not, why not? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr WHETSTONE: It has been reported today that a convicted child rapist will arrive in Adelaide next month to compete in the world championships.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier, Minister for Defence and Space Industries) (14:58): I am happy to answer this question. The attraction of the world championships in beach volleyball to the state of South Australia was done through the Major Events Fund, hence it falling into the responsibility of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and therefore answering to me.

Let's be very plain about a couple of things that would be already self-evident by virtue of the type of legislation that this government has passed in terms of how strongly we feel about child sex offences and offenders generally. We do not believe that Mr van de Velde should be granted entry into this country. We do not believe that any sex offender who has been convicted of serious crimes should be allowed into our country. I am very pleased to advise the house that the Attorney-General of South Australia has written to the Minister for Home Affairs making plain the South Australian government's position.

More than that, we believe that the Beach Volleyball World Championships is an important opportunity to celebrate that particular sport, an Olympic sport, here in South Australia, and we see increasing levels of participation. In fact, on the weekend I was able to witness, along with a couple of other people present, down at Glenelg, beach volleyball well and truly in train. The member for Gibson was there. This is an event that we think presents an opportunity to highlight the contribution of that sport on South Australian beaches at a really important time, and we would not want to be distracted through the presence of someone who we do not really think should be in the country, let alone participating in the event. Our position is clear and we stand by it.

MASTERS SWIMMING SA

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Did the state government provide advice to Masters Swimming SA on whether the 2025-26 Open Water Swim Series should proceed and, if so, what was that advice?

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:01): I thank the member for his question. I did touch a little bit on this yesterday. I have been meeting with different sport and recreation groups that are involved in beach sports. When I heard that Masters Swimming had concerns I did offer a meeting with them and the department, and Surf Life Saving as well, to better understand the concerns that they had with regard to hosting their event. I appreciate a lot of those concerns were around any financial impacts they may have. We went further into those discussions about what that would mean and what they would need to help make the beach events a success.

I would certainly advise them that we are willing to provide assistance where we can, and we have backed that up this week with the announcement of our Active Club grants that will help support organisations like them, and others as well, which can also help go towards facilities, such as wash-down facilities, asthma kits and any other components that they think will help make that safe.

We certainly had a discussion around the health advice, what is available. Obviously, a lot of that is available online through our algal bloom website as well, as it is on our hotline for people who are interested in asking questions and getting to know the information further. My message to Masters Swimming is that we are certainly here to assist them. The feedback that we received from them is that they are certainly still intending to host events at the beach over the summer. I am more than happy to continue working with them so we can help make those events a success.

Mr WHETSTONE: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: We will see if it is a supplementary. The member for Chaffey.

ALGAL BLOOM

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:02): Yes, we will, sir. Minister, are you aware of any other sporting events that have or will be cancelled due to the harmful algal bloom?

The SPEAKER: That's a separate question. The Minister for Rec and Sport.

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:02): Again, I would like to thank the member for his question on this matter. The member would be aware that there was another organisation that advised that they needed to cancel their event. That was a very specific event that has to happen on a very specific date for them to qualify for other events. For them, it was to ensure that they have a contingency plan in place because they do not want their athletes and swimmers to miss out on that operation.

As I mentioned yesterday, we are working very closely with organisations through the department as well. We are asking for their information. We are putting together a calendar. We want to know when their events are, what they are looking at doing and what supports we can provide to give them every confidence. That goes, as I said, to facilities such as wash-down and asthma kits. It also goes towards components about what messaging assistance they need, what inquiries they are hearing from families and what supports they need to feel equipped to have those conversations to ensure that the sports that they love continue to go ahead and be a success in the coming summer months.

REGIONAL HOUSING

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Can the Minister for Housing inform the house when the next lot of government houses will be finished and ready for government employees to move into?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:04): The member has caught me on something of a hop, I must confess, on regional housing. We are doing so many housing projects across the state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, be like Harrison, come on.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I will have to go back and get the exact timing of each of the housing projects finishing for the honourable member. He has been a great advocate for regional housing over some time and, of course, Bordertown was the epicentre of this issue being raised.

I think the last government employee housings to be finished are actually in Ceduna and I think they are finishing around the end of this month, so I will get an exact time and date. Most importantly, the ones in Port Augusta are already tenanted out to police and nurses, and the rest of them in the Riverland, Mount Gambier and the Copper Coast are in the process of being tenanted. Of course, once we complete those homes, we will have a good think about where to next.

EMERGENCY SERVICES AWARDS

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house about the 2025 South Australia Emergency Services Awards?

The Hon. R.K. PEARCE (King—Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:05): I would like to thank the member for Waite for her question. I know she is a fierce advocate for emergency services, not only in her local community but beyond, and it was a pleasure to be able to visit the Belair CFS station last Friday to be able to deliver their quick-response vehicle.

I also had the pleasure of being able to attend the Emergency Services Awards since becoming the minister, and I was joined by distinguished guests from across the sector, including the volunteers' association, the United Firefighters Union, the PSA, CFS Foundation and members of the SAFECOM Board.

Since 2001 these awards have celebrated the courage, leadership and commitment of our emergency services. For almost a quarter of a century they have highlighted not only acts of bravery in the moment but also the quiet, steady dedication that defines true service.

The past year has made it clearer than ever that the real strength of South Australia lies within its people. Over in Wilmington, CFS crews faced down devastating fires and protected their community under immense pressure. In Innamincka, SES volunteers responded to severe flooding reaching some of our most remote and isolated residents. Along our coast, Surf Life Saving volunteers once again provided the ever-watchful presence, performing countless patrols and rescues, and I know that this year they are gearing up to do even more to support South Australians.

On our roads, in our hospitals, in our towns and across the water, the MFS, the SA Ambulance Service and Volunteer Marine Rescue have continued their tireless work, responding at all hours in all conditions without hesitation.

But these awards were not about the incidents, they were about the people who were behind them. They were about people like Anthony, who demonstrated compassion and calm authority during the tragic triple fatality on the Nullarbor and in search for the missing surfer, Lance Appleby. Jason Druwitt has given decades of service to the CFS not just as a firefighter but as a young mentor to volunteers and an advocate for mental health.

Shane, whose leadership of his MFS crew in Port Lincoln has extended well beyond the station walls, engaged with his entire community in fire prevention and also preparedness. MFS station officers Sean, Ben, Dom and Ben's calm professionalism during a shark attack response was directly linked to saving a man's life.

SAAS crews in the South-East showed both courage and compassion in responding to a major shooting, not only treating the critically injured but also standing alongside and supporting their colleague in an unimaginably confronting situation. Simon Newell, after more than 40 years of Surf Life Saving, is still patrolling our beaches, training new recruits and leading by example. Finally, Stephen Hancock's lifetime of commitment to Volunteer Marine Rescue has not only saved lives but also shaped the very systems and procedures relied upon across our state.

These are just some of the 32 individuals who were recognised at the awards. Each of their stories were unique, but they share a very common thread: a deep commitment to serving others, often in the most difficult of circumstances. What shines through in every single citation is not just

professionalism but also compassion, the way recipients mentor others, strengthen their communities and support their peers. That is the true heart of emergency services: not only stepping up in a crisis but also building resilience each and every day.

On behalf of the South Australian government and on behalf of every South Australian who has been kept safe, supported or comforted by their efforts, I want to again thank every emergency services worker and volunteer for their service, and I congratulate each and every one of the award recipients.

Grievance Debate

JETTY ROAD UPGRADE

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:10): There is something the people of Glenelg and the surrounding community are starting to recognise under this Labor government and, in particular, the Premier: if the Premier actually does come to Glenelg, which is very rare, it is only for a photo opportunity. He is there using our jetty and beaches as the postcard backdrop for his press conferences and the glossy tourism campaigns, but when it comes to actually investing in Glenelg and our traders, our infrastructure and our coastline, the Premier is nowhere to be seen.

Let's look at what is really happening at Glenelg right now while the tramline is closed. The federal government has put money on the table for the Jetty Road upgrade. The City of Holdfast Bay is contributing ratepayer funds. However, the Malinauskas Labor government is contributing zero dollars to this project. The state government, the one that should be standing up for South Australia's premier coastal destination, has refused to chip in a single cent. This is despite the fact that Glenelg is not just a local shopping strip, it is a state asset and a tourism attraction at a local level, at a national level and, importantly, at a state level.

Back in 2024 when the council first announced the upgrade to Jetty Road, I was outspoken in saying that ratepayers could not afford a huge rate rise during Labor's cost-of-living crisis and the council needed to pause and produce detailed designs to then consult with the community, but also that the state government should contribute. All levels, especially the state government, should be helping to fund this tourism asset rather than allowing the burden to fall mostly on ratepayers. What is worse is that this is the same Premier who cut \$20 million of funding that the former Liberal government had allocated to Glenelg. Labor ripped it away.

But Labor has form in letting our community down. When the Premier was in charge as the police minister, the Glenelg Police Station had its operating hours slashed from seven days a week to only operate between 9am and 5pm, Monday to Friday. While this Premier and his ministers are busy taking selfies on the sand, Jetty Road traders are doing it tough while the upgrades are underway and the tramline is closed. Businesses that have served our community for years are now struggling to keep their doors open.

The Malinauskas Labor government is completely missing in action, wilfully ignorant about the impact on local traders of the tram being closed—the main economic artery bringing visitors to the Bay. We saw the huge pressure on business when the tram was closed for just three weeks in 2017. Now the tram is closed for six months, including during the summer months when businesses do most of their trade for the year. The small business minister had to be dragged down to meet the Jetty Road traders only two days before the tram was closed, yet offered no solutions and no assistance then, and we are still waiting. The chair of the Jetty Road traders' association, Gilia Martin, had this to say last week:

This time we are closed the tram for six months because of the State Government tram separation project and we have had zero support from our State Government. This is a huge impact for our traders and our 330 businesses on Jetty Road.

So while small business owners on Jetty Road are pleading for help, the Premier's answer has been silence.

When it comes to support for Glenelg during the harmful algal bloom, it is a similar story. In July, with the harmful algal bloom increasing in intensity and the state Labor government fumbling its response, thousands of dead marine animals were washing up on Glenelg's beaches. While Peter Malinauskas was on holiday, I was visiting our beaches regularly to see firsthand the

devastation on marine life. So when the Premier belatedly comes to Glenelg not to support Jetty Road but to buy his way out of mismanaging the algal bloom crisis, I say this: you cannot keep using Glenelg as a backdrop for your photo-ops while turning your back on the people who live and work there.

The Liberal Party understands that Glenelg is not just a local landmark; it is part of our state's identity because our community is worth supporting. It is a community that I have lived and worked in for over 20 years. That is why I will keep fighting, and the Liberal Party will keep fighting, to make sure that my community gets the investment that it deserves.

GIATRAS, MR J.

The Hon. L.P. HOOD (Adelaide—Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:14):

I rise to honour a truly great man in our Prospect community, John Giatras. John was more than just a local barber—he was our friend. He was the most committed and caring son, brother and uncle, and he was taken from us too soon. A light has left Prospect Road and, to be honest, it will never feel the same knowing John is not waving back at you as you wander past John and George's Hair Salon for Men as he stood at his barber's chair chatting and laughing with his clients.

Alongside him was his 92-year-old dad, George. They opened the business together in 1986 and were inseparable. Next year would have marked 40 years serving our Prospect community. It breaks our heart not to be able to go and sit on the couch and have a chat with John, to let the kids run in for a lollipop or just to pop my head around the door and say, 'I'm in a rush, I'll be back another time'—because John gave the best advice. He never sugar-coated his opinions, and I always knew the feedback he gave me was frank and fearless based on the daily chats with his hundreds of local clients.

One of my favourite photographs is of John cutting the hair of my little boy, Ned, for the very first time. John was smiling, sharing wisdom and was efficient as always. John was there for life's biggest milestones and the everyday moments. Last month, at John's funeral at St George Greek Orthodox Church, hundreds gathered to pay their respects and it is where John's dad, George, embraced his son for the last time.

John's brother-in-law also read a letter from one of John's clients, Elias Demourtzidis, that really said it best, and I will share those words with you now:

To my good friend John.

It's still hard to believe you're gone.

You were one of the kindest souls I've ever known, the type of person who gave without expecting anything back, who showed up for everyone, every time, no matter what you were dealing with yourself.

It's hard to put into words the impact someone can have just by being themselves, but you were one of those rare people.

You didn't just cut hair, you lifted spirits. Your chair was more than a seat, it was where people felt heard, welcomed and seen.

You had a gift, not just with your hands, but with your heart. You made everyone feel like a family.

Whether it was a fresh cut, a good story or just a quiet moment of understanding, you gave your best to everyone who walked through your door.

You lived your life with so much heart. You did everything you could for the people you loved, especially your family.

The way you cared for your father, with quiet strength, patience and love was something I'll never forget. You didn't just talk about love or loyalty, you lived it, every single day.

It was your actions, in your sacrifices, in the way you put others before yourself without ever asking for recognition.

You were always there. For your family, for your friends, for me. A steady presence. A safe place. Someone who made the world feel less heavy just by being in it. And now that you're gone, that space feels impossibly empty. The way you showed up for them and for your community will never be forgotten.

But still you live on. In our memories.

In the way your kindness left a mark on everyone you knew.

In the way we now try a little harder to be better, more present, more giving, because that's how you lived.

You were more than a barber, you were a good soul. A kind presence. A trusted friend.

Thank you for all the conversations, the laughs, the wisdom and the care. You made your mark not just on heads but on many many hearts.

Thank you for being you, for your heart, your loyalty and your love. Thank you for all the times you put others first, even when no-one noticed...but I noticed, we all did.

You are missed beyond words and remembered with deep respect and love.

I also want to thank the community for the flowers and tributes that they have left at John and George's Hair Salon for Men. The City of Prospect will be mulching those flowers and placing them in the garden beds and installing a plaque also in the garden bed in front of the shop. I have also raised a suggestion of a mural of John, or John and George, along Prospect Road, which has been sent to our council's art group for consideration.

Each year I award a Lucy Hood MP Community Kindness medallion to primary and high school graduates from each local school recognising a student who has given back to their community through the simple act of kindness. For the schools located in our Prospect area, from this year onwards—and for as long as I have the privilege of serving my community—I will be renaming the award the John Giatras Community Kindness Award, to ensure the legacy of John's impact in our community, and that it lives on.

To John's beloved dad, George; his sister, Mary; brother-in-law, Peter; his nieces, his wider family and his dearest friends, I am so sorry for your unimaginable loss. The only comfort I can give you is to talk about John in this place, our state's parliament, so he is forever part of our state's history books. He was a local legend and he will never be forgotten. Rest in peace, our dear friend.

COUNTRY SHOWS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:20): As the country roadshow rolls around South Australia, men and women pulled into Loxton on the long weekend to join with locals for the 105th Loxton Show. It was a great weekend at Loxton, albeit 38°, for families right across the Riverland and Mallee to enjoy and to come out into the sun. It is one of those country shows that is filled with great opportunity, with the equestrian horses in action, the sheaf toss, sheepdog trials, the cowboys, the whips, the horses, the wood chopping, the car show that dropped into town and the vintage tractor display, to name but a few.

Again, this year, this was an opportunity for that community to display what has been a great landmark for Loxton and that is their great pavilion opportunities: the cooking, the flower displays, the paintings, the artwork that really does go above and beyond. And, yes, I was part of that. The competition entries were full. The exhibition hall had all sorts of cookery, all sorts of displays and was a sea of blue ribbons. I will have to blow my own trumpet for some of the local produce that I made—I managed to stump up six blue ribbons, as well as a few red and a few green. But what I must say is that the dried fruit, the confectionery and my jams were very hard to beat.

Lyn Arnold, a stalwart of the Loxton Show, managed to beat me in many categories. She is outstanding, I must say, because I struggle. As the education minister and many on this side might attest to, the jam will be delivered to many of your offices and doors in the coming days, just to taste some of that great Riverland produce. In those 30 categories the participation rate was outstanding, and I cannot thank all those people enough.

It does not come together without a lot of contribution by the locals, by those people who are hardworking show patrons: the patron, Theo Kaesler; the president, Richie Darling; president-elect, Glenda Cass; vice president, Ian Crambrook; the secretary, Lynn Hand; the treasurer, Denise Vaughan; the liaison officer, Ian Cass; the entertainment coordinator, Jo Sheppy; grounds coordinator, Steve Schulz; pavilion coordinator, Paul Kaesler; property managers, Tony and Tania Klix; and everyone on the management committee. It really was a great day, two days of great show action, and I look forward to being back there again next year.

Then a little way past that long weekend, I attended the Lions Youth of the Year, hosted by the Renmark Lions Club. It is a program about fostering and encouraging student interest in leadership and public speaking, and it was great to see five finalists step up and be asked random questions without notice and be given five minutes to answer those questions. I think all of those young secondary school students did an outstanding job of off-the-cuff speaking in front of an audience of around 100 people. I congratulate all of them.

Sadly, there can only be one winner, and some complementary winners, and Riley Broad won the night. She was an outstanding candidate. She spoke for five minutes without notes. She answered questions for five minutes without notes. I compliment her on the way that she performed and the content of her speech and what she put to people. Noor Dhillon received the award for public speaking. Both Noor and Riley received my Tim Whetstone MP Award for student leadership in 2024-25 respectively. The other three contestants must also be congratulated: Stephen Files, Banjo Rumbold and Kayleigh Stevens from Renmark High because they did an outstanding job. They gave hope to everyone in the room that they are the next generation of leaders, they are the next generation that will be public speakers, and they will present themselves extraordinarily well.

Thanks also go to the judges—Gillian Stevens, Bronwyn Cant and Ian Andrews—who all did an outstanding job. It would have been a tough judging exercise because all five speakers performed impeccably well. So congratulations to all of those young finalists and congratulations to the Lions Club of Renmark; it was an outstanding opportunity for our young ambassadors and leaders to show their stuff.

WRIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills, Minister for Police) (15:25): It is a pleasure to rise and provide an update to this place on the delivery of some local commitments in the seat of Wright. There are many I am pleased to have the opportunity to update members of this place about but also, of course, residents of the seat of Wright themselves.

I might start with an update on the opening of The Heights Technical College, one of five we are building across the state. We opened the technical college at Findon first, and we have since opened the technical college at Port Augusta. By the start of the 2026 school year we will open the three remaining technical colleges at Tonsley, Mount Gambier and in my own seat at The Heights.

The building is finished ahead of time, which is fantastic, so we had an opportunity to do something we did not have the opportunity to do with our first tech college, which was to show families through and give them an idea of how these technical colleges are different to the tech colleges they may remember from years gone past. The primary issue we have had so far is accommodating all the interested families, students and local community members who are keen to see how fantastic this building is.

I have spent a lot of time there myself. Before it was finished, we used that building to sign our Better and Fairer Schools Agreement with the federal education minister and the Premier. Once it was finished, the first meeting The Heights Technical College actually accommodated was an education ministers meeting. I was very proud to have education ministers—federal and from all states and territories—come to The Heights Technical College to see how great these are going to be. I am really confident that given the streams that are going to be accommodated there—including aero skills and building trades, to name a couple—it is going to provide some amazing job opportunities for young South Australians who live in the north-east for many years to come.

Wynn Vale Drive was another election commitment I made before the 2022 state election. I do not expect people in this place to be particularly familiar with the intersection of Wynn Vale Drive and Bridge Road, but people who live in the north-east will be all too familiar with how difficult it is to turn right from Wynn Vale Drive onto Bridge Road. In fact, it is so difficult that people avoid it, and those who do try often turn left and then do a U-turn across three lanes of traffic on Bridge Road or go for a rat run past local houses—and often past Gulfview Heights Primary School, where I think there have been some near misses with cars speeding past there.

I am very pleased that just this week we saw the first set of traffic lights erected there, which is great. It has been a big project because we are doing a number of things at the site, not just

installing traffic lights but redesigning the whole intersection—indented bus bays, new kerbing, new stormwater, a whole range of different things. Being a local resident myself and using it quite regularly, I have seen a number of accidents occur there, and it was only a matter of time before one of those was a very serious or fatal accident, so I am pleased that this election commitment will be delivered on time and be completed very soon.

One that the member for King has touched upon in this place already is the election commitment to build a new ambulance station at Golden Grove. That is complete. It is open and operational, and the member for King and I have both been there to meet the crew. It is in a fantastic place, one of the last remaining bits of open land there in Golden Grove near the intersection of the Grove Way and the Golden Way. It is well-placed to be able to service the area and reduce waiting times.

It is also particularly well-placed in the sense that it is an older area in the north-east. A lot of people move to the Delfin development in their later years to retire, and there are a number of lifestyle villages, so having an ambulance service in close proximity is very important, and we have delivered on that as well.

On the Community Wastewater Management Scheme, I have been pleased to host some community forums with the member for Newland recently about progress on removing those septic tanks. I think there were more than 4,500 across the north-eastern suburbs. We are well underway there, and Surrey Downs in my own electorate is seeing work now to have those residents transferred onto a more modern wastewater system.

I will finish by mentioning the Wynn Vale Dam, the home of the best parkrun in South Australia, which is Jubilee Way, where I spend my Saturday mornings. We have seen upgraded paving and we have seen a brand-new playground for kids, and that is really important. It means people can use the beautiful surrounds all year around and it can accommodate those sometimes 300 runners on a Saturday morning as well.

REGIONAL ROADS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:30): I rise today to speak about the importance of the investment into our regional roads right across South Australia, and they are vital for the economic drive of our state. The contribution that regional communities make always needs recognition in this place. Our roads really are the physical connection to our productive regional businesses to get their high-quality products to market, and no more so than on Eyre Peninsula.

Having safe roads is also incredibly important for keeping our regional communities safe. It is especially pertinent in a year like this where we see an incredibly distressing state road toll. A previous government has put significant investment into highways on Eyre Peninsula. The previous Liberal government invested into the Lincoln Highway on the eastern side of Eyre Peninsula and the Tod Highway, which goes through the middle. That wide road that was delivered under the previous Liberal government now makes such a difference to those traversing that road between the turn-off to go to Cummins all the way up to Kyancutta.

The Eyre Highway is the road that goes all the way across the top of my electorate really, from Port Augusta all the way to the border. That wide road, which has been delivered by the previous Liberal government, has made a real difference to not just local use but the significant amount of east-west traffic that traverses that road. There is also the Birdseye Highway, which is the one that goes from Cowell all the way across to Elliston. These are important investments into road infrastructure on Eyre Peninsula, which my community members well and truly welcomed with the investment by the previous Liberal government.

I really want to bring the government's attention now to the road condition of the Flinders Highway. This is the one that traverses the West Coast. It goes all the way from Ceduna to Streaky Bay to Elliston and down to Port Lincoln. It is a long road and it is a dangerous road, sadly. It is not just a road that sees domestic use but it is also a really important road that holiday-makers use. There is incredible scenery along the West Coast but it is also a road that heavy vehicles use.

With the trucks that traverse this road, it really means that the narrow pathway that is followed does provide for a dangerous situation. We need to have the shoulders sealed on the Flinders

Highway. Especially, there are some really dangerous sections along that road and, sadly, we have seen some incidents and accidents that have occurred because of that interaction between heavy vehicles, caravans, cars and other freight movements along that road. The government needs to be investing into that road.

The section between Streaky Bay and Ceduna really comes to front of mind for me, as well the section south of Elliston where we see 10 or 12-inch drop-offs on the edge of a really narrow roadway. It only adds to the extra danger being faced by the people having to travel long distances. I think it is the duty and the role of the member for Flinders to encourage the government that a wider road is a safer road and it needs that investment. In particular, the Flinders Highway needs the attention and the investment of this Labor government.

I am also asking the government to release the findings and the recommendations of the Eyre Peninsula Grain Export Supply Chain Planning Study. That is a big mouthful, but it is a body of work that I understand has been substantially completed and one that has had a significant component of it funded by Eyre Peninsula councils. It needs to be released so that there is some clarity for the people of the EP about what the plan is for freight movement, including consideration of the future of the Eyre Peninsula rail network, the need for highway upgrades and the potential for other freight options on the EP. This body of work is necessary. It is important. We need some direction, and we do not need the government to play politics with it. We need answers, and we need them now.

Last week, I welcomed the shadow minister, the Hon. Ben Hood, to Eyre Peninsula and took him for a tour of the regional road network, including the dangerous sections of road within the City of Port Lincoln. I am advocating for there to be a partnership with the City of Port Lincoln council to deliver a really important upgrade to the roads at the intersection of Le Brun Street and Verran Terrace. It is a dangerous situation.

I know the Port Lincoln city council have put significant efforts into redesigning that intersection. They have applied for Black Spot funding. I understand that South Australia is the only state that has not announced its Black Spot funding for this financial year. I am encouraging the government: look at where these really important, dangerous intersections are, especially Le Brun Street and Verran Terrace in Port Lincoln. It needs investment strategically from the government, and that is what I am calling for.

PREGNANCY AND INFANT LOSS REMEMBRANCE DAY

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:35): Today is a really important day: it is Pregnancy and Infant Loss Remembrance Day, which is an important time to break the silence and break the stigma surrounding miscarriage, stillbirth and neonatal death. This is a significant month for families who have been there, and speaking, often when those families cannot, cannot be discounted.

One of the things that bereaved families often talk about is the fact that people do not know what to say, so they do not say anything at all. But we know that talking matters. We know that saying the names of babies loved and lost matters. We know that awareness, education and advocacy is vital, not just in addressing the causes of pregnancy and infant loss but, of course, in advocating for those families who are grieving their children.

It has been one of the great privileges not just of my career, I think, but my life to find myself in a position where, in this important place, I can and do advocate for pregnancies and babies wanted, loved and lost. We do not know the exact figures, but roughly 110,000 Australians have a miscarriage every year, and over six babies every day are born still in Australia, double the national road toll. Another 600 babies each year lose their life in the first 28 days after birth. I do believe in this place it is of critical importance to speak up and speak proudly about those babies we hold only in our hearts.

I, like so many of us, have been very lucky to be elected here. It has given me an opportunity to say my baby brother's name and say it proud: Benjamin Isaac, who would have turned 25 just a few weeks ago, something my mum and my family never could have imagined we would have the opportunity to speak about during the depths of our grief. I went through life loving and knowing my

baby brother, as I know so many older siblings have. I will always do what I can to break that silence for him and for the families who I know often are not able to.

I would like to acknowledge today the babies I have got to learn about as the Chair of the South Australian parliament's select committee into stillbirth. It has been a great privilege to give parents the opportunity to say their babies' names aloud and to hopefully find some purpose in their grief. Mum told me early on that she never thought my brother would have a legacy. I hope that our work as a committee is a legacy not only for our Ben but for each and every baby whose parents or loved ones have contributed to it. I want to thank those parents for honouring us with their stories.

I would also like to acknowledge today some wonderful people in the fight to speak up about those babies as well as the fight to support families and the fight to educate expectant parents. Here in South Australia, we are blessed to have the Red Tree Foundation, which provides counselling supports for bereaved parents who lose a pregnancy or a child up to 17. What a beautiful, beautiful role Red Tree plays for our families.

Tonight, I will join Red Tree for its first Wave of Light. Landmarks, including our parliament, will be lit red as bereaved families walk through our city with candles in memory of their little ones. It will be a privilege, as it always is, to walk with those families and hear their little ones' stories. I also acknowledge Red Nose, which plays a vital role around Australia providing similar supports to families. Finally, I would like to acknowledge those who advocate for prevention and awareness: our federally funded Stillbirth CRE, in conjunction with the Stillbirth Foundation.

Additionally, here in SA we have the incredible Still Aware, Australia's first stillbirth charity. How lucky I am that those wonderful people are based right here in SA. I get to connect with them in such a meaningful way on a regular basis and I feel incredibly grateful. I will be joining Still Aware again this week for their fundraising gala and do want to put on the record my thanks for all they do in memory of dear Alfie.

Today in this place, I acknowledge those babies again as I will continue to do as long as I am here in this parliament. To parents and family members and loved ones, I say this: I see you, I grieve with you, and I value the lives of your babies loved and lost.

Private Members' Statements

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:40): The catalyst for change usually starts with passionate people, and none more so than Mike Holden and Erin, who I am happy to host here today, from Kangaroo Island. Of course, they represent Kangaroo Island Brewery, one of the many fine institutions that exist on the island as a drawcard for our tourists. I am sure that the locals enjoy imbibing those multibrews as well. I got to know Mike and talked with him about the issues that face all islanders when it comes to travel barriers, and it is something that we share in common.

But today's address is to focus on the positives. It is the jewel in the crown when it comes to tourism opportunities. We know the travel vouchers should be incentivising people to make their way to Kangaroo Island. I sincerely hope to hear that people flock to Kangaroo Island to enjoy Seal Bay, Vivonne Bay, Emu Bay or get to Flinders Chase and enjoy a multibeer or enjoy the wineries and distilleries that are available, or to find their way to The (enchanted) Fig Tree, stay at the Ozone Hotel in Kingscote and generally enjoy everything that is wonderful about Kangaroo Island.

The challenges for the islanders continue when it comes to getting on and off, health barriers, and the PATS reform that is required that can lead to delayed transfer of care. We know that the agricultural industry have challenges when it comes to freight. But all in all, we want to encourage more and more people to discover the beauty of Kangaroo Island. I thank Mike Holden for his passion and advocacy on that matter.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:42): I rise to continue championing the incredible successes of the Brighton Bombers Lacrosse Club that fielded an amazing 10 teams across grand finals this season. But I particularly stand here today because I want to give a shout-out to the exceptional talent of their junior players and acknowledge those who have recently won awards, including the best girl defender, Jade Mossop; the best boy defender, Toby Virgo; most consistent girl, Sofie Mead;

most consistent boy, Sam Inglis; best and fairest junior girl, Lily Maros; and best and fairest junior boy, Riley Attenborough.

It is an incredible achievement at such a young age to win an award and I know, given the history of the Brighton Lacrosse Club, that your pathway is evident before you. You have incredible mentors in the club, great success across all age levels, and I really believe that you are going to continue shining as you play the sport that you love.

Brighton has many teams that were successful this season, including the Brighton Bombers and Brighton Rugby Club, and it is an absolute honour to go out and support them whenever I can. I really congratulate them once again on an amazing season.

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:43): I rise to speak about some concerns which have been raised with me about some night works in my community as they relate to the Adelaide Hills Productivity and Road Safety Package. There are a number of night works happening along North East Road between Houghton and Gumeracha. First up, I want to make this point really clearly: we absolutely support these critical upgrades in my local community, but some of the disruptions and the lack of communication with local residents in my community has been really disappointing to say the least.

There are some night works that are happening on a section of road between Paracombe Road and Tippet Road. Some locals in my community have received emails that these works were occurring and others have not. For those who have not received this communication, it was really confronting for them to learn that they have a very extensive detour to get down the hill. This road is a really critical link between the Adelaide Hills and places like Modbury and Tea Tree Gully in my local community.

One of the most concerning elements of this is that it has been reported to me that emergency services were not notified of these night works, which has left some locals really disappointed and obviously concerned, because in an emergency every single minute counts. That is why I am really encouraging the department to be open and transparent with people in my local community about how long these night works are going to continue. It is really critical that they happen as quickly as possible and that there is adequate communication for members of my local community in the Adelaide Hills.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:45): I rise to pay tribute to my favourite Kangaroo Islander, who we unfortunately lost last Friday at the age of 102, Dudley Roberts, born in Port Pirie. In 1943, as an 18 year old, he signed up to serve his country in World War II. He saw active service in Borneo and Papua New Guinea. He came back and, like so many young Australians, took part in soldier settlement programs, so he ended up in Parndana on Kangaroo Island, where he became a friend to so many. He was someone who always put his hand up to help. He was there every ANZAC Day and always involved in RSL activities.

I used to love having chats with him at the footy or at the local show. He always had an exceptionally good joke. There was a great one he told about politicians and how seldom we use our brains. It is too long to tell in the time that I have here, but it is a ripper.

The Premier met him one day. We were looking around the Kingscote hospital, and Dudley was in hospital, and the Premier got to meet him and hear some of his jokes. We are going to miss Dudley so much. To his children, Greg, Suzanne, Sandra, Janice and Ian, 15 grandchildren and 26 great-grandchildren, I am sorry I will not be there at Dudley's funeral tomorrow, as I have some commitments in here. Dudley will never be forgotten by the people of Kangaroo Island. He was one of our greatest-ever residents.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY REVIEW - PENALTIES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:47): Obtained leave and introduced a bill

for an act to amend the Building Work Contractors Act 1995, the Fair Trading Act 1987, the Magistrates Court Act 1991 and the Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Building and Construction Industry Review—Penalties) Bill 2025. This bill proposes to amend the Building Work Contractors Act 1995, the Fair Trading Act 1987, the Magistrates Court Act 1991 and the Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995 to improve the regulatory framework for the support, oversight and management of the building and construction industry in South Australia. These acts establish registration and licensing schemes for workers in the construction industry, set the requirements for domestic building work contracts and provide for disciplinary action against workers, amongst other matters.

In recent years, there have been substantial shifts in the industry that have introduced significant challenges. Some provisions in these acts have not been updated for over 20 years and do not reflect the current risks and challenges in the industry with increased housing demand, shortages and delays in obtaining materials, lack of trade labour and large cost increases.

Following the release of the national Building with Confidence Report in February 2018 and concerns and reform proposals raised through industry feedback, we have undertaken a Building and Construction Industry Review. The review focuses on opportunities to protect and empower consumers while supporting workers and businesses to deliver quality building services and enhance industry compliance.

This bill considers an important issue that lies at the core of ensuring responsible and accountable business conduct: the enforcement of compliance through appropriate penalties. The increased penalties contained within this bill send a clear message that noncompliance will not be tolerated. This bill significantly increases the penalties under the respective acts, introduces expiations for many existing offences and establishes new offences for undertaking unlicensed work and falsely holding out to be licensed.

In any regulatory framework, compliance with established provisions is not merely a matter of legal obligation; it is a reflection of the integrity, fairness and accountability of the industry. By strengthening penalties and enforcement options for breaches of the acts, they serve as a powerful deterrent against misconduct. The introduction of expiations for existing offences under the acts and increasing the Magistrates Court's ability to impose fines in relation to building matters enhances the enforcement capacity by reducing barriers to undertaking enforcement actions.

The ability to expiate against offences introduces opportunities for CBS to proactively tackle concerning issues in the building industry, with immediate outcomes to address misconduct. CBS will retain the ability to seek further enforcement options to ensure that a penalty is proportionate with the offence and will now be able to seek these high penalties through the Magistrates Court where serious or repeated breaches occur. We recognise that small and medium businesses make up the majority of the industry and, in a marketplace where trust is essential, consumers must feel confident that their rights and investments are secure.

The increase to penalties and the introduction of expiations is about prevention, protection and progress to ensure that consumers are safeguarded and the integrity of the building industry in South Australia remains strong. Compliance and enforcement activity undertaken by CBS aims to be fair, proportionate to the conduct, and in the public interest. These greater enforcement options provide CBS with a broad spectrum of enforcement tools to ensure compliance and customer protection without creating unnecessary challenges for traders. The ultimate result is a fairer, safer and more trustworthy building industry for all South Australians.

This robust enforcement scheme aims to promote a culture of responsibility across the construction industry and encourages businesses to invest in compliance training and risk management systems to uphold their obligations. CBS strives to work with industry to promote a

culture of transparency and support education for traders. Additional stages of the Building and Construction Industry Review will focus on supporting practitioners and traders to meet their obligations by improving industry standards.

I want to thank key industry stakeholders, including the MBA and HIA, for their assistance in strengthening their industry and for supporting their members to ensure that, by and large, we have a high-quality construction workforce in South Australia. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Building Work Contractors Act 1995

3—Amendment of section 6—Obligation of building work contractors to be licensed

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

4—Amendment of section 19—Approval as building work supervisor in relation to licensed building work contractor's business

The amendment in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offences set out in the section.

5—Amendment of section 25—Disciplinary action

The amendment in this clause increases the amount of the fine able to be imposed by the Tribunal on a person against whom disciplinary action is taken in accordance with the section.

6—Amendment of section 26—Contravention of orders

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

7—Amendment of section 28—Formal requirements in relation to domestic building work contracts

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

8—Amendment of section 29—Price and domestic building work contracts

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

9—Amendment of section 30—Payments under or in relation to domestic building work contracts

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

10—Amendment of section 31—Exhibition houses

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

11—Amendment of section 34—Requirements of insurance

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

12—Amendment of section 37—Powers of court in relation to domestic building work

The amendment in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

13—Insertion of sections 47A to 47D

This clause inserts new sections as follows:

47A—Licensed building work contractor must not contract with unlicensed person

The proposed section makes it an offence for a licensed building work contractor to contract with a person to carry out building work on behalf of the licensed building work contractor unless the person holds a building work contractors licence of the appropriate class under the Act.

The offence does not apply to a building work contractor who is exempt from complying with section 6 of the Act in respect of the relevant building work or in circumstances prescribed by the regulations.

47B—Building work contractor not to use another person's licence number etc

The proposed section sets out the following offences applying to a building work contractor in relation to building work performed, or to be performed, by the building work contractor:

- using or referring to a licence number that is not the licence number assigned to their licence by the Commissioner in a manner that is intended, or is likely, to mislead or deceive another person into believing that the building work may lawfully be performed under the authority of that licence;
- using or referring to a licence number that is not the licence number assigned to their licence by the Commissioner when obtaining builders indemnity insurance;
- directly or indirectly representing that the building work will be performed under the authority of a licence other than a licence held by the building work contractor;
- using or referring to a licence number in a manner that is intended, or is likely, to mislead or deceive another person into believing that the building work may lawfully be performed under the authority of that licence.

47C—Offence to hold out as licensed etc

The proposed section sets out the following offences:

- a person who is not licensed under the Act holding themselves out, or permitting another person to hold themselves out, as being licensed under the Act;
- a person who holds a building work contractors licence with conditions holding themselves out, or permitting another person to hold themselves out, as holding a licence that is not subject to conditions;
- a person who holds out another as being licensed under the Act if the person is not so licensed.

47D—Offence to hold out as registered etc

The proposed section sets out the following offences:

- a person who is not registered under the Act holding themselves out, or permitting another person to hold themselves out, as being licensed under the Act;
- a person who holds a building work supervisors registration with conditions holding themselves out, or permitting another person to hold themselves out, as holding a registration that is not subject to conditions;
- a person who holds out another as being registered under the Act if the person is not so registered.

14—Amendment of section 48—False or misleading information

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

15—Amendment of section 49—Name in which building work contractor may carry on business

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

16—Amendment of section 50—Publication of advertisements

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

17—Amendment of section 51—Licensed building work contractor to have sign showing name etc on each building site

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

18—Amendment of section 58—Prosecutions

This amendment allows offences to be expiated within 2 years of the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed.

19—Amendment of section 62—Regulations

The amendments in this clause increase the amount of the penalty that may be applied in relation to an offence in the regulations.

20—Amendment of Schedule 3—Transitional provisions

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offences set out in the section.

Part 3—Amendment of Fair Trading Act 1987**21—Amendment of section 8A—Conciliation**

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties and expiation fees applying in relation to the offences set out in the section.

Part 4—Amendment of Magistrates Court Act 1991**22—Amendment of section 9—Criminal jurisdiction**

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties and expiation fees applying in relation to the offences set out in the section.

Part 5—Amendment of Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995**23—Amendment of section 6—Obligation of contractors to be licensed**

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

24—Substitution of section 12

This clause substitutes a new section 12, providing an offence in relation to who can carry out certain work, with penalties commensurate with those inserted or amended by this measure.

25—Amendment of section 13—Obligation of workers to be registered

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

26—Amendment of section 25—Contravention of orders

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

27—Amendment of section 32—False or misleading statement

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

28—Amendment of section 33—Name in which contractor may carry on business

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

29—Amendment of section 33A—Publication of advertisements

The amendments in this clause increase existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

30—Amendment of section 33B—Requirements for contracts for domestic plumbing, gas fitting or electrical work that contain a charging clause

The amendment in this clause increases existing penalties applying in relation to the offence set out in the section.

31—Amendment of section 40—Prosecutions

This amendment allows offences to be expiated within 2 years of the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed.

32—Amendment of section 44—Regulations

The amendments in this clause increase the amount of the penalty that may be applied in relation to an offence in the regulations.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Teague.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PLANNING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND OTHER MATTERS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:53): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Architectural Practice Act 2009, the Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994, the Law of Property Act 1936, the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the Real Property Act 1886, the Residential Tenancies (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2023 and the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

In 2024, the Malinauskas Labor government released the South Australian Housing Roadmap, which established clear policy actions to address the housing crisis. The government continues to deliver on its Housing Roadmap commitments, which has resulted in the following outcomes—a few amongst many.

The government continues to deliver significant land releases in Concordia and Onkaparinga Heights. The Concordia code amendment, which was recently released, signed, has resulted in 10,000 new homes being rezoned and establishes a framework to deliver infrastructure from the outset before those homes are built.

The government has taken every step it can to address housing affordability through establishing the first-home buyer program and resolving housing supply shortages through significant infrastructure funding to SA Water.

The housing crisis affects us all and if the government can identify additional efficiencies to bring housing to the market quicker, then we will act. The changes proposed within the Statutes Amendment (Planning, Infrastructure and Other Matters) Bill 2025, drive significant efficiencies in the housing sector.

Firstly, there is the facilitation of technology and artificial intelligence to make planning decisions. This means that planning consents can be issued in a matter of minutes instead of weeks, and the enablement of electronic dealings for property and land division, and the Department for Housing and Urban Development has stated that these changes will save up to three months in time, and that is a significant opportunity for industry and home builders alike. Whilst this bill is about improving the current legislative framework for the housing sector, it also sets the framework for any future iterations of the Housing Roadmap.

The drafting of the Statutes Amendment (Planning, Infrastructure and Other Matters) Bill 2025 seeks to make changes to various acts within the planning, property and construction sectors. The bill proposes to amend the Architectural Practice Act 2009; the Land and Business (Sales and Conveyancing) Act 1994; the Law of Property Act 1936; the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016; the Real Property Act 1886; the Residential Tenancies (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2023; and the State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025.

The key functions of these amendments are about streamlining processes and reducing administrative burdens where possible and, as part of this bill, amendments are proposed as follows. The Architectural Practice Act 2009 will be amended to allow the Government Architect to sit on the Architectural Practice Board for longer than the current maximum nine-year term. This is to resolve an issue where the Government Architect may be employed for a period longer than nine years, but is not permitted to sit on the practice board.

The Land and Business (Sales and Conveyancing) Act 1994 will be amended to allow the government to broaden the use of rent-to-buy schemes in appropriate circumstances following the successful pilot program from the South Australian Housing Trust.

The proposal to amend the Law of Property Act 1936 will allow for the use of electronic signatures to execute deeds, and this will result in a significant reduction in time to ensure that the dealings can be finalised in a matter of minutes, as opposed to days.

The proposed amendments to the Real Property Act 1886 enable electronic land division dealings, in line with the Housing Roadmap commitments. This proposed change will save up to three months in finalising these matters.

In addition, there are a number of key amendments to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. These changes include a proposal to enable the automated assessment of development applications through the SA Planning portal, which is a Housing Roadmap commitment. This proposed change will allow for technological advancements, such as artificial intelligence to be used for making decisions within the planning process.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is currently undertaking a trial of this technology which is world-leading in its development. The productivity gains for adapting the use of AI means that a planning application can be approved in a matter of minutes, as opposed to a 9.5 working day average.

The Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 will be amended also to require a landowner to consent to a development application being lodged over their land. This proposed change will ensure greater transparency, especially given the increased use of automated assessments. Additionally, this change will offer greater protections to existing landowners by preventing planning applications being made over land they have no vested interest in.

Additional changes are proposed to the streamlining of functions relating to the State Planning Commission. This is to ensure that the commission can focus on more strategic statewide planning initiatives. These changes do not reduce the powers or role of the State Planning Commission, and the Minister for Planning can still seek the important and impartial advice of the commission as required.

The proposed amendments to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 enable the simplification of amending the Planning and Design Code by allowing the minister to initiate amendments without always seeking advice from the State Planning Commission. The minister can still seek the commission's advice, should it be required. These changes will ensure that there is a reduced administrative workload on the State Planning Commission due to the significant volume of code amendments entering our planning system. Additionally, these changes will ensure the reduction of assessment timeframes for these matters.

The proposed amendments to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 allow the minister to prepare a report to the Environment, Resources and Development (ERD) Committee of parliament without the advice of the State Planning Commission. Advice from the State Planning Commission will be sought when matters are complex or have resulted in significant community interest within the engagement process.

The bill seeks to amend provisions that specify that land division clearance may not occur unless SA Water has confirmed an allotment has been connected to water services or that there is a binding agreement in place in relation to the connection of water services. The amendment will allow for land division assessment to occur, but it will not be finalised until an agreement is reached for the connection of those services.

The bill will insert a new requirement in the act to mandate that local governments must prepare local area plans to support the implementation of regional plans that have been or are being prepared. The proposed amendment will ensure that there is an alignment between the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan and the strategic planning activities undertaken by local government. The Department for Housing and Urban Development will continue to work and partner with local government and the Local Government Association of South Australia to support these important strategic activities.

The bill seeks to improve processes associated with infrastructure schemes by providing a power of delegation for a scheme coordinator and allowing a basic infrastructure scheme to transition into a primary infrastructure scheme without needing to commence a new scheme from the beginning. Finally, the bill will also introduce minor and technical amendments that will improve the operation of the PDI Act. These will include inconsistencies between state and federal legislation, the recognition of First Nations people in the objectives of the act, and standardised language and terminology.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank key individuals who have contributed to the development of this bill. Firstly, I would like to thank the State Planning Commission and its members for the excellent strategic work that they undertake for the development of the South Australian planning system. I would particularly like to thank Craig Holden, the Chair. I would also like to thank the Department for Housing and Urban Development, led by David Reynolds, and, in addition, Marc Voortman and the team within the planning and building unit, who have continued to deliver significant policy reform to ensure that we, as a state, remain steadfast in our commitment to deliver the Housing Roadmap.

The government has listened to our stakeholders and industry in ensuring that these amendments build on the strong foundations of our property and planning legislative frameworks. The proposed amendments simplify building and development in South Australia and, more importantly, enable more South Australians to get into more homes. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Architectural Practice Act 2009*

3—Amendment of section 7—Terms and conditions of membership

This amendment provides that the restriction on a member of the Architectural Practice Board of South Australia from holding office for more than 9 consecutive years does not apply to a member nominated by the Minister who is a public sector employee.

Part 3—Amendment of *Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994*

4—Amendment of section 6—Abolition of instalment purchase or rental purchase arrangements

This amendment allows the regulations to prescribe a kind of contract for the sale of land in respect of which section 6 does not apply.

Part 4—Amendment of *Law of Property Act 1936*

5—Amendment of section 41—Execution and attestation of deeds

This clause inserts a new subsection to provide for the manner in which a deed may be created in electronic form and be electronically signed or sealed.

6—Amendment of section 41A—Easements without dominant land to be validly created

This amendment replaces the existing power of the Governor to declare by proclamation a body that may validly hold an easement over dominant land with a power of the Minister to do so by notice in the Gazette.

7—Transitional provision

This clause provides for a transitional provision consequential on the amendment in clause 6.

Part 5—Amendment of *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*

8—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

These amendments clarify that, for the purposes of the principal Act, an *allotment* does not include land that is unalienated Crown land or land alienated from the Crown otherwise than in fee simple to provide for consistency with the operation of the *Real Property Act 1886* in respect of allotments.

9—Amendment of section 12—Objects of Act

This amendment provides that the scheme established by the principal Act is intended to recognise, protect and promote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledge, culture and tradition.

10—Amendment of section 28—Disclosure of financial interests

This amendment requires a member of a committee established by the State Planning Commission to disclose their financial interests in the same way as a member of the Commission.

11—Amendment of section 42—Practice directions

This amendment provides that a practice direction issued by the State Planning Commission for the purposes of the principal Act may specify substantive requirements or steps in connection with any matter arising under that Act.

12—Amendment of section 48—SA planning website

These amendments clarify that other legislation may provide that an entity may publish a document on the SA planning portal.

13—Amendment of section 54—Protected information

This amendment removes the requirement for the Minister to take into account the advice of the State Planning Commission before issuing a direction with respect to prohibiting, restricting or limiting access to any document, instrument or material on the SA planning portal.

14—Amendment of section 71—Incorporation of material and application of instrument

This amendment removes the restriction on a regional plan providing that any matter or thing is to be determined, dispensed with or regulated according to the discretion of specified entities.

15—Amendment of section 73—Preparation and amendment

This clause removes the requirement for the Minister to act on the advice of the State Planning Commission before approving the specified entities initiating a proposal to amend a designated instrument.

It also requires the Minister to publish on the SA planning portal a copy of any advice furnished to the Minister by the State Planning Commission in the course of consultation conducted in accordance with section 73(10)(a) or (b) within the specified periods.

16—Amendment of section 74—Parliamentary scrutiny

This clause requires the Minister, rather than the State Planning Commission, to prepare a report to accompany the referral of a designated instrument to the ERD Committee and changes what must be set out in the report.

17—Amendment of section 75—Complying changes—Planning and Design Code

The amendment in subclause (1) removes the requirement for the Minister to seek the advice of the State Planning Commission before initiating or agreeing to an amendment to the Planning and Design Code.

The amendments in subclauses (2) and (3) allow amendments to the Planning and Design Code under section 75(1) and (2a) to comprise a change to the application of a zone or subzone (rather than just to their boundaries) or a change of a prescribed kind. The amendment in subclause (3) relies on an amendment to section 75 set out in the *State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025* commencing first.

18—Amendment of section 76—Minor or operational amendments

This clause allows the Minister to amend a designated instrument in order to provide consistency between the designated instrument and any provision of an Act of the Commonwealth that is prescribed by the regulations or in accordance with any plan, policy, standard, report, document or code that is prepared, adopted or applied under an Act of the Commonwealth.

It also removes the requirement for the Minister to consult with the State Planning Commission before making an amendment to a designated instrument under section 76.

19—Amendment of section 78—Early commencement

This clause removes the requirement for the Minister to consult with the State Planning Commission before acting under section 78(1).

It also removes the current provision that deals with the version of the Planning and Design Code, or a design standard, that an application must be assessed against while an amendment to such a document is in interim operation. Section 132 will now apply in such circumstances.

20—Amendment of section 80—Ministerial building standards

These amendments remove the requirements for the Minister to consult with the State Planning Commission before acting under section 80.

21—Amendment of section 82—Entities constituting relevant authorities

This amendment provides that the Chief Executive is a relevant authority in the circumstances referred to in section 242A (which is to be inserted by the measure).

22—Amendment of section 88—Accreditation scheme

This clause removes references to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs in section 88.

23—Amendment of section 99—Related provisions

This amendment is consequential on the insertion of section 242A by the measure.

24—Amendment of section 102—Matters against which development must be assessed

This clause:

- provides that a relevant authority must assess development against requirements applying under Part 15 Division 2 (other than under section 198) as part of granting planning consent;
- allows the regulations to prescribe requirements relating to the provision of water supply and sewerage services that an application in relation to a proposed division of land must be assessed against;
- clarifies that requirements applying under section 198 are relevant in relation to a proposed division of land;
- allows a relevant authority to reserve its decision on a specified matter, or its decision to grant planning consent, until further assessment or consideration of the proposed development, or until an authority is granted or not granted, under an Act of the Commonwealth;
- provides further guidance in relation to how consents may be granted;
- makes some technical amendments.

25—Amendment of section 106—Deemed-to-satisfy assessment

This clause provides that proposed development in respect of which a design standard applies may be assessed as deemed-to-satisfy development if planning consent is granted subject to conditions requiring that the development be consistent with the design standard.

26—Amendment of section 107—Performance assessed development

This clause provides that if proposed development is to be assessed as code assessed development (but is not deemed-to-satisfy development) the development will be assessed on its merits against the Planning Rules (not just the Planning and Design Code).

It also allows the Planning and Design Code to provide that certain provisions of section 107 do not apply, or apply with specified modifications, in respect of a specified class of development.

27—Amendment of section 113—EIS process

These amendments:

- require the Chief Executive (instead of the State Planning Commission) to undertake certain functions in the EIS process;
- require the Minister to publish a proponent's response to matters raised and submissions referred to the proponent during the EIS process;
- remove the requirement for certain documents to be kept available by the State Planning Commission for inspection and purchase.

28—Amendment of section 114—Amendment of EIS

This amendment replaces the requirement for the State Planning Commission to give notice of the place or places at which copies of an EIS and Assessment Report amended under section 114 are available for inspection and purchase with a requirement for the Chief Executive to publish such documents (with the amendments) on the SA planning portal.

29—Amendment of section 119—Application and provision of information

This amendment replaces the provision that clarifies that a person who is not the owner or occupier of land constituting the site of a proposed development may apply for the approval of the proposed development with a provision stating that an application may not be made by a person who is not the owner of the land constituting the site of the proposed development unless the owner has consented to the application being made, the applicant is a

prescribed person or body, or a person or body of a prescribed class, or the application is an application of a prescribed class, or made in prescribed circumstances.

30—Amendment of section 120—Outline consent

This clause allows a relevant authority to reserve its decision on a specified matter, or its decision to grant an outline consent, until a particular circumstance or action has occurred (including further assessment of the relevant development).

The Planning and Design Code may specify matters that must be reserved on the application of the applicant. Any matter that is not fundamental to the nature of the relevant development may, subject to the Planning and Design Code, be reserved.

31—Amendment of section 122—Referrals to other authorities or agencies

This amendment changes the point at which a response from a prescribed body under section 122 must be published on the SA planning portal from as soon as is reasonably practicable after the response is received to as soon as is reasonably practicable after a decision on the application is made under Part 7.

32—Amendment of section 130—Essential infrastructure—alternative assessment process

This clause:

- allows the Minister or State Planning Commission to, before an application is approved or refused, permit an applicant to vary the application if the essential nature of the proposed development is not changed;
- allows the Minister to vary or revoke an approval or condition of an approval on the application of a person who has the benefit of the approval under section 130;
- imposes a condition on an approval under section 130 that involves building work;
- allows the Minister to determine that a certificate or approval under Part 11 is required in respect of the development;
- provides that if an EIS must be prepared with respect to the development any amendment to the application is to be treated as an amendment under section 114.

33—Amendment of section 131—Development assessment—Crown development

This clause:

- allows the Minister or State Planning Commission to, before an application is approved or refused, permit an applicant to vary the application if the essential nature of the proposed development is not changed;
- allows the Minister to vary or revoke an approval or condition of an approval on the application of a person who has the benefit of the approval under section 131;
- imposes a condition on an approval under section 131 that involves building work;
- allows the Minister to determine that a certificate or approval under Part 11 is required in respect of the development;
- provides that if an EIS must be prepared with respect to the development any amendment to the application is to be treated as an amendment under section 114.

34—Amendment of section 132—Law governing proceedings under this Act

The amendments in this clause:

- provide that the application of section 132 is subject to the regulations;
- clarify that the law in force as at the time the application was made includes the law as provided for in legislative instruments at that time;
- provide that section 132(2) applies to the Planning Rules rather than just the Planning and Design Code.

35—Amendment of section 138—Land division certificate

This clause provides that a land division certificate must not, subject to the regulations, be issued unless the State Planning Commission is satisfied that SA Water has notified it that connections for the purposes of the provision of water supply and sewerage services in respect of each allotment the subject of the division of land exist, a binding agreement for the provision of such connections has been entered into by the applicant or SA Water is not responsible for the provision of water supply or sewerage services in relation to the land and any prescribed requirements are satisfied. It also makes some technical amendments.

36—Amendment of section 153—Temporary occupation

This amendment allows an approval of the council for temporary occupation of a building without a certificate of occupancy to be given only if the council is satisfied that the relevant building complies with any requirements prescribed by a practice direction issued for that purpose.

37—Amendment of section 154—Building certifiers

This amendment allows a building certifier to exercise the powers of a council under Part 11 Division 4 in relation to a building in circumstances prescribed by the regulations.

38—Amendment of section 160—Mining and renewable energy matters to be referred in certain cases to Minister

This amendment is consequential on other amendments in the measure.

39—Amendment of section 162—Interpretation

This amendment expands the definition of *primary infrastructure* that is to be inserted into the principal Act by the *State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025*.

40—Amendment of section 163—Initiation of scheme—basic infrastructure

The amendments in this clause:

- remove the requirement for the Minister to act on the advice of the State Planning Commission under section 163;
- remove the requirement for the Minister to consult with the Commission before including other information in a draft outline of a scheme;
- remove the requirement for the Minister to consult with certain persons in preparing a draft outline of a scheme;
- replaces the requirement for the Minister to publish a draft outline in the Gazette with a requirement to give notice of the draft outline in the Gazette;
- provide for greater consistency with section 163A that is to be inserted into the principal Act by the *State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025*.

41—Amendment of section 163A—Initiation of scheme—primary infrastructure in relation to declared project area or designated growth area

These amendments provide for greater consistency with section 163.

42—Insertion of section 165A

This clause inserts section 165A as follows:

165A—Delegation

This section provides a delegation power for a scheme coordinator appointed under Part 13 Division 1.

43—Amendment of section 166—Consideration of proposed scheme

This clause provides that specified funding arrangements for the provision of infrastructure should be developed consistently with the principle that charges should be limited to recovering the reasonable costs relating to the infrastructure and sets out what such costs include. The amendment in subclause (1) relies on an amendment to section 166(2)(a) set out in the *State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025* commencing first.

44—Amendment of section 167—Adoption of scheme

This clause allows agreements or deeds that relate to the provision of infrastructure in relation to a relevant designated growth area or declared project area (as applicable) to be terminated by the Minister by notice published on the SA planning portal if a scheme under section 163 or 163A is adopted or a scheme under section 163 is varied under section 167A. It also sets out requirements relating to consultation and the agreement of certain parties and provides that compensation is not payable in relation to the termination.

45—Insertion of section 167A

This clause inserts section 167A as follows:

167A—Variation of basic infrastructure scheme to include primary infrastructure

This section allows the Minister to vary a basic infrastructure scheme so that it also provides for primary infrastructure on the recommendation of the scheme coordinator for the basic infrastructure scheme.

46—Amendment of section 168—Role of scheme coordinator in relation to delivery of scheme

This clause adds a new function for a scheme coordinator in relation to a scheme established under Part 13 Division 1. It further provides that no liability attaches to the scheme coordinator, the Minister or the Crown in relation to any advice provided in good faith under section 168 to a person proposing to apply for a development authorisation.

47—Amendment of section 169—Funding arrangements

This clause makes a minor amendment in relation to what a funding arrangement for an infrastructure scheme may include.

48—Amendment of section 198—Open space contribution scheme

This clause updates section 198(2) to clarify that the provision applies in relation to an applicant who has made an application for development authorisation that provides for specified matters and that land to be vested in a council or the Crown to be held as open space under an agreement referred to in the provision must not exceed 12.5% of the area of the land to be divided.

49—Amendment of section 202—Rights of review and appeal

This clause updates language in respect of the circumstances in which an applicant may apply to the relevant assessment panel for a review of, or appeal to the Environment, Resources and Development Court against, a prescribed matter.

50—Amendment of section 225—Civil penalties

These amendments remove the requirement for the State Planning Commission to ensure that specified information is published on the SA planning portal and the requirement for a council to be granted an authorisation by the Commission before acting under section 225.

51—Amendment of section 230—Enforceable voluntary undertakings

These amendments remove the requirement for the State Planning Commission to publish specified notices on the SA planning portal and the requirement for a council to be granted an authorisation by the Commission before acting under section 230.

52—Insertion of section 242A

This clause inserts section 242A as follows:

242A—Use of equipment or computers to make decisions

This section allows an approved system (being any equipment, computer, software or another mechanical or electronic device or process of a class or kind approved by the Chief Executive) to be used to perform specified functions under the principal Act, or do other things, including performing assessments and granting consents under section 102, granting development authorisations and giving notice of decisions. Anything done, determined or created by an approved system will be taken to have been done, determined or created by the Chief Executive.

53—Insertion of section 245A

This clause inserts section 245A as follows:

245A—Local Area Plans

This section requires a council to prepare a report (to be referred to as a Local Area Plan) to address specified matters, including strategic planning issues within the area of the council with particular reference to any regional plan that applies in respect of the area of the council, and to contain specified material. It sets out requirements in relation to the preparation, review, approval and publication of a Local Area Plan.

54—Amendment of Schedule 1—Disclosure of financial interests

The amendments in this clause add committees and subsidiaries established by the State Planning Commission and a joint planning board to the definition of *designated entity* for the purposes of Schedule 1.

55—Amendment of Schedule 3—Codes of conduct and professional standards

The amendments in this clause:

- provide that a code of conduct adopted by the Minister to be observed by members of the State Planning Commission extends to members of a committee or subsidiary established by the Commission;
- provide that a code of conduct adopted by the Minister to be observed by members of a joint planning board extends to members of a committee or subsidiary established by the board;
- clarify that a code of conduct adopted by the Minister to be observed by members of an assessment panel applies to members of a State Planning Commission assessment panel;

- remove the requirement for the Minister to take steps to consult with the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs before adopting or varying a code of conduct to be observed by accredited professionals.

56—Transitional provisions

This clause provides for transitional provisions consequential on the amendments in clauses 27 and 35.

Part 6—Amendment of *Real Property Act 1886*

57—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The amendment in subclause (1) inserts a new definition of *execution* for the purposes of the Act. The amendments in subclauses (2) and (3) consequentially delete the definition of sign (which is now to be incorporated into the definition of execution). Subclause (3) also inserts a new subsection (3) to allow the Minister by notice in the Gazette to specify that a particular application or instrument may be lodged electronically, despite section 7 of the *Electronic Conveyancing National Law*.

58—Amendment of section 39—Caveat against bringing land under Act

This amendment is technical.

59—Amendment of section 41—Applicant may withdraw his application

The amendments in this clause are consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing and make a number of other technical amendments.

60—Substitution of section 42

This clause substitutes section 42 as follows:

42—Documents of title submitted with application

The proposed section recasts section 42, preserving the requirement for the Registrar-General to retain documents of title, but extending the ability of these documents to be produced to a person if they have been held by the Registrar-General for more than 80 years.

61—Amendment of section 55—Non-compliant documents may be registered or recorded

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

62—Amendment of section 69—Title of registered proprietor indefeasible

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

63—Amendment of section 80B—Application requirements

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

64—Amendment of section 96—Transfers

The amendment in subclause (1) deletes an obsolete requirement from the section. The amendment in subclause (2) is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

65—Amendment of section 105—Sale under writ of fieri facias or decree, warrant or order of court

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

66—Amendment of section 143—Discharge of mortgages and encumbrances

This amendment inserts a new subsection to clarify that if certification under section 273(1) is provided by a mortgagee in relation to an instrument discharging a mortgage, the instrument will be taken to have been executed by the mortgagee.

67—Amendment of section 147—Cancellation of registration of mortgage by Registrar-General

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

68—Amendment of section 150—Transfer of mortgage, lease and encumbrance

This amendment inserts a new subsection to clarify that if certification under section 273(1) is provided by a mortgagee in relation to a transfer, the instrument will be taken to have been executed by the mortgagee.

69—Amendment of section 157—Revocation of power of attorney

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

70—Amendment of section 191—Caveats

The amendments in this clause extend the ability for an address for service of a caveat to include an email address and make a number of other technical amendments.

71—Amendment of section 220—Powers of Registrar-General

The amendments in this clause update an obsolete reference and make a technical amendment.

72—Amendment of section 223LA—Interpretation

The amendments in subclauses (1) and (2) update obsolete references. The amendment in subclause (3) is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

73—Amendment of section 223LD—Application for division

The amendment in subclause (1) extends the ability of an application for division to be made not only by the registered proprietor of land but in addition, in the case of an application made pursuant to an order of a court, by the registrar of the court or a person directed by the court to make the application. The amendment in subclause (2) is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

74—Amendment of section 223LDA—Application may deal with statutory encumbrances

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

75—Amendment of section 223LH—Consent to plans of division

The amendments in this clause are consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing and make a number of other technical amendments.

76—Amendment of section 223LJ—Amalgamation

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

77—Amendment of section 246—Unregistered instruments to confer claim to registration

The amendments in this clause are consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing and make a technical amendment.

78—Amendment of section 247—Informal documents may be registered

This amendment is consequential on the deletion of the definition of signing.

79—Repeal of section 266

This clause repeals an obsolete section.

80—Amendment of section 267—Witnessing of instruments

The amendment in subclause (1) makes clear that the witnessing requirements set out in the section apply only to circumstances requiring the personal signing of a document. The amendments in subclauses (2), (3) and (4) are technical in nature.

81—Amendment of section 276—Service of notices

The amendment in this clause extends the ability of documents to be served by providing that they may be served electronically.

82—Amendment of Schedule 3—Caveat forbidding lands to be brought under the *Real Property Act 1886*

This amendment is technical.

83—Repeal of Schedule 17

This clause repeals an obsolete provision.

Part 7—Amendment of *Residential Tenancies (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2023*

84—Amendment of Schedule 1—Related amendments

This clause deletes an amendment in this Act consequential on other amendments in the measure.

Part 8—Amendment of *State Development Coordination and Facilitation Act 2025*

85—Amendment of section 31—Impact assessed development

These amendments are consequential on other amendments in the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Teague.

CARERS RECOGNITION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (16:04): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Carers Recognition Act 2005 and to make related amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, the Evidence Act 1929 and the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (16:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As this week we are celebrating National Carers Week, I am pleased to rise today to introduce the Carers Recognition (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2025. The bill amends the Carers Recognition Act 2005. The Carers Recognition Act was first introduced in 2005 to recognise and support carers, while also encouraging compliance of applicable organisations with the obligations under the act and the Carers Charter. The Carers Charter is a set of non-binding principles regarding carers for applicable organisations to follow.

In 2024, the Department of Human Services completed a review of the Carers Recognition Act, while the commonwealth completed an inquiry into carers recognition and released the National Carer Strategy 2024-2034. Over 2,000 carers had their voices heard across these pieces of work and we have utilised the breadth of these consultations in drafting this bill.

The bill will align the Carers Recognition Act with the National Carer Strategy, to promote national consistency in how carers are defined, recognised and supported by governments. The bill will see this act become the first carers recognition legislation in Australia to align with the national strategy.

There are estimated to be 236,600 carers in South Australia, comprising 13 per cent of the state's population. The demand for unpaid care across Australia is expected to grow by 23 per cent between 2020 and 2030. However, the growth in the number of carers taking on a caring role is not expected to keep pace (16 per cent), leading to an increase in carer gap in the future.

It is vital that legislation recognising carers is kept up to date and ensures the best possible recognition for carers. The bill amends the act to:

- broaden and clarify the definition of 'carer';
- broaden the scope of the act's obligations and reporting requirements;
- introduce a requirement for the act to be reviewed every five years; and
- contemporise the Carers Charter.

The amendments will:

- broaden the scope of the act, which currently only applies to seven public sector agencies, so that it applies to all public sector agencies that must comply with its obligations and reporting requirements;
- include a definition of 'carer' that focuses on defining when a care relationship exists, which has been found to be more inclusive of the diversity of caring roles and makes it easier for carers to self-identify;
- remove the requirement for care to be ongoing;
- include explicit mention of 'medical condition', 'terminal illness' and 'dementia', as well as when care is provided for someone experiencing alcohol or other drug dependence;

- replace the term 'mental illness' with the broader term of 'mental ill health', which includes both diagnosed mental illness and mental health factors which may predispose a person to developing a mental illness, including experiences of trauma and suicidality;
- clarify the exclusion surrounding those caring in a voluntary capacity to specify the exclusion does not apply to approved carers within the meaning of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017, as these carers are not excluded from the act;
- remove section 5(3), which was an explanatory clause that commonly confused carers and other stakeholders who took it for an exclusionary clause;
- clarify that 'relevant services' for the purpose of the act are those that are provided specifically to carers and the people they care for, as opposed to services that are provided to carers incidentally;
- simplify the language surrounding the existing obligations the act places on applicable organisations, and includes the obligation for an applicable organisation to ensure their internal human resource policies have due regard to the Carers Charter;
- introduce a requirement for the act to be reviewed every five years, to ensure it remains effective and responsive to the needs of carers;
- introduce a new contemporary Carers Charter which reflects the National Carers Strategy and its focus areas and which provides explicit recognition of informal kinship carers, sibling carers and Aboriginal collective kinship care relationships and other carers who have previously felt unrecognised by the legislation; and
- make consequential amendments to three acts that fall within the Attorney-General's portfolio to ensure the above changes to the requirement for care to be ongoing do not impact those pieces of legislation.

The amendments made by this bill have been subject to wideranging consultation. During the review period, the Department of Human Services reached out to 30 non-government stakeholders who contributed to the first review, or were otherwise identified as being interested parties, and 95 public sector agencies, leaders and carer policy teams of other commonwealth, state and territory jurisdictions.

The bill will contemporise the Carers Recognition Act and work alongside the National Carers Strategy to improve the recognition and support of carers and support the ever-changing landscape of caring relationships.

Thank you to the many carers and stakeholder organisations as well as workers in the Department of Human Services who have shared their experiences and contributed to this important legislation. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Carers Recognition Act 2005*

3—Amendment of section 3—Objects

This clause amends section 3 of the Act to reflect that the Act will now apply to public sector agencies.

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause makes various amendments to definitions used throughout the Act. The definition of *applicable organisation* is altered to reflect that the Act will now apply to all public sector agencies (with the exemption of Ministers

and chief executives of administrative units), and any person or body which provides relevant services under a contract with a public sector agency. A new definition of *care relationship* is inserted, which points to the amended section 5. A new definition of *disability* is inserted, which refers to the definition given by the *Disability Inclusion Act 2018*. The definition of *relevant services* is amended to include policies, programs or services which are specifically directed at carers and the persons they care for. The definitions of *domestic partner*, *reporting organisation* and *spouse* are deleted as they are no longer terms used in the Act.

5—Substitution of section 5

Section 5 of the Act is proposed to be substituted as follows:

5—Meaning of care relationship and carer

Proposed section 5 establishes the concept of a *care relationship* for the purposes of the Act. A care relationship exists where one person (the *carer*) provides personal care, support or assistance to another person for any of the reasons listed. Provision is also made for circumstances that do not constitute a care relationship.

6—Substitution of section 6

Section 6 of the Act is proposed to be substituted as follows:

6—Obligations of applicable organisation in relation to Carers Charter

Proposed section 6 requires applicable organisations to take all practicable measures to ensure that its agents and employees are aware of and understand the Carers Charter, and that they, and the organisation generally, take action to reflect the principles of the charter when providing relevant services. It requires that an applicable organisation's internal policies are developed with due regard to the Charter where those policies may impact an employee's caring role, and requires that an applicable organisation consult with carers, or bodies that represent carers, when developing or evaluating relevant services.

7—Amendment of section 7—Reporting by reporting organisation

This clause amends section 7 such that all public sector agencies other than Ministers and chief executives of administrative units will be required to report on their compliance or noncompliance with the obligations imposed by section 6.

8—Substitution of section 9

Section 9 of the Act is proposed to be substituted as follows:

9—Review of Act

Proposed section 9 requires the Minister to cause a review of the operation of the Act and the Carers Charter to be conducted, and a report on the review prepared and submitted to the Minister, after the section has been in operation for 5 years and then each 5 years thereafter. A copy of a report submitted to the Minister under the section must be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after the Minister receives it.

9—Substitution of Schedule 1—South Australian Carers Charter

This clause deletes Schedule 1 of the Act and replaces it as follows:

Schedule 1—South Australian Carers Charter

Proposed Schedule 1 outlines the updated South Australian Carers Charter.

Schedule 1—Related Amendments

Part 1—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

1—Amendment of section 5AA—Aggravated offences

This clause is consequential to the amendment of section 5 of the *Carers Recognition Act 2005* made by the measure.

2—Amendment of section 20A—Choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting

This clause is consequential to the amendment of section 5 of the *Carers Recognition Act 2005* made by the measure.

Part 2—Amendment of *Evidence Act 1929*

3—Amendment of section 34U—Interpretation

This clause is consequential to the amendment of section 5 of the *Carers Recognition Act 2005* made by the measure.

Part 3—Amendment of *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009*

4—Amendment of section 8—Meaning of abuse—domestic and non-domestic

This clause is consequential to the amendment of section 5 of the *Carers Recognition Act 2005* made by the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Teague.

NORTHERN PARKLANDS BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 14 October 2025.)

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

These five amendments relate to the central proposition around the setting of the levy. When we brought that to the house, the original bill had just the House of Assembly for the setting of the levy. Those opposite and I had a very amenable policy conversation about it, and I undertook to go away and think carefully about it. The government presented amendments to the other place to include the Legislative Council—both chambers of parliament.

All of these five amendments relate to that policy discussion, so I think this is an improvement to the bill. It obviously locks in parliamentary oversight to all of the features of the bill that there should be and should give some assurance to those opposite and to the community more broadly that the government's intentions are just to build a very comprehensive, big, beautiful northern parklands.

Mr TEAGUE: I appreciate the—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): You don't have to address the beauty of the amendments—or the bill, the beautiful bill or beautiful amendments, or is it all beautiful?

Mr TEAGUE: I was tempted to make a short contribution, but I am much more interested in hearing from the Chair, actually.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): I am off the leash, member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: Please, stay that way; do continue, and I will sit down and we will have the benefit. This bill has now come full circle, and I appreciate the minister's summation of how those amendments that were dealt with in the other place came about. The result of the debate in this place also had the effect of having some amendments in terms of the original constituent councils being added. That was done here, so there has been some work to get this all ready to go. I do not have anything to add specifically in relation to the reason for those amendments; it is good that was done.

In terms of the minister's observations about this big, new project all being ready to go, I recognise the input of the Local Government Association in assisting in terms of the debate as it has progressed along the way. That has been of assistance to me—and I think I can also speak for the member for Flinders in this regard—and those of us on this side who participated perhaps most actively at the committee stage.

For the record, I note that the feedback from those constituent councils remains, so far as some feedback from elected members, that this is early stages, and some of what is about to happen might still be news to some of them to an extent. The real rubber is going to hit the road in terms of the additional impost in terms of rates and all the rest of it, charges that are going to flow on, and the elected members in those councils are the ones who are going to need to navigate that shortly. So I continue to urge the government to bring everyone along in that process. I otherwise note the contents of these amendments and the imminent passage of the bill.

Motion carried.

TAFE SA BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 October 2025.)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills, Minister for Police) (16:18): I want to thank those who have made contributions, in particular the member for Morialta, who was a former minister responsible for TAFE in the Marshall government. I thank him for his contribution; although we do not agree on everything he said, there were a number of things in there that I do agree with him on. I am sure we will touch upon those in the committee stage, should we venture that way.

As I outlined in my second reading speech, there are probably some overdue changes here. This government has made a lot of investments in TAFE. We made a commitment before the 2022 election to rebuild it, and I think I have been pretty frank in my assessment of decisions that have been made in the past by governments of both persuasions. The member for Morialta touched upon some of those, but this is a chance, at a kind of crucial juncture for our state, where we have had historically low unemployment, historically high job advertisements. There has been a lot of opportunity in terms of projects that are here now and projects that will be coming online.

Whether it is AUKUS, whether it is the new Women's and Children's Hospital, whether it is building thousands of new homes or whatever it might be, the challenge that is the same across all those projects is finding the skilled workforce, not cannibalising the workforces of existing projects just to move them to another project and, of course, wherever we can giving those job opportunities to South Australians.

TAFE, as the public training provider in this state, obviously has a key role to play, including and I might say particularly in regional South Australia, particularly in a state like ours that is, outside the metropolitan area, really a state of thin markets. That is just the nature of our state. We have to deal with that and, because of that, having a strong public provider I think is particularly important in South Australia. In many cases, for those regional communities, the only training provider they have, at least in terms of one that might have a bricks and mortar presence, is TAFE.

Again, I thank Jeannie Rea for her work on the TAFE Roadmap, which has informed a lot of the amendments that we have put as part of this bill. What we are proposing here and what I am proposing as the minister is a sensible meeting halfway of what you could do in terms of rolling back the corporatisation of TAFE and instead giving it the kind of flexibility that it needs to be able to operate in the best interest of the state.

I know we will probably get into a bit more detail with the member for Morialta on that. I thank him and the opposition for signalling their support for the bill. I thank the Hon. Dennis Hood in the upper house, who has just come into the portfolio but has engaged really strongly with me and my staff. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: We would like to take our full 15 minutes times three on every single clause, if we may.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): I am in your hands, member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Minister, thank you for taking some general questions on clause 1, which may save us some time later. As you are aware, the opposition has expressed an interest in an amendment that might provide for a review of this legislation after three years. I gave some commentary in my second reading speech as to how we might have benefited had such a

review been undertaken in 2015. I wonder whether the government has given any consideration to this proposition and/or whether the minister has any concerns with the proposal.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I think it is a sensible suggestion and I am willing to support it.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Has the minister received any advice on whether these legislative changes will have any impact on staff or workforce numbers?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: No advice has been received. In fact, there has been advice received, but that there will be no impact on workforce numbers because of this. In terms of student impact, yes, but my hope and the advice is that that impact will be positive in terms of what TAFE can do for students. But, other than those two things, my answer is no.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: In a similar vein, has the minister had any advice or discussions with officers specifically related to the impact of these changes on industry engagement and industry outcomes as compared with the current act?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Good question, member for Morialta. There are a couple of things I would say to that. There was a lot of industry engagement that went into the Jeannie Rea review, which has then informed the amendments that we are proposing here. So that is one thing, but there are also some changes that we are making around board representation. I think that is clause 9 and we might touch upon it later, so I will not go into too many specifics, but it talks about more direct industry experience and engagement, which is certainly something that I think is needed.

One of the comments you probably have heard me say in regard to our tech colleges and why the tech colleges of years gone past went out of vogue is that I think that kind of nexus between industry, real industry experience on the tools and what is needed by employers, and what was being offered by TAFE and tech colleges got broken, therefore employers did not see as much of a benefit as they perhaps once did in taking graduates of tech colleges or trade schools. We need to keep that tight, otherwise the same thing will happen again, and that applies to TAFE just as much.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 5 passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Clause 6 relates to the functions, and indeed it is a fairly broad clause. I think the minister, in the description of the bill, explained that when the board is operating as they run TAFE, obviously they are responsible to the minister for—I forget the name of the statement, but the one that replaces the charter and the performance statement. There is a new version of that where the government can set the directions for the TAFE board.

The essential premise of the bill is that, rather than relying on operating in the best interests of TAFE SA as a corporation, which is the current situation, the board's running orders, in the absence of specific direction, will be the functions in the act. I am wondering in particular about the situation with the way that TAFE engages with non-government training providers. Particularly, I note the function at clause 6(2)(c):

- (c) authorise the use of land, buildings, equipment, facilities or services used for technical and further education for commercial, community or other purposes for a fee or otherwise...

As far as I can tell, that gives a passive power to TAFE SA in which they can engage with non-government providers. Clause 6(4)(b), on page 7 at the top, provides that TAFE must perform its functions:

- (b) in an efficient and effective manner, including (if practicable) through shared use of its services, facilities and resources...

I am wondering if the minister can reflect on the matter. We understand that, as is not unusual for any training provider, it has infrastructure but it is not every day that infrastructure is used. Historically—and I think this is reflected in the comments of the Skills Commission in the Rea report, if I am correct—there has been a bias towards TAFE middle management potentially saying no to non-government providers or community or industry bodies seeking to access that.

I am wondering whether the minister has considered more explicitly including in the functions guidance to the board and the organisation to seek those opportunities or to lean to yes rather than no. I am not proposing a specific amendment here, and I realise that this can in some ways be defined by the government's directions and encouragements to TAFE. But between the houses, I think it is certainly the opposition's interest to explore whether it is possible to more proactively articulate encouragement for the TAFE SA organisation, to take what Associate Professor Rea and, I think, the minister have described as his leadership role in TAFE matters in South Australia to the extent of actively supporting the public good that can come out of training being provided by non-government providers.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I think there are good points that are made there and I agree with almost everything that you have said, to be perfectly frank. As to the statement of priorities, which I think is the document you allude to that will replace some of the existing documents, I can set those things out and I think I can say safely in this place that I intend to do that. I have been quite strong on that in my 3½ years as minister and I continue to do that.

You correctly referred to something that Jeannie said in her report about promoting the use of TAFE facilities with non-TAFE providers where they are not being used by TAFE. I think we would be silly not to do that, particularly at a time when we have a huge skills challenge in front of us. We do not have the luxury of having skills facilities, TAFE or otherwise, sitting around not being used when there is another provider, government or otherwise, that would be keen to use them.

I note you said you were not proposing an amendment. For what it is worth, I think that is the right thing because we considered it and I do not think it is necessary, but I can speak to that in my statement of priorities, and I intend to do that should this bill be successful.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will not ask a question; I will just offer a quick appreciation of the minister's response and the commitment of what he proposes to do in the statement of priorities and indicate that the opposition will give further consideration as to whether we believe an amendment would be helpful here. As I think the minister has indicated, I know the Hon. Dennis Hood will be seeking to engage constructively with the government between the houses and so I am sure this may form part of those suggestions. I am happy to move on.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Clause 9 relates to the board appointments and responsibilities, and the opposition's view is that, broadly, this clause is well constructed and appropriate. I am usually not of the view that you want to be too prescriptive unless necessary on specific appointments, but I do think that there is potentially an opportunity for one amendment that the opposition is considering, and I would be keen to get the minister's consideration of it, if not a response immediately, or at least, potentially, an indication of whether there is anything we have missed or whether the government might consider it between the houses, and I particularly refer to regional representation.

I note that at clause 9(4)(b), the broad skill sets required of the board, or at least the skills matrix for the effective performance of TAFE SA's function, have to include—and (b) states:

- (b) knowledge or expertise in the education and training of persons who have experienced disadvantage in accessing education, training and work or are from non-metropolitan, regional or remote areas;

In the minister's second reading conclusion speech, and I think he highlighted it in the first one, and it is apparent to anyone, that TAFE as the public provider is going to be the largest provider of training across the state, and that is particularly so in the regions where there is a thinner market of training provision, if you like, and lower margins available that might attract non-government providers or greater costs for the not for profits.

So given the specific and particular priority and requirement for TAFE to serve our regional areas the opposition is very keen to see not just the skills matrix informed as I just described but a

specific inclusion of somebody who lives and potentially works in regional South Australia. My recollection is that I appointed Jen Cleary to the board. I imagine that the minister has probably, for all I am aware, included regional representation in his own consideration since. I think that it would be counterintuitive for anyone to take seriously a TAFE SA board skills matrix that did not include somebody living in regional South Australia. With that in mind, I think that it would be an extraordinarily low-risk proposition to a sensible board composition to include it as a requirement.

I might leave it there for the minister to respond to, other than to say that I think subclause (4)(b), as is currently described, does not require that somebody even have the knowledge or expertise of rural and regional and non-metropolitan areas. The sentence is constructed as saying that board nominees either, as far as I can tell, have knowledge or expertise of somebody experiencing disadvantage in accessing education, training and work, or are from regional and remote areas. I am not wanting to downplay the importance of understanding disadvantage, but as far as I can read it, there is no requirement from that clause that somebody even understands or has knowledge of regional South Australia, let alone lives there.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Thank you, member for Morialta. Your observations are correct. That clause in terms of (4)(b) asks that the minister, in nominating members for appointment, 'must ensure that those nominated include persons who together have', so, yes, you are right. We thought long and hard about being more prescriptive in terms of who is on the board. As I am sure you would recall all too well from your time as a minister, it is a bit of a slippery slope once you start doing that. I am conscious that the TAFE board is already a large board. I quite routinely get feedback from chairs of boards in my portfolio areas that that can become quite unwieldy and difficult. I grappled with the idea of doing that, but I found it hard to find a way of doing it without expanding the board, which would create its own problem.

Having said that, you are right about the things you have said in terms of regional South Australia. I have appointed two regional people for that deliberate reason: Helen Strickland, who I think is from Mount Gambier in the South-East, and Andrea Broadfoot from the Upper Spencer Gulf region. I wanted them on there because they not only have regional experience but live in the regions and are well embedded in their communities, so I have certainly made that a priority in my time. The short answer to your question, though, is that we continue to be in discussion with the Hon. Dennis Hood about that, so I am not closed off to it.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I was interested in this clause while I was reflecting on the historical context of 2017 in my second reading speech, particularly the mechanism by which the Governor may remove a director from the office on the recommendation of the minister, at clause 10 (3), and the minister may recommend the removal of a director on any ground that the minister thinks fit, at 10(4). I suppose my simple question is: is this the same as in the current act, or is there a change? If there has been a change, why is that the case? In either case, is the minister able to explain how this mechanism would work in practice?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Thank you for the question, member for Morialta. It is the same as it was, except for a small change to subclause (4) and the removal of (e), which were both done by parliamentary counsel on their advice. Apparently, they are updating those in acts as they go, and that is all. Other than that, it will operate as it has already operated in the past. It was not something that I requested or that came about through the Roadmap review.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the minister for that. I appreciate the, I think, correct action that the member for Port Adelaide took in 2017. I do not think there would be too widely diverging views on that in relation to the exercise of this power. I genuinely speak from a place of ignorance. I do not think I ever had it suggested to me during my time as minister that I would be required to remove a director or a chair of a board. There were possibly examples where we did not stress too much when somebody's expiry was coming up, and there were examples where we were desperately trying to convince people to renew. The feedback that I have had from board chairs is similar to what the minister has had in relation to the way that boards operate. I think it is pretty effective in this department, for the most part.

I guess the second part of my question is: genuinely, has the minister got advice into how this works? It does not describe having to go through cabinet here. Does it have to go through cabinet, or is it just a memo from the minister to the Governor? Is there some other process that would benefit future ministers, if anyone is ever placed in the same position as the member for Port Adelaide was unfortunately placed in in 2018?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The advice I have is that it would still have to go through cabinet and to the Governor.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 and 12 passed.

Clause 13.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Is this a new clause?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: It is not. There has been a change in the reference to the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act, which is a name change, otherwise it is not a new clause.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the minister and seek his advice in terms of operation. I recall—and I am sure the minister had the same experience—when you advertise for positions on the TAFE board, it is seen as an attractive board to be on by many people who want to contribute to the state of South Australia. My recollection is that if a person were a chief executive or a senior officer of an RTO that was not TAFE SA, I struggled to imagine how they would be able to fully contribute to the TAFE SA board without having to remove themselves from a vast number of their items due to conflicts. I imagine that this clause presumably would capture those people.

I was reflecting: I think there is a head of a group training organisation on the TAFE board at the moment. I suspect that they would be the sort of person for whom this clause may be written, just because they have an indirect interest in training and the technical and further education sector as a customer of TAFE and other RTOs. Am I correct in assuming, then, that this is providing clarity that, for somebody with that industry connection, the fact that they use RTOs should not be seen as a barrier to their participation on the TAFE board? That is my understanding; is that a fair assessment?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: That is a good observation. What I can say is that this is not in here, or being maintained, in a bid to prevent people who might run an RTO, or with genuine RTO experience, from being on the board. I would not want that. I think we need to have that for the reasons you understand very well, but it is there to help us navigate what can be tricky areas. CITB can be like that as well. We are conscious of that and just making sure that we manage it well. I would not want to prevent TAFE from having people on its board who have had that genuine experience in running a training provider that is not the public one.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the minister for that answer and, yes, confirm I believe that it is important for people with training experience to be on it. In my experience, when somebody applied who had past experience of running a training organisation, that made them a very attractive proposition, especially if they no longer were actively working in that area. I appreciate the minister's response.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 22 passed.

Clause 23.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: This relates to barring notices that we have discussed previously in relation to schools, both in recent legislation and in the 2019 education act, when new barring notices and provisions were put in place. In most recent legislation relating to schools, my understanding is that barring notices are appealable to the minister. My understanding from a brief read here, unless I have missed something, is that in this act they are not.

I have a very simple question that I might put in three parts, and the minister can respond to all of them at once or we can see how we go. Why are these different from schools, why can we not

have an appeals process to the minister, and would the government consider supporting an amendment to replicate the schools model?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I will try to answer in the three-part format. Thank you for that. We did contemplate this, because obviously it was fresh in our minds due to the changes we have made around schools because of what we are seeing increasingly from parents who are exhibiting abusive behaviour online, exhibiting abusive behaviour in a perimeter around the school, and all those sorts of things. We came to the conclusion that we are not seeing those two examples with TAFE. If that were to change, I have already said in this place that we will support a three-year review. I think that would be a good thing to have in the three-year review, to see how the barring order is going and are we seeing abusive behaviour?

I know from a personal perspective why this is needed, may I say, in regard to TAFE. There was an unfortunate incident and I am sure some of our staff have copped that as well, so it is important that we put it in place. However, I have not seen any evidence of it being perpetrated in the online environment that would necessitate the exact same changes we have made to schools. If that changes, there will be that three-year review in which to contemplate that. Would we contemplate a review or appeals process, as you are familiar with and as the member for Port Adelaide is familiar with, around barring notices? Yes we would.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (24 to 33), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills, Minister for Police) (16:47): I move:

That this bill now be read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS REVIEW) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 September 2025.)

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (16:48): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Local Government Elections Review) Bill 2025 and, in doing so, indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition.

We could probably say this bill has been a long-awaited one. It is now nearly three years since the local government elections, and I note that the work to consider potential legislative changes in the shadow, or in the light, of those elections I think was started under the previous local government minister, Minister Brock, at the time and has continued on under Minister Szakacs. It has been long awaited because we had to wait for the Electoral Commissioner's review of the local government elections.

That extended for what I think is an unacceptable period of time, because we are at the stage now when we are considering changes to the local government elections process in some of the last few sitting days of this parliamentary term, and the next parliamentary term will only have a small number of sitting days and it will be too close to the next local government elections for that cohort of parliamentarians to be considering changes without there being a significant impact on local government elections. So this is a last-minute attempt to look at what changes can be brought in for the local government elections process.

The Electoral Commission review took over two years to be delivered to us, and that was probably because of the wideranging number of complications that that local government election brought up. We cast our minds back to, firstly, some of the complications around the reporting processes. Some of the responsibility for the shortcomings in that process certainly lay at the feet of

those elected members who missed a step in the process, but I believe also there were some real shortcomings in the way that was managed with the obligations that are legislated on the Electoral Commissioner through that process around the communications with elected members right across the state on their obligations and what they were required to do.

The ramifications of that were pretty significant; that is, there were dozens of elected members who technically had to be removed from their positions. This is why I say I think the delay in the Electoral Commissioner's review was exacerbated by that as well. We see that there were a number of different elections around the state that were actually undermined by some of the processes that were followed.

To have a situation such as we had, for instance, at the Adelaide Plains Council—where we had a portion of the elected member cohort who were technically not elected because of the failing of a push-button process at the Electoral Commission, and for that to only be discovered a significant period of time after that mistake and the rectification of that taking even longer—really did, in my mind, put at risk not just the reputation of that democratic process but also the confidence of the community in that process. That was something that was obviously front and centre for the minister at the time but also for the community.

We also had the complicating factor of the Court of Disputed Returns process, which prolonged the results of the local government elections. In the end, in the case of the City of Adelaide, it got to the point of annulling the results and a supplementary election being required more than two years after the result was declared. So this has been long awaited, but being long awaited I was hoping there would be some real substance in what we would be considering as part of the response from the government in trying to frame up their response to what changes could be made to the Local Government (Elections) Act.

There are a number of different bits and pieces and I want to step through them and look at a few of them individually in my contribution. In doing so, I highlight that there are some aspects that the opposition supports, there are some aspects where we will be seeking amendments—whether in this place or the other place—and there are some aspects that we do not support, for reasons that I will explain either now or in future contributions.

One aspect in particular on which there was obviously a significant amount of attention in the last local government elections was the qualifications of electors who were able to vote within a local government election. Under the existing rules, you do not need to be a citizen of the country to vote in local government elections; indeed, non-citizens can vote after being in a council area for only a short period of time. This was part of the complication, I guess you would say, within the City of Adelaide election, which was highlighted by the process that followed the appeal to the Court of Disputed Returns and the end result of what actually happened.

It has long been my position and the position of our side that we believe that you need to be a citizen of this country to be voting in local government elections. Indeed, that aspect of the bill I welcome. There are some uncertainties, and I hope to flesh out with the minister through the committee stage the way they will frame these changes within this legislation. On my reading of this legislation, they have made the eligibility with this amendment to only include those individuals who are on the South Australian electoral roll.

We have this situation, obviously, in local government elections where your qualification is within your local area if you are on the electoral roll within it, and that is straightforward for individuals. But for those who are landowners, business owners or property owners in a council area but do not necessarily live in that area there is a supplementary roll that is required for those who are qualified to vote in that council election.

This is especially pertinent, as I said, with business owners and landowners, and it allows them the capacity to be able to vote in a local council area where they have a direct interest in there being a positive outcome for the community. Maybe it is a landlord who rents out their property; they have a real interest in making sure that decisions that are made around some of the services and infrastructure delivered by their council are done so in an effective and efficient way. A business owner might have a direct financial interest in what decisions are made by that local government area.

The part of this bill that I am going to be asking questions about, with the definition as I read it as put in this piece of legislation to amend the Local Government Elections Act, speaks about the state electoral roll. On my reading of it, this does not allow for individuals who have an interest—a business interest, a property interest or otherwise—in a council area, who perhaps live interstate, to vote within that council election. I will run through some scenarios to try to highlight why this is something that I think needs the attention of the government when considering this bill.

It is especially pertinent within border communities, where a property owner—a farmer, for instance—may live on one side of the border for whatever reason. They might live in Victoria—I would not recommend it; but sure—and may hold a significant landholding on the South Australian side of the border. Whether that is in the area of the Tatiara District Council or whether it is down in the District Council of Grant, the business owner will have a direct interest in that council area. However, on my reading of the proposed legislation a person will not have the capacity to be able to use their voting power to ensure that they put forward candidates whom they think would suit best the needs and wants of the community.

So you could have that scenario, where the property owner is just over the border or, for instance, some of our communities that are closer to the border have people who spend half their time on one side of the border and half their time on the other. They may have a holiday home in Robe, for instance. That one springs to mind, but there are a number of South-East councils or holiday areas right around the state. People can spend half their time in one state and half in the other, but they are enrolled to vote in a state apart from South Australia.

I know a lot of individuals and families in my electorate, for instance, who live in the Northern Territory and spend half their time at Coffin Bay or Port Neill. They have a direct interest in what happens within that community, and in the investment that council makes into services or infrastructure. Under this legislation, and the way I read it, they will not have the opportunity to enrol in a supplementary roll to have their voice heard. This puts at risk Australian citizens who are landowners or business owners to potentially be disenfranchised by this process and not have the ability to have their voice heard.

I understand the reasons behind it. As I said, the aspect around Australian citizenship I absolutely support and I think it is a positive change which provides some clarity and some direct democratic advantage. But as to the aspect around the interstate voters, I will be seeking some clarity from the minister and will certainly be considering what potential amendments we might put forward.

There is another requirement within these changes for councils to hold what are called public information meetings for prospective candidates. This is where, in the lead-up to an election when the nominations have come in, there is a requirement within this proposed amendment to the legislation for that council to hold public meetings for those prospective candidates. There is an aspect where a council can decide to opt out of that obligation, if they put it within their caretaker policy. I see this as an about-face as far as the process goes because you could potentially have a situation where a council term decides to either include or not include the capacity for there to be a public meeting but that elected member body is completely at odds with what the prospective candidates for the upcoming local government election could be.

Changes could be put forward through the caretaker policy—that is, the policy each council has to have in place to bridge that gap between when the local government election nominations are open and when the final results are declared, that caretaker period. That policy itself can only be changed prior to those nominations being received and put in place. This really does set up for a layer of uncertainty and division which is not necessary.

The other aspect of this obligation to require a public meeting is that each of the 68 council areas are very different. As someone who has experience within regional councils, I know that the obligation to require a council to have a public meeting may not necessarily be welcomed. But it also does not really provide the structure for what the expectation is around who puts that meeting together. In the caretaker process, the CEO of a council takes on a lot of the day-to-day management of a council. To potentially have a situation where a CEO would be required to take charge of the structure and delivery of a potential public meeting could put them at odds with whoever their future employers might be.

In a situation where you have a council election where the CEO's future employers are going to be contesting an election, you could have a situation where a CEO is making decisions which could advantage or disadvantage an individual candidate—for example, a potential elected member. This could be in a scenario where the certainty around who the facilitator of such a meeting would be, who makes the decisions about the amount of time each candidate gets to speak, the questions that are allowed or the decision as to whether there is a threshold of behaviour or misbehaviour that a candidate might engage in, who makes the decisions to not include them in that process?

This aspect is an unnecessary one. I am surprised that it came forward within this piece of legislation because in all the feedback that I received, and I am sure the minister received comparable feedback from councils and communities, I did not see this as a subject that was brought up with me as one that they saw as necessary to be rectified through legislation.

There are some aspects that we will be supporting, for simplification of the process or adding in extra layers. One, for instance, is the capacity for telephone voting which within this piece of legislation is now extended as per state election regulations. I think this is a sensible change and I know it is one which local government supports in the feedback that I have been hearing from councils all around the state, to make sure there is not that capacity for a cohort of the community to be disenfranchised by a process.

We do know that the local government elections process is a little bit nuanced compared to a state election, where it is a vote-on-the-day system. Local government elections are a postal vote, and there are nuances that come with that but, under existing arrangements, there is that risk that there are people who have challenges with accessibility for that postal system that might be advantaged by having a telephone voting process in place. So we certainly support that aspect.

One part of the local government elections process that I have been hearing about over and over again from councils right across the state, especially in regional areas, and that they want to see rectified is to have more clarity and transparency for communities as to the number and names of the people who are nominating through that council election process. As I said, this is especially pertinent within regional communities, and we saw this writ large in the last council term.

It was the first council election process where the names and the number of nominations were not actually published throughout the process. We had a number of councils—predominantly regional councils—who did not receive the requisite number of nominations to fill the positions on their elected member body, and thus they were required to have supplementary elections. I was watching this with interest because, with the changes made under the last Liberal government, this was one aspect where the minister at the time and I (I was LGA president at the time) certainly had a disagreement about what the best outcome for the community might be.

All the way through, with my experience in local government and community leadership, especially within regional areas, I have supported the capacity for there to be not just the number but also the name of the nominations that are coming into a council election. We can potentially have some perverse outcomes when you have a council area—and there are some small council areas out there in regional South Australia, in particular—with only a thousand or a couple of thousand electors. That obviously limits the pool of the people who might consider putting up their hand for local government.

If we do not know how many nominations there have been we get the potential for the outcome we saw in a number of regional council areas, where there were not enough nominations to fill the positions. If there were publication of the names and number of nominations 24 hours out from when nominations close in a regional seat, for instance, I could look at it and think, 'Gee whiz, we're too short,' and I would go and get in the ear of someone I knew was a passionate community leader in my area and say, 'Look, we're short for counsellors; you should consider taking up this important role.'

This is what local government is within regional communities in particular: it is community leadership in its most magnified form. It is people who get paid very little to be in the role of an elected member, but the responsibility for their community, not just now but into the future, is really important. Without that capacity to understand and know how many nominations there have been, or the names

of those people who nominated, we had those perverse outcomes that ended up costing communities.

The amendment that has been put forward to the legislation within this Statutes Amendment (Local Government Elections Review) Bill sets up the framework for the number of nominations to be published. It is my position—and I will be putting forward amendments either in this place or in the other—to not just have the number but also have the names of those nominees published at an opportune time. In regional communities especially it is not just the numbers but also the names that really matter, because we need to make sure the right people are putting their names forward.

If a community reflects on the names that are published and reflects that perhaps there might need to be others who put their name forward, then they can make that decision with clarity. Having just the numbers could still risk having a community disengaged with that nomination process. That is certainly an amendment that I am going to be putting forward and would encourage the government to consider supporting because, as I have said, I have heard from regional communities in particular right around our state about not just the number but also the name of the nominee, as per what the process was only two local government elections ago.

The minister has indicated that there is consideration within this to also allow for pre-poll voting at supplementary elections, a trial per se through to 2030. This is another one that I have questions about, not just in the delivery of it but the necessity of it as well, which I will be putting to the minister, especially around the timing of those supplementary elections and, when nominations are received, whether there is actually the timeframe within that process to have a pre-poll, which adds an extra layer on top of that election process.

We are not necessarily seeing any financial advantage because, in my reading of this legislation, there would still need to be the mail out to each and every individual, yet we know in this place that the cost of that postage is only going up. If there was a saving I could see the justification, but the way I looked at it, this is not going to provide for any of that administrative saving.

An aspect that caught my attention within what the minister is putting forward within this bill is specifying the reimbursement amount available to members for printed communication with constituents. I understand the motivation behind it, but I also think that this sort of decision cannot be made as a stand alone. Once again, it is not something that I have heard in the feedback from local government that it is something that is especially pertinent and front of mind, so I will be interested in asking questions as to where the motivation for this aspect in particular has come from.

If we were going to be looking at the reimbursement amounts available to members across the board for all the different cost bases, I would understand that, but singling out this aspect in particular, the reimbursement amounts available to members for printed communications with constituents as a stand alone, I have certainly got uncertainties and questions around that aspect.

There is an aspect within this piece of legislation to enable councils a level of flexibility to operate during a period of declared emergency. There have been situations over the last number of years where this had to be brought in by the minister of the time to allow for councils to be making decisions. Obviously, during a public health emergency like COVID-19, that was very front and centre and this is where the minister at the time made a declaration to allow for the requirements around council bodies meeting, for instance, to have some flexibility within that to allow them to not be as stringent with the timeframes or the means of meeting.

For instance, we all suddenly got used to meeting online with each other, where previously that was something that was more of a novelty than a necessity. We on this side support this aspect in particular. I do have some questions and want to get an indication from the minister as to what their expectation is of how this would be used. My understanding, from reading it on face value, is that one aspect it does open up is the potential for an overzealous minister in the future to use these powers over and above what the expectation of the minister of today might be envisioning that this aspect allows for. This is an area that I will be certainly adding a few questions into the process with.

Within this legislation there are additional parameters that are set out around the conduct and the direction of scrutineers through the election process. Once again, sadly, it is making legislation to suit the lowest common denominator, because the vast majority of scrutineers through

the process will be acting in a respectful and thoughtful way. This does put in a few parameters around the expectation of the conduct and the direction of scrutineers through the local government elections process. Once again, this is one that I indicate we are going to support. There will be a few questions for clarification through the committee stage, which I will be putting forward.

This legislation also adds in the capacity for there to be additional parameters around the publication of misleading election materials and specifically around where there is direction within election materials to electors on how to mark their paper. This is one that I think is common sense. We do not want to have election material provided by a candidate to an elector that actually instructs them to incorrectly mark their voting papers.

It is important that, although you can perhaps take direction from correspondence from a candidate, the actual instructions on the process of marking and delivering your ballot paper are purely on the advice of the Electoral Commissioner in the materials that they provide to electors. I certainly appreciate the reasons behind that and support that change. There are some minor voter roll changes and also some minor adjustments of the timeframes around the vote count commencement. I understand these are based on recommendations coming from the Electoral Commissioner to give them some scope to be able to go through that local government election count effectively and do it in a conscientious way.

There are more specifications for financial disclosures that are built into this legislation, simplifying the process as well as the requirements around the large gift returns. It is fair to say that the obligations within the existing legislation probably do not reflect the reality of what is actually received by candidates right across the board, the hundreds of candidates that put their hands up for a local government election. To simplify that process and to lessen the requirement for reporting I think is a sensible amendment that will be provided within this legislation.

The reality of how many candidates actually receive a large gift—I ran in a few local government elections; I would have loved to have received some large gifts, but I did not. I think there would not be too many that actually do. I think it was reflected within the reporting around the last election that the obligation for the reporting probably outweighed the reality of what is actually delivered when it comes to local government elections. We absolutely support that aspect around the financial disclosures and the large gifts.

One other aspect that I want to highlight is the heavy-handedness, really, that was built into the last piece of legislation, which we saw once again writ large with the failed process around the reporting mechanisms in the last council election. This legislation now puts in place that candidates or elected members, once elected, who do not comply with disclosure requirements, whether that is in the electoral returns or the gift returns or the like, are suspended rather than removed from office.

If there is a procedural oversight, which we saw dozens of elected members and candidates caught up in last time around, then those elected members are actually suspended for the period of time until they rectify that mistake rather than be suspended and need a decision of this place to try to reapply their positions en masse. It is sensible legislation, and I would certainly congratulate the minister and the department on listening to what the feedback was, especially from our local government.

I see that within this legislation there is also the capacity to reflect the state election legislation around corflutes in local government elections. Once again, I think this is something which is certainly not as prominent in local government elections as it was in state elections. I do not think I saw a corflute in regional South Australia with the local government elections, but there are some zealous candidates at the metro level who used to put up corflutes for consideration in local government elections, but no more. That will reflect the state election campaign requirements.

There are some changes around the access to the voters roll and the declaration of nominations dates. There are some slight adjustments that we support. There is the aspect within the legislation about the capacity for councils to replace an elected member, who, for whatever reason, decides to give up their position and cause a vacancy. The bill confirms that a vacancy created within 12 months of the previous election will be filled by a re-count back.

This is one which, it is fair to say, on this side we are still considering our position on, and I will be leaning into some questions to the minister on different aspects because I think there are both positives and negatives to this process. There is some clean-up around the appointments of deputy returning officers and, once again, some clean-up around the specified dates as to when elections will be formally concluded.

One other aspect—which I note is not within the legislation but the minister mooted that it might be included within the regulation—is a requirement for candidates at a local government election to proactively be required to disclose any adverse conduct findings by the Ombudsman or the Behavioural Standards Panel. I hope that the minister will be able to unpack this a little bit for me, because I think there are some complicating factors within that which could have potential perverse outcomes for actual candidates when we are going through the local government election process.

Like I said, this is a bill that has been long awaited. I was hoping there would be some aspects within this legislation over and above what is actually in it because I recognise the consultation process that former Minister Brock instigated—and it is fair to say he threw some big ideas out there—for there to be feedback from the community and from local government to really challenge councils to look at what their community's expectations of them are.

Indeed, I think it is really important that in this place we are making decisions about councils and local government areas and their communities that are looking to the future of what the requirements are going to be, questioning different aspects and looking at the structures to ensure that they appropriately reflect the expectations of their community.

Although a separate tier of government, local government in South Australia is formed by legislation of this place, so it is the responsibility of the minister and the parliament as a whole to ensure that those frameworks, those structures, that are put forward in legislation for local government appropriately reflect the ongoing expectation of community.

Whether that is providing some extra containment for local governments that might be overly zealous with what they think they can try to achieve, or whether that is removing some of those restrictions or regulations which as the shadow minister I hear (and I am sure the minister does as well) councils get frustrated with: the obligations that are put on them and the additional aspects, whether it is cost shifting or regulation shifting from state government onto local government, which I continue to hear over and over from councillors as I travel around this state.

I indicate that there are several aspects within this legislation where I think there can be changes to fine-tune what I recognise as the expectations of the community, and the government in good faith can at least consider the amendments that were put forward either here or in the other place in between the houses to make sure that there is appropriate reflection of what local government and their communities', in particular, expectations are.

There are some aspects that we do not support, the majority we do, and there are some aspects that we will be certainly looking to try to amend when we are looking at the process. With that, I conclude my remarks and look forward to the committee stage of the bill.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (17:24): I would like to contribute a little bit to this bill. I thank the minister for bringing in this bill. As the shadow minister, the member for Flinders, has indicated, this has been a long overdue process. I had the privilege of being the Minister for Local Government before having to step down, and I am very passionate about local councils in particular. The last council elections were a dog's breakfast, to be quite frank. It was an embarrassment to me, specifically as a person who has been involved with local councils for over 20 years and then the minister twice, to see the results of the last one. As the member for Flinders has indicated, it was quite awkward when there were not enough council nominations and things like that.

I asked the Office of Local Government to go out and do a public consultation. The new Minister for Local Government has now received all that and has brought this bill back for the consideration of the house. During this consultation period, I understand 92 submissions were received directly, including submissions from 32 of South Australia's 68 councils and a sector-wide submission from the Local Government Association. For those outside who may not know, the Local

Government Association is the key body for all councils across South Australia, so the submission was very good. A further 406 surveys were completed on the government website, which contained 54,000 comments.

The Local Government Association was also consulted on this through that process in my time as minister, and it has continued under the new minister. Certainly, the Local Government Association has lots of discussions on the reforms. The LGA, as I said earlier, was principally supportive of the proposals during my time. As the minister has indicated in the second reading speech, and also the shadow minister, I think that is very important.

The best idea of the consultation after the last council elections was in regard to the issue of people who were not Australian citizens supposedly having their voting papers—because it was a postal vote—taken by somebody else and filled out. This bill makes it quite clear that you have to be an Australian citizen and have to be on the House of Assembly electoral roll. Therefore, as was indicated earlier, the people who are voting at council elections are Australians, they are on the House of Assembly electoral roll, and that is the way it should be. I congratulate the minister on actually taking that on board and also the public at the consultation for bringing that in.

As I understand it, an amendment has been proposed in order to increase the integrity of local government elections following feedback from the survey. The proposed amendments are also intended to provide greater assurance to our community that only those entitled to vote are the ones who are going to vote.

Recent findings of the Court of Disputed Returns, as the shadow minister has indicated, were prolonged. It was quite embarrassing that some people actually had to be removed from their positions as elected members, but also during the last election there were many candidates, including some mayors, who actually did not fulfil the requirements required on the returns. During that period of time, we had to put through special legislation to allow those people, instead of having another supplementary election. Another supplementary election is a cost factor to the smaller councils, particularly regional councils—up to \$30,000—so we were able to keep those people involved in the system.

I should also say that councils themselves need to exercise their property franchise entitlements. This means that if somebody is on the House of Assembly electoral roll, their businesses can nominate somebody, so the councils need to do that.

A significant reform of the new system is the management of campaign donation returns. This was also part of the discussions held with the Electoral Commissioner over a period of time. I think it is very important that the general public, when they have the opportunity to elect somebody, should be aware of donations and things like that. As the member for Flinders indicated, when he was mayor he would have welcomed some donations. Even when I was on the council and ran for mayor twice, we did not get donations in regional areas; however, that safeguards that opportunity.

The new system is both significantly more simple for candidates to manage and places greater emphasis on the disclosure of gifts and donations. As I said, I think the community needs to understand that someone is giving a donation, in case there is a conflict of interest, and things like that. The new opportunity is that the number of candidates per council area, whether it is the wards or mayoral, has to be promoted there. I understand from this bill that it requires councils to put that number up. As the shadow minister has indicated, I would like to also see the names put up as part of that, but I think that is something we can discuss during the committee process.

The bill also requires councils to hold a public meeting to enable candidates to speak to voters, to make certain that the voters themselves have the opportunity. I think that is great. As elected members in this house, we have the opportunity to talk at public meetings. I think it is very wise for the communities to hear from the candidates, to understand and ask questions of those candidates, to ensure that everybody is aware of what they are doing. If a council elects not to do it, then the council, the principal member, being the mayor, has to give a reason for it, and the reason why they are not going to hold a public meeting has to be very genuine. Again, we will watch this as we go through the process.

Another thing proposed is that voters should be aware of whether somebody standing for council has previously breached behavioural standards. Too often, people who have run for election in councils have not made known to the public some of their past history and, when they get in, that bad behaviour could come into play in the new council. Even when I was a councillor, when I had the privilege of being the Minister for Local Government, and now, one of the things I became very upset with and embarrassed by was the behaviour of certain councillors. These people, and the communities in particular, are there for the betterment of their community, and they should respect that and behave in a very professional manner.

The bill also requires the Electoral Commission to publish numbers of nominations on their website. It also requires councils to make a small allowance available to council members for reimbursement for publication of material associated with community engagement activities. Whilst I agree with that, I think we need to be able to put in some guidelines and also have a limit on that. Enabling a trial of pre-poll locations for voters to drop in and vote for a supplementary election held between 2026 and 2030 will establish whether the benefits of an additional voting method are broadly adopted. I think that is a good idea.

The bill will introduce standards for conduct for scrutineers and offences for those sorts of people. In my time as a councillor, as the mayor, I never used scrutineers, as I trusted the Electoral Commission people or council staff to be honest, transparent and true to what was being presented to them. However, at the same time, we have to have some guidelines and assurances that the scrutineers act in a proper manner and treat the Electoral Commission people, or whoever it may be counting the votes, in an honest way.

I also understand the regulation of election advertising posters and corflutes in local government elections now provides for consistency with state and federal elections. If you do not have your name out there in your community, then in actual fact you should not be running for that position. You are there to represent your community. One of the things I find with my volunteers, as a member of parliament, is that they hate putting up corflutes and having to take them down, plus it is an eyesore. I think that is a good move, but we will see how that turns out.

I also understand the legislation should support the unique characteristics of local elections, including the property franchise and the postal voting system, but should also provide local elections with the same level of assurances as state elections. As the shadow minister has indicated, in South Australia the state government is responsible for the behaviour of the councils, which I agree with.

The bill also includes a number of measures to improve the efficient delivery of local government elections and improve the integrity of council elections which will be of benefit to the community. We all have to remember, irrespective of whether you are a state politician, a minister, a federal minister, a councillor, or a mayor, you are there for the community that you represent. We are here to do the best we can for our state and our communities in this state parliament.

Councillors are there to understand and do the best they can for their community. They are community people. They are there basically as volunteers. I know there are a lot of mayors out there and I hear people say that mayors should not get involved with certain discussions. But local government in general is changing very, very quickly and that is good.

The real challenge, in the context of council elections, is the ability for voters to understand who is running for council. This goes back to what I said a minute ago. The Electoral Commission will put up the numbers for each council, but I think it is very important for every community—specifically regional people—to understand who is running for council. If there is nobody running there may not be a vacancy there and, as the shadow minister has indicated, you could then do a bit of lobbying and talk to somebody and say, 'By the way—' and then outline the situation, because the last thing we want is to have a supplementary election in a council area, especially in the regional areas.

I will leave it there, other than to say again that I believe that this bill is well and truly overdue. However, it has now gone through the right process and it has gone through the public consultation. The general public themselves had the opportunity to make comment on the survey, and I thank sincerely everybody who contributed to that survey. I thank sincerely all the councils that may have made submissions to that survey. I again pay tribute to the minister for bringing it back here and I

am looking forward to a speedy passage here so that we can get this out of the way. The council elections are next year in 2026. When we do come back, or whoever may come back into the new parliament, there will be only a short period of time remaining. If this bill does not go through in its entirety it will make it a lot more difficult for the 2026 council elections. So I commend the bill to the house.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (17:37): I, too, am rising to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Local Government Elections Review) Bill. Like others in the chamber today, as someone who has served at both local and state levels of government, including as a mayor at the City of Onkaparinga and, along with the member for Flinders, on the board of the Local Government Association, I understand firsthand how important it is that our council elections are fair and trusted by the communities that local councillors represent.

Local government is the level of government that is closest to the people. It is where residents see their rates at work. So every morning when people drive out of their driveways they drive onto a road that is looked after by the council and past the parks and playgrounds that are maintained by the council, and their kids and families are using libraries that are maintained and funded by the council. Most of what you see in our suburbs where we live is looked after by our councils, so it is only right that the process of electing those who lead and manage these councils be above reproach.

This bill is not a small piece of housekeeping. It is the culmination of significant and meaningful consultation with councils and with South Australians right across our state. At the request of the former Minister for Local Government, Geoff Brock, the Office of Local Government undertook statewide consultation to explore how we could strengthen the integrity of local government decisions.

The consultation received 92 direct submissions, including from 32 of South Australia's 68 councils, two of those being the largest councils in my electorate of Davenport, namely the City of Onkaparinga and the City of Marion. There was a sector-wide submission from the Local Government Association and there were 406 completed surveys on the YourSAy page, generating an extraordinary 54,000 individual comments. That level of engagement alone tells us something important, and that is that South Australians care deeply about how their local councils are elected and governed.

The Local Government Association have said they are principally supportive of reforms that improve the transparency, integrity and efficiency of elections, and that is precisely what this bill delivers. The most significant reform in this bill is the requirement that all voters in local government elections be enrolled to vote in state and federal elections too. This change brings local elections into line with state and federal elections by ensuring that only Australian citizens are entitled to vote, while still preserving the property franchise for those who own or occupy property in a council area.

Why is this important? Because it strengthens the integrity of our elections and ensures that every ballot issued is legitimate. Some will remember that this reform responds directly to serious concerns that were raised after the 2022 periodic elections where irregularities were identified. The Court of Disputed Returns' findings in relation to the City of Adelaide Central Ward revealed the unlawful enrolment and use of ballots by non-citizen residents. These illegal practices led to the removal of four elected members and, more damagingly, eroded public confidence in the fairness of our council elections. The integrity of our electoral system cannot be taken for granted, and this bill restores that confidence.

Under the new arrangements, councils will be responsible for confirming that any nominated property franchise voter is an Australian citizen and enrolled at a valid address, reducing the burden on returning officers to verify citizenship after ballots are cast. In short, this is about preventing misuse before it happens, not cleaning up messes after the fact while leaving people to live in limbo.

Integrity does not stop at who votes. It extends to how voters are informed about who they are voting for. One of the biggest frustrations that voters express, particularly at local government elections, is the lack of information about candidates. In 2022, more than 1,250 candidates contested 184 positions across South Australia. For many voters, the only information available was the 150-word profile in their ballot pack.

Mr Speaker, you would remember my 150 words from when I was running for the City of Onkaparinga. I had many a back-and-forth with the Electoral Commission until they finally accepted those 150 words. There were many rules. I was not allowed to criticise the current council in any way, shape or form, and many would remember that the City of Onkaparinga was highly criticised at the time for its lack of transparency and integrity.

Thanks to the member for Mawson for bringing attention to that and putting a little bit of pressure on the Electoral Commission to finally accept the 150 words that allowed me to explain how I was going to represent 180,000 members of the City of Onkaparinga. It is really difficult for those candidates to promote who they are and how they are best going to represent people. I can certainly say from personal experience how difficult that is and why it is so important that this bill is tackling that issue head-on.

Firstly, councils will now be required to hold public candidate meetings, which creates direct opportunities for voters to meet and hear from candidates and for candidates to be questioned by the public they will soon be representing. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the Onkaparinga Northern Community Forum, who hold these candidate sessions in my electorate of Davenport at the Aberfoyle Community Centre.

Even prior to this bill being introduced, they have always done that. For every local, state and federal election, they make sure all the candidates are brought in and they promote that opportunity to the community to come and hear firsthand from the people wanting to represent them. This reform responds directly to community feedback. We had 84 per cent of YourSAy respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that more should be done to give candidates a platform to share their views and experience.

Secondly, it introduces a simpler and more transparent system for campaign donation disclosure. Candidates will be required to report on their donations throughout the campaign rather than afterwards, which actually gives voters more of an opportunity to understand who is backing, and financially backing, those candidates.

Importantly, the government also intends to make regulations requiring candidates to disclose if they have been the subject of adverse findings from integrity bodies, including the Behavioural Standards Panel, the Ombudsman or the ICAC. Any of us who have spent time in the local government space will know that a huge amount of time is sucked up by behavioural issues. So I think it is really important that, as we also heard from the former Minister for Local Government, our communities should know if they are electing someone who is going to go in and spend ratepayers' time and money on silly behavioural disputes. There are huge amounts of legal fees as well for those individual councils.

As someone who has led a large council, I can tell you that trust in our institutions starts with accountability from those who seek to lead them. Voters deserve to know if a candidate has previously breached those integrity or behavioural standards. These measures will give voters a clearer picture of who they are voting for, what they stand for, how they conduct themselves and who supports them. Beyond those key reforms, the bill also introduces a range of practical measures to modernise and improve the efficiency of local government elections. These include:

- publishing nominations as they are received, helping to reduce uncontested elections or last-minute withdrawals—and I can tell you there have been multiple elections where I have witnessed potential candidates hanging around in the lobbies of council chambers waiting for those last few seconds to put up their application form so that they can put it in the least contested seat and have the best chance of winning an uncontested election;
- allowing modest reimbursements for council members to engage more effectively with their communities through communication and outreach—councillors are not paid a lot of money to do their job, so I think this is really important and will be really helpful for them to be better at representing their communities;
- trialling pre-poll voting for supplementary elections between 2026 and 2030, recognising that not all voters prefer or are able to use postal voting—I wish I was standing here

celebrating that we were moving towards online voting but unfortunately we are not ready to do that just quite yet, but one day;

- introducing clear standards of conduct for scrutineers and new penalties for anyone obstructing election duties or misleading voters—it sounds like there might be some further questions during committee on that particular topic, but there certainly were examples at the last election for why this is necessary. I can only speak to the City of Onkaparinga standards, but things certainly went down at the City of Onkaparinga chambers by the scrutineers at the last election. SAPOL was called on multiple occasions, which is pretty disappointing, so I really hope that these standards mean that we see a bit of a higher standard from those scrutineers; and
- updating corflute regulations to bring consistency with state and federal election rules, which is just a no-brainer.

Additionally, the government intends to amend regulations to expand telephone voting access to all people with a disability, which is fantastic. This is an important and overdue step to make local democracy more inclusive.

Each of these measures might seem small in isolation, but together they add up to a system that is fairer and more consistent. The relationship between councils and the state government is one of partnership and mutual accountability most of the time. The state has a clear responsibility to ensure that council elections are conducted with the same integrity and assurance that South Australians expect at the state and federal level.

I am proud to support this bill, not only as a legislator but as someone who has served within the local government system and seen firsthand both its strengths and its vulnerabilities. Our councils make decisions that shape the daily lives of every South Australian. The least we can do is ensure that the process by which we choose their leaders is trusted. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (17:49): I thank members for their contribution and I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Mr TELFER: I look forward to a vigorous committee stage, maybe not all tonight but potentially tomorrow, depending on the will of the house.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Almost certainly not tonight.

Mr TELFER: I am happy to, because I think it is really important that we flesh out a number of different aspects of this bill. Clause 2 is around the commencement of the act. What recommendations have the Electoral Commissioner and the LGA provided to the minister on the commencement of the bill?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I thank the member for his question and I look forward to the committee stage. It is very much in his hands to get as much of this on the record as we possibly can, hopefully not going too far into the night. We have had no representations from ECSA or the LGA about the commencement date. However, I can advise the member that the expectation is that all clauses will come into effect on 1 January 2026.

Mr TELFER: Minister, are you confident that allows enough time for the required adjustments to the process to be fully understood by the sector and enacted not just by the Electoral Commissioner but by local government as a whole? It is not a simple process to hold probably 66 different elections, by that time, with the duplication of mayoral and elected member elections. Are you confident there is going to be enough time to put these changes into play?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am confident. Not only is it our endeavour but such is the will of the parliament for this to be contemplated and passed this year. I do not know, we may be coming back next year. We may have a busy sitting schedule in January and February. Assuming that we will not, yes, I do, and the expectation for us and the nature of the engagement we have had with the sector has been that this will be enough time for the periodic election to be fully encompassed with the reforms. Keep in mind that the rolls close at the end of July which gives a full seven months, so we think that is a very reasonable time. It could be an arbitrary date at any time but the 1 January period would be something that we think is well and truly sufficient.

Mr TELFER: Is that the advice you received from the Electoral Commissioner about it? Is he comfortable that there is going to be enough time to be able to get these aspects in particular in place? There are some nuanced aspects. We talked about telephone voting and the like, so it is not necessarily a simple process. There are some aspects that will take a little bit of framework to try to develop.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: We have had no concerns at all raised by the Electoral Commissioner. I believe I did this in my second reading speech but certainly for the record, my thanks to the Electoral Commission staff for the way that they have engaged in this process, particularly by way of taking a collaborative approach to the design, some of the clauses and, as the member has rightfully asked, the capacity for the Electoral Commissioner to effect these changes in a manner which is necessary for them to execute their responsibilities and duties.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr TELFER: This makes amendments to the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 preliminary clauses, which are basically the definitions within the legislation. Clause 3 changes the definition of a 'designated person'. It takes out some aspects of commentary around the case of a body corporate and instead speaks purely about 'in respect of a body corporate or group entitled to be enrolled on the voters roll for an area or ward, means a natural person, of or above the age of majority', and then puts in this aspect about a state elector.

Does this definition adjustment mean that in the case of a body corporate, someone entitled to be enrolled cannot be an Australian citizen from interstate, but has to be an Australian citizen from South Australia?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Broadly, I will use this opportunity to articulate both clause 3(2), which is the substantive amendment, and clause 3(1), which is the consequential amendment that changes the definition. It is clear, and the member has picked this up in his second reading contribution, that it is the view of the government and, frankly, the reasonable expectation of the community at large, that some of the highest order of obligations upon government and policymakers across every level of government is to ensure fair elections, free elections, and perhaps most importantly elections that can continue to enjoy the confidence of the community.

It is also important—and I can put this on the record—that the deliberations, to put it that way, the government has formed around 'citizenship tests' is one we did not arrive at lightly. I say that in the context of being the son of a migrant, and not just a migrant but the son of a refugee, who, more than any person I have ever known, valued and prioritised the freedom he sought and found here in South Australia.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council with a message drawing the attention of the House of Assembly to clause 6 printed in erased type, which clause being a money clause cannot originate in the Legislative Council but which is deemed necessary to the bill. Read a first time.

FAIR WORK (WORKER ENTITLEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the amendment made by the House of Assembly without any amendment.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Thursday 16 October 2025 at 11:00.