

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 14 October 2025

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 14:16 and read prayers.

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

Bills

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PROHIBITION OF PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN MATERIAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy assented to the bill.

Condolence

SIR ERIC JAMES NEAL AC CVO

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:18): By leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Sir Eric James Neal AC CVO, former Governor of this state, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished service to the state and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I rise today, on behalf of the government, to commemorate the life of the Hon. Sir Eric James Neal AC CVO, former Governor of this state, and a man whose 101 years were marked not only by remarkable longevity but an unwavering service.

Sir Eric James Neal was born on 3 June 1924 in London to James and May Neal, the eldest of four children. In 1926, when Sir Eric was just two years old, his family made the journey to Australia. Sir Eric grew up in South Australia, attending Largs Bay and Hindmarsh public schools, later completing his schooling at Thebarton Technical School. Sir Eric concluded schooling at the age of 16 to enter the workforce but remained committed to learning, enrolling in engineering studies at the South Australian School of Mines.

Encouraged by his father, James, Sir Eric pursued an apprenticeship at the South Australian Gas Company. He learnt the trade of plumbing and gasfitting there under his father's guidance. A successful engineering career led to an impressive business career. Sir Eric served as the chief executive of Boral, one of the nation's largest building construction companies, a role he held with distinction for 14 years. His vision and leadership extended far beyond a single company. He served on the boards of BHP, Atlas Copco, Westpac and John Fairfax Limited—some of Australia's most significant corporate institutions.

In 1996, Sir Eric made history once again, becoming the first South Australian Governor appointed from a business background. As the 32nd Governor of South Australia, Sir Eric brought a wealth of experience, extended networks and a pragmatic understanding of global commerce. During his years as Governor, Sir Eric strengthened South Australia's international ties, leading successful trade missions to Europe, Asia and North America. His work supported local businesses, advanced the state's interests abroad and reminded the world of South Australia's innovation, talent and opportunity.

But retirement was never truly part of Sir Eric's vocabulary. After his retirement as Governor in 2001, he continued to give back to public life, serving as Chancellor of Flinders University from 2002 until 2010. In this role, he championed education, research and opportunity for young South Australians, just as he himself had once been given the chance to learn and grow. He also served

as the chair of the South Australian government Road Safety Advisory Council from 2003 until 2011, contributing to policy that helped save lives and make roads safer.

In a particularly meaningful role, he chaired the Veterans' Advisory Council, where his leadership culminated in the opening of the ANZAC Centenary Memorial Walk, a lasting tribute to those who served. Sir Eric's contributions were recognised with some of the very highest honours that can be bestowed. He was made a Knight Bachelor for his service to industry. He was appointed Companion of the Order of Australia for his extraordinary service to commerce and the community. He held appointments as a Commander of the Royal Order (CVO), Knight of the Order of St John and Fellow of the Australian Academy of Technical Sciences and Engineering.

Behind his many achievements stood a constant source of love and support: his wife of 72 years, Lady Thelma 'Joan' Neal. Together, they raised two sons and built a life rooted in love, loyalty and strength. Sir Eric reflected that much of his long life and success was thanks to Joan, his anchor, his companion and his greatest source of joy. Of course, there was one other great passion in his life: the Port Adelaide Football Club. A lifelong supporter and, indeed, patron, Sir Eric stood by the club through triumph and adversity, as only a true supporter can.

On behalf of the government, I extend my condolences and best wishes to the greater Neal family. With the passing of someone who certainly made their mark on this state, I commend the condolence motion to the chamber.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I rise today on behalf of the South Australian Liberal Party to honour the remarkable life of Sir Eric James Neal AC CVO, former Governor of South Australia, and to extend our deepest condolences to his two sons, his five grandchildren, his five great-grandchildren and to all those who mourn his passing.

Sir Eric's story is one of extraordinary achievement and lifelong service. Born in London in 1924 and raised in Largs Bay, after migrating to South Australia in 1927, from humble beginnings he rose to become one of South Australia's most distinguished figures in both business and public life. His early training as an engineer at the South Australian School of Mines was a foundation for a career that would see him shape much of the infrastructure and industry that underpins our modern state and nation.

Sir Eric was a pioneer of Australian business. He led Boral as chief executive for 14 years and served on the boards of BHP, AMP, Westpac, Coca-Cola Amatil and John Fairfax Holdings, earning a reputation as a man of vision and integrity. His contributions to infrastructure were profound, from his pivotal role in the Sydney Harbour Tunnel to his quiet advocacy for investment and jobs in South Australia.

In 1987, Sir Eric was appointed Chief Commissioner of the City of Sydney during the city's bicentennial celebrations, bringing order and efficiency to a time of rapid growth and change. In 1996, the Dean Brown Liberal government appointed him Governor of South Australia, the first governor chosen from a business rather than a political or military background.

During his five-year term, Sir Eric and Lady Joan Neal worked tirelessly to make Government House the people's house, visiting communities across our state and hosting thousands of schoolchildren, civic groups and community organisations. Sir Eric brought a unique perspective to the role, acting as a quiet but effective ambassador for South Australia. He led trade missions to China, Sweden, Malaysia, the United States and the United Kingdom, opening doors for South Australian businesses and industries and always careful to do so in a way that respected the apolitical nature of his office.

Sir Eric's legacy extends well beyond his time as Governor. Following his vice-regal service, he became Chancellor of Flinders University, championing higher education and research partnerships between universities and industry. He oversaw the development of what he described as a renaissance of engineering at Flinders, leaving a lasting mark on the institution and on generations of students.

A deeply committed supporter of veterans and commemorative projects, Sir Eric chaired the Veterans' Advisory Council and was instrumental in the creation of the ANZAC Centenary Memorial

Walk on Kintore Street. His leadership ensured that this important project was delivered on time and with the dignity it deserved.

Throughout his life, Sir Eric displayed the qualities of service, humility and connection. Whether in boardrooms, at Government House or chatting with students at Flinders University, he was approachable and he was grounded. Former Prime Minister John Howard described him as, and I quote, 'a great all rounder', someone who combined business acumen with compassion and public service.

Sir Eric's centenary last year was marked by tributes from across the nation, including a personal message from King Charles III, a fitting recognition for a man whose service spanned continents and communities. His passing at the age of 101 closes a remarkable chapter in our state's history, but his legacy endures in the institutions he strengthened and in the lives that he touched. As we reflect on Sir Eric's life, we see a man who believed that public office was about responsibility, not power, and who used every role he held to build a better South Australia. His story is a reminder of what principled leadership can achieve.

On behalf of the opposition, I extend our deepest sympathies to Sir Eric's family and to all who knew and admired him. South Australia has lost a true statesman, and his example will continue to inspire us for generations to come. Vale Sir Eric Neal.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:27): I rise, briefly, to reflect on the passing of Sir Eric Neal and to convey my sympathies to his family and friends. As has been observed by others, Sir Eric's life was one of remarkable achievement. As part of his distinguished public service, he was Chancellor of Flinders University from 2002 to 2010, and it was in that capacity that we first met when I served as student president and representative on the university council. I was on the university council in 2005 and 2006, I believe.

Sir Eric recognised the important role that students played on the university council, and I remember fondly our many political chats during those times. I think it is fair to say that we had slightly different views on a few things, but I think we both enjoyed those conversations. He would often seek the views of student representatives. Indeed, this was a period of significant change for the university sector and he provided strong leadership during that time.

As has been observed by Flinders University Vice-Chancellor Professor Colin Stirling, Sir Eric was a man of great integrity and wisdom. His contribution to Flinders University was profound and his legacy continues to shape the institution today. He had an extraordinary ability to bring people together and to inspire confidence in the university's mission. He was deeply respected by staff, students and the broader community.

I ran into Sir Eric many years later, as a North Adelaide resident, during my time on the Adelaide City Council. I remember my surprise, when doorknocking in North Adelaide back in 2014, to be greeted by Sir Eric, and we had a good discussion then as well. We bumped into each other often at events over the years and he was always warm and friendly. I believe he was a thoroughly decent man with a strong commitment to community service.

As the Premier observed, few people attain the remarkable age of 101. Sir Eric achieved much in his century-long life and has had a significant impact on our state. It was testament to the high regard in which he was held by all sides of politics that there was such strong representation from the parliament at the state funeral that I had the opportunity to attend a few weeks ago. I think it was a very fitting send-off for Sir Eric and a fitting recognition of his remarkable life. Vale Sir Eric Neal.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:29): I rise today to pay tribute and convey my deepest condolences to Sir Eric Neal's family—his two sons, Peter and James, five grandchildren and five great-grandchildren—and his extended family and friends on the passing of a truly remarkable South Australian, Sir Eric James Neal, at the age of 101. Sir Eric was a man of great integrity, wisdom and service. His life was defined by longevity, resilience and contribution. I was also at the memorial service at the cathedral with so many honourable members that day. It was a beautiful send-off with many emotional and humorous speeches at the same time that spoke a lot about the humility and the legacy of Sir Eric.

I have a number of personal stories to share about Sir Eric. I recall, when I was the chairperson of the Hong Kong Australia Business Association business award, he agreed to be the guest of honour for that particular award. On the night of the award, I received a phone call about 4 o'clock, and I thought somebody was playing a prank on me because when I picked up the phone, he said, 'This is Eric here.' He obviously was not feeling very well, so his voice sounded really different. I said, 'Come on, Eric,' because he just said 'Eric' and I had a friend who was attending the dinner and I thought someone was playing a joke on me, so I said, 'Come on, don't do this. You can't be serious about this.'

Then he said, 'I really am Sir Eric Neal,' and I did not really believe him. Anyway, I said, 'Okay, I will see you tonight,' and I hung up. Then the official secretary of Government House rang and said, 'You just spoke to Sir Eric Neal. He has not been feeling well and he has lost his voice.' I thought, 'Oh my God.' He would actually personally call. Instead of somebody else calling, he sent a personal apology to say that he could not make it on the night. I felt really bad, so I said, 'Can you please apologise to Sir Eric? I didn't mean to be rude and offensive.' That was the sort of person he was.

I have other stories about Sir Eric Neal. One of his sons, James, and I are really good friends. We went out boating. Sir Eric said, 'Okay, kids, you guys can have fun. You don't have to pay attention to me.' Lady Joan and Sir Eric just sat on one side, and we did our thing as his guests on the boat. He was a really remarkable man. We are sad about his passing but I think that for somebody of his status to be able to make such a great impact on so many lives, and touch so many lives, is really truly remarkable.

I also know that Sir Eric loved education. He was a patron of the Australia Malaysia Business Council. During the whole time he was patron, with every single president who served with him and every student who was awarded an international student's award by the Australia Malaysia Business Council, Sir Eric always spent time when presenting awards—that little bit of special time to acknowledge the excellence of each individual student. That is also an incredible legacy that he has left in supporting education.

Many other members have mentioned his incredible career in business and also celebrated so many different qualifications as well as contributions he made to society. I just want to pay other tributes I have written down here. Beyond his public achievements, Sir Eric's personal life was equally inspiring. He met his beloved wife, Lady Thelma 'Joan' Neal, at the Royal Adelaide Show in 1947, a chance encounter that blossomed into a lifelong partnership. They were married for over 70 years, celebrating a union marked by devotion, grace and shared service to the people of South Australia.

Sir Eric was also a lifelong supporter of the Port Adelaide Football Club, serving as a joint patron from 2005. His passion for the club was well known, and he provided important support over the years. Port Adelaide president at the time, Greg Boulton, once said that Sir Eric represented everything the club stood for: success, pride and the courage to overcome the odds.

Today, I am truly grateful to be able to pay this tribute. To his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy. I hope that you all find comfort in knowing that Sir Eric's contributions will be remembered with deep respect and gratitude. Always in our hearts. Vale Sir Eric Neal.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:36 to 14:46.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Independent Commission Against Corruption Annual Report, 2024-25
[Ordered to be published]
Independent Commission Against Corruption Integrity State Volume 4, 2024-25
[Ordered to be published]
Office for Public Integrity Annual Report, 2024-25
[Ordered to be published]
Annual Report of the Inspector of the Independent Commission Against Corruption, The
Office for Public Integrity and Ombudsman SA for the period
1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025
[Ordered to be published]
Ombudsman SA Annual Report 2024-25
Annual Report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2025—
Report 8 of 2025—
Part A: Executive Summary
Part B: Controls Opinion
Part C: Agency Audits—October 2025

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Regulations under Acts—
National Electricity (South Australia) Act 1996—Firm Energy Reliability and Orderly
Exit Management
Notices under Acts—
Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Act 1999—Trans-Tasman
Mutual Recognition (Tobacco and Other Products)
Notice 2025

By the Attorney-General (The Hon. K. J. Maher)—

Rules of Court—
District Court Act 1991—Uniform Civil—No 15
Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993—Uniform Civil—No 15
First Nations Voice Act 2023—Uniform Civil—No 15
Local Government (Elections) Act 1999—Uniform Civil—No 15
Magistrates Court Act 1991—Uniform Civil—No 15
Supreme Court Act 1935—Uniform Civil—No 15
Youth Court Act 1993—Uniform Civil—No 15
Rules under Acts—
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Legal Profession Education and Admission
Council (No. 2)

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. C.M. Scriven)—

Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia: Report, 2024-25

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. E.S. Bourke)—

Regulations under Acts—
Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016—General—Co-located
Housing and Schedule 6
Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012—Safety Management System

Question Time

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of algal bloom and fish kills. Why has the Malinauskas

Labor government still not made a formal request for the algal bloom to be declared a natural disaster, despite overwhelming evidence of economic and environmental disaster and devastation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for her question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I do appreciate that those opposite don't understand teamwork. Fortunately, those of us on this side do.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, get on with your answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am very pleased to be part of the team on this side.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Various members of our government have made numerous statements of requests in regard to the algal bloom being declared a natural disaster, a national disaster. This is a very significant issue here in South Australia that has an impact on our coastal communities, on our fisheries, on our way of life and on our environment. This is something that we have been working on for many, many months, and we have been working closely with the federal government.

Our announcement today in regard to more than \$102 million for the second round of support, assistance, research and so on is funded fifty-fifty by the federal government. This really speaks to the fact that our focus has been and continues to be on how we can assist the South Australian community in terms of those very important impacts.

As I mentioned, there are environmental impacts, and we are seeing that across all of the areas of our coast that are affected. We are seeing the economic impacts, particularly on fisheries and aquaculture licence holders but also on businesses in coastal areas or businesses that provide goods and services in relation to fishing, in relation to beachside lifestyles and beachside visitation—tourism businesses. We are also seeing the many impacts on people's health and wellbeing.

We have put together, by working with industry, by working with stakeholders in the environmental areas and by working with business, a very comprehensive package, and we are very pleased that the federal government has funded that fifty-fifty.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): Supplementary: has anyone in the government acted on those statements made publicly to date informally requesting the algal bloom be declared a natural disaster and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:58): Is that the same question?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure where the supplementary actually comes from with regard to the federal—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Very strange.

The PRESIDENT: Deputy Premier! Ask your next question.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries regarding the algal bloom.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: According to Professor Mike Steer, Executive Director of SARDI, the algal bloom has been caused by three things: (1) floodwaters from the River Murray

flooding event in 2022-23 bringing extra nutrients into the sea; (2) a cold water upwelling in summer 2023-24, lifting more nutrients to the water surface; and (3) a marine heatwave since September 2024, lifting water temperatures 2.5° above normal. These three causes are also listed on the government's algal bloom website explicitly as the cause of the algal bloom. So my question to the minister is: does the minister agree with SARDI's executive director?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): I am always very pleased to take the advice of eminent scientists and I am also very pleased that we have eminent scientists within SARDI and within PIRSA.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:59): Supplementary: did these same scientists advise the minister that the algal bloom was likely to dissipate in winter?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:00): Throughout the period of the algal bloom, we have had advice from the scientific experts. They, of course, have drawn on existing information around algal blooms. We know that we had an algal bloom here before in Coffin Bay in 2014, if I remember correctly, as well as potentially other areas, and there have been algal blooms around the world; however, it has been unprecedented here in South Australia in terms of its duration.

What we have been able to learn is that algal blooms do react in different ways, in different environments and in different parts of the world. At any given time, we can act only on the advice that we have at that time, which in turn is based on the information available.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries regarding the algal bloom.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: At a recent Senate inquiry into the algal bloom, PIRSA scientist Dr Styan said, 'I think the short answer is that we don't know enough to know what the cause is.' Those comments were supported by his colleague Dr Doubell, when asked what caused the bloom. He said, 'There are hypotheses, but there's no data to understand what the contributing factor was.' So my questions to the minister are:

1. How does the minister respond to her own PIRSA scientists who are on the record stating that they are still unsure as to what has caused the algal bloom?

2. Is the minister concerned that the information provided by her government to the South Australian public on the causes of the bloom is contested by scientists in her own department?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for her question. We know from the track record of those opposite that we should always take with a pinch of salt anything that they claim to be quoting from. Even in the quote that was given by the honourable member, she said the contributing 'factor', singular, as though there is a single contributing factor. Throughout the algal bloom forums, we have been providing information about the sorts of things that contribute to a harmful algal bloom. That is the advice we have received. That is the advice we will continue to act on.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Supplementary, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I will listen to it, arising from the answer. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister state with 100 per cent certainty that the government knows the exact cause of the algal bloom and, if not, why does an official government website state that it does?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:03): The algal bloom has contributing factors. Three of the main ones, as we have outlined—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —are the upwelling, things such as increased nutrients which can be from the River Murray floods; the marine heatwave; and the weather conditions. All of these things are contributing factors. This is entirely consistent with what we have said all along based on the advice that we have.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:03): Supplementary: will the government then revise the text that is on their own website to—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter and the Deputy Premier, order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Girolamo! Now, start again. The Hon. Mr Ben Hood, I will listen to your supplementary question.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Thank you, Mr President. Will the government amend the text on the website to reflect that the algal bloom does not have three causes but has multiple causes and other—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: It doesn't have three, it has multiple.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Yes, that's right.

The PRESIDENT: No, it doesn't arise from the original answer.

RETURNTOWORKSA INSPIRING EXCELLENCE AWARDS 2025

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:04): My question is to the Deputy Premier and Minister for Industrial Relations. Will the minister please inform the council about the ReturnToWorkSA Inspiring Excellence Awards?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for his question, and note his dedication to the safety of workers, and his longstanding and lifelong commitment to workers' safety in his roles in this place, and previously being a unionist, which I think is a very noble thing to do.

As members would be aware, the Return to Work scheme provides vital support to workers who are injured in their employment in South Australia. The role of claims managers is an under-recognised part of our workers compensation scheme, but the system could not operate effectively without the individual support to workers in their attempts to recover from their injuries, and return to their jobs and their communities. Being away from work due to an injury can be mentally and emotionally challenging, and leave workers feeling isolated, uncertain, and overwhelmed. At their best, claims managers can help people navigate a complex system, overcome personal and professional challenges and find their way back to work.

I was pleased to attend the ReturnToWorkSA Inspiring Excellence Awards last month. The Inspiring Excellence Awards provide an opportunity to recognise excellence, innovation, leadership and collaboration amongst the staff of ReturnToWorkSA's claims agents EML and Gallagher Bassett. Those claims managers play a vital role in helping workers recover and rebuild their lives after injuries

that often have a significant impact. They deal with workers who are often at their most vulnerable moments, and it's important they have access to professional support that treats them with dignity and respect.

The awards provide an opportunity to recognise that contribution, as well as the innovations and improvements that have been developed in recent years. This includes programs that are better tailored to the real-world demands of industries like transport and logistics, as well as improved services in remote areas of the state. The awards included the following categories:

- Excellence in the Delivery of Mobile Claims Management: awarded to Gabriel Burden at Gallagher Bassett;
- Excellence in the Delivery of Support to Seriously Injured Workers: awarded to Tracy Polglase at EML;
- Excellence in the Application of Technical Expertise in Claims Management: awarded to Jenny Haughey at EML;
- Excellence in the Field of Eligibility: awarded to Cassandra Martin at Gallagher Bassett;
- Excellence in the Field of Customer Service: awarded to Gerry Howley, customer care liaison at EML;
- Excellence in Innovation Claims and/or Injury Management: awarded to Brenden Bishop, a return to work specialist.
- Rising Star: awarded to Ethan Whittaker at Gallagher Bassett;
- Excellence in Leadership: awarded to Brendan Gloyn at Gallagher Bassett; and
- Outstanding Overall Contribution to the Return To Work Scheme: awarded to Gemma Todd at EML.

I congratulate all the award winners and thank them for their contribution to the operation of our workers compensation scheme, and for helping injured workers recover from their injuries.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney a question about AI images and little missing boy Gus.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: As we would all no doubt be aware, some two weeks ago we learned of little four-year-old Gus going missing from his family homestead about 40 kilometres south of Yunta in the remote part of SA's Mid North. I think it's fair to say that while most South Australians have been holding their breath, hoping and praying that this little boy will be found safe and well, others have taken to social media to spread misinformation and AI-generated depictions of the child. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Does he share the concerns of tech and legal experts who have expressed concerns about the ease with which harmful and entirely deceitful content is being produced and disseminated, content that, according to the media, preys on public feeling and potentially interferes with the search for this little boy?
2. Does he consider that our recent reforms to these laws are broad enough to capture this sort of behaviour?
3. If not, will the Attorney commit to considering further reforms that will address those very concerns that I have just alluded to that have been raised by legal and tech experts when it comes to this sort of image manipulation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for her question. I might say from the outset that the reports that I saw of some of the images the honourable member is talking about I utterly condemn and I think we

all find completely deplorable. They are images that I think would raise significant concerns and be very, very distressing.

The rise of artificial intelligence is something that, for regulators, poses significant challenges, as this is an exceptionally rapidly moving area of technology. We have in this parliament looked at ways of addressing some elements of this. I note we worked collaboratively with the honourable member and the honourable member worked collaboratively with the government on changes we made in this parliament in relation to humiliating and degrading images, images that it was possible our current laws did not fully cover, being wholly artificially generated, not just manipulated, images.

We changed the law to make sure that the existing criminal law in relation to those sorts of images covered wholly generated images. I am trying to remember the statistics, but I think it was the federal eSafety Commissioner who looked at the creation of deepfakes. Somewhere in the 90 per cents are non-consensual pornographic deepfakes and somewhere in the very high 90 per cents of those are women and girls, so it was an area that absolutely needed us making sure the law covered as broadly as it should.

Just this week, new laws have commenced in South Australia in relation to election campaigns, meaning that those artificially generated deepfake voices or videos can't be used in an election campaign without someone's permission, and when they are created by someone or with their permission, it needs to be clearly identified that that is the case. We have seen in the US and places like India election campaigns run where even people who have passed away are purported to have made statements endorsing or campaigning or condemning things in political campaigns. We have made legislative change in some areas. There absolutely is more to do.

We have released a discussion paper as a government looking at how we treat someone's likeness in terms of their ability to control what is done with their images or voice, whether it should be something that's more akin to copyright, so that you actually have a proprietary right over your image, your likeness, your voice, that someone can't use without your permission.

We have seen regularly on social media, on the internet, people purporting to support various commercial products, financial products, pseudoscience, health remedies, when they have done absolutely no such thing at all and it's artificially generated. It is an area we are looking at. In fact, we take it that seriously that, in government, we have an assistant minister in the South Australian parliament that is dedicated to looking at issues to do with artificial intelligence, particularly how we, as regulators, deal with issues that are thrown up.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:13): Supplementary: will the Attorney investigate whether or not this activity, as described by the Hon. Connie Bonaros, falls under the definition outlined in section 474.17 of the commonwealth Criminal Code Act 1995, specifically the use of a carriage service to menace, harass or offend, and whether it is in the public interest to prosecute these people, should they be able to be identified?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:13): I am happy to get some advice on that. Under certain areas, there are abilities for state law enforcement to enforce commonwealth laws. Whether this is an area or not, I am happy to get some advice on.

AGED CARE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Deputy Premier—and might I congratulate him on his appointment—and Leader of the Government in this place on the topic of restrictive practices and human rights.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Last week, the ABC revealed that a federal regulator had found that restraints were being used inappropriately at a South Australian government-run aged-care home at Northgate. The centre looks after South Australians with dementia and complex disabilities. I

understand that the regulator first identified the problems in November of last year, but they were only revealed last week as the result of an ABC investigation. My question to the Deputy Premier therefore is:

1. Why did his government sit on the regulator's report for almost 12 months without revealing that its home at Northgate had been under investigation?
2. Doesn't this sorry episode underscore the need for a human rights act to protect the rights of vulnerable South Australians like those residing at Northgate?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for his question. I think, regarding the last part of it, the call for a human rights instrument, we thanked and noted the Social Development Committee of this parliament for their recent report that did a lot of work in reviewing instruments that protect human rights, particularly around Australia. It is something we will consider. I want to be clear, though, that we do not have a policy, as a Labor government, to introduce a human rights piece of legislation. But we will certainly consider properly, as any responsible government should, that report.

In relation to specific issues to do with the report on aged care, I don't have details on that. I suspect it falls somewhere between Health and Human Services. But I will refer that to my colleagues in another place to bring back a reply for the honourable member.

AGED CARE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:15): Supplementary arising from the answer: is the Leader of the Government concerned that a minister in his government has sat on a report from a regulator for nearly 12 months?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:15): As I said, I will pass the question on to the appropriate minister and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries regarding the harmful algal bloom.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: During an ABC radio interview yesterday, the Premier said, and I quote, 'A lot of people refer to the algal bloom as the toxic algal bloom. It's not toxic.' This is in stark contrast to respected environmental scientist Faith Coleman, who was quoted on ABC news last night as saying, and I quote, 'We are getting a lot of mixed messages through this bloom, and we know that it is toxic to fish because they are dying.' My question to the Minister for Primary Industries is: does the minister stand by the Premier's comments—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: —that the algal bloom is not toxic?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I am hoping the minister heard the question, because I am sure as hell I didn't, the Hon. Mr Hunter. Minister, did you hear the question?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:17): I think I heard the question. Again, I refer to my earlier comments in regard to always taking with a huge pinch of salt anything that those opposite are purporting to reproduce through quotes, or indeed through committees. If those opposite had been listening to the Premier's interview, I recall that he was talking about humans being at the beach. It

was part of the discussion around the summer plan. If I recall correctly, Dr Faith Coleman referred to it being toxic to fish and that it was only toxic to humans if you consumed something like 10,000 litres of seawater.

I don't know about those opposite, but my understanding is that, generally, when people go to the beach they don't consume 10,000 litres of saltwater. Those opposite may believe anything; we have seen before that they may believe anything. Indeed, maybe they have used ChatGPT to look up something like this. What we do see, really sadly and very disappointingly, is those opposite deliberately trying to foment confusion, deliberately trying to push misinformation, instead of actually working collaboratively as responsible South Australians, responsible people in this parliament, to actually help South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —get through the harmful algal bloom, to actually help South Australians get through the harmful algal bloom, to help South Australian businesses who are affected to survive through the harmful algal bloom, and to help our South Australian environment get through the harmful algal bloom. Instead of behaving in a collaborative way and trying to help South Australians, they want to play politics. They want to try to chase headlines instead of taking a responsible approach.

I think that, at the election next year, South Australians will remember how irresponsible those opposite have been, and they certainly should—they certainly should. They should actually think about being constructive, as indeed we were during COVID. They should think about being constructive instead of trying to chase headlines. Those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Those opposite have a track record of misinformation and misleading parliament. I think they should cease and desist.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the Algal Bloom Summer Plan. Will the minister speak to the chamber about the state government's Algal Bloom Summer Plan and how it will assist impacted—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Mr President, these people have been complaining about this all month and now we are about to give them some information about where we are going, and I can't even hear myself speak.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, just ask your question, please.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: —and how important it is to ensure accurate and timely information that informs people's choices this summer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. The \$102.5 million Algal Bloom Summer Plan is a comprehensive, science-backed, community-led and industry-driven plan to steer our state through the challenges that the algal bloom presents this coming summer.

While as a state we have learned a lot about the algal bloom over the last seven or so months, there is still an element of the unknown: ultimately how long the algal bloom will persist in South Australia's waters. What we do know is that the impacts have been felt across industries and

communities, and the summer plan is another element that builds on the significant support that has already been made available.

It builds upon the investments already made in science and research and the natural environment. Additional funding of \$37 million is made up of: \$20.6 million for large-scale shellfish reef restoration and community shellfish reef restoration projects, seagrass and blue carbon restoration and threatened and vulnerable marine species breeding programs, including fish stocking for vulnerable and threatened species; \$17.3 million will go towards water monitoring and forecasting, offshore water analysis, AI cybotots with live detection technology, setting up the Office for Algal Bloom Research and algal bloom mitigation investigations, including techniques for controlled waterways such as clay; \$6.1 million is provided for a coastal infrastructure grant program for things like showers, benches, fish cleaning stations, barbecues and shade structures; as well as a coastal events program which will see grants of up to \$20,000 to assist with events to encourage visitation and economic activity across coastal regions this summer.

Comprehensive additional support is available for fishing and marine sectors, with additional funds for business support grants that will see eligible businesses which have already received a grant under the initial support package able to apply if they are able to demonstrate a continued further three-month downturn, covering both the \$10,000 business support grant and up to \$100,000 fisheries and aquaculture assistance grants. Of course, impacted businesses which have not yet applied for a grant are also able to seek assistance and the timeline for doing so has been extended to 31 March from the original closing date of 30 November.

An additional up to \$25,000 grant is available for hardest hit fisheries and aquaculture licence holders to support their workers, which is important as those businesses work hard to retain their much valued workforce through this difficult time. Further licence fee relief will be available with support extended until at least the end of June 2026. Grants of up to \$150,000 for commercial fisheries and aquaculture licence holders will be made available for an industry response and resilience program, helping with diversification opportunities and business resilience. This is the important aspect of support that has been called for by industry.

However, I note with interest the disparaging remarks made about this program by the Leader of the Opposition in this place, who this morning called it a token and asks, 'How exactly are fishers and operators meant to build resilience and capitalise on new opportunities?' The Leader of the Opposition may want to ask that question to the industry and industry members that requested this program. Though, to be fair, I know that the Leader of the Opposition in this place does not often reach out to industry bodies to seek their views, so I guess she is not aware.

Indeed, I would refer the leader to the comments made by Mr Kyri Toumazos of Seafood Industry South Australia, who said of the summer plan that he:

...congratulates the Malinauskas Labor government on the collaborative approach navigating the challenges faced by the industry.

The Premier hasn't just listened, he has acted on the strong advice and need of the seafood sector and delivered on all the key asks.

We look forward to partnering with the government to get these initiatives off the ground and provide desperately needed relief and assistance to the seafood sector and the coastal regional communities that rely upon it.

Another quote was from, I understand, the *Country Hour* today, where Mr Lester Marshall, who is in the oyster industry, said:

We've accessed funding. The Premier has done a fantastic job. He's listened, and I think it's been fantastic. This, today, will be brilliant and well received.

While those opposite continue to try to make political capital, we are getting on with the job. The Leader of the Opposition still continues to seek the negativity despite that response that we have so far received.

There will be an extension of the popular Coast is Calling program, with a further 30,000 travel vouchers on offer over the summer holidays, and the Dining Cashback program, where up to 300,000 South Australians will secure up to \$50 off their meal at hospitality venues across our coastal communities, driving critical business to these businesses that are such a part of our

summers on the coast. These measures are complemented by beach programs that will encourage visitation to beaches, ensuring timely and accurate information on conditions and safety and ensuring beach clean-ups are undertaken daily across metropolitan and southern beaches.

The state government understands this issue continues to evolve, and the response continues to evolve with it. We have worked very closely with industry and communities in getting support to them as well as critical information, with the many community forums held across the state being well attended as well as the algalbloom.sa.gov.au website and a new algal bloom hotline.

Compare this with the approach of those opposite, who have chosen a different path, constantly sowing distrust in science and the information being provided so that South Australians can make informed choices. One of the clearest impacts of this is when businesses which are still fishing are facing difficulty—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It is disappointing that those opposite don't care enough about our South Australian communities to actually listen to the information about the summer plan.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: We are providing information about the comprehensive summer plan, but they are complaining that it's taking too long. Well, the people in South Australia's industries and coastal communities think this is the work you should be doing. You should be learning about the summer plan and how you could actually work with us.

The PRESIDENT: Sit down. While you are providing information, I am tolerant. When you are just throwing bait across the chamber, that's not providing information. This has been going on for eight minutes. It's an important topic, right? Finish your information, and then let's get onto the next question.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: One of the clear messages from business, particularly those in fishing who are facing financial difficulty, is that they need the message to get out there that their product is safe. Sadly, those who want to foment distrust of our seafood are doing them a huge disservice. It seeps through every time Vincent Tarzia and the Leader of the Opposition in this place talk down our seafood or discourage people from visiting our coastal communities. We would have hoped for a bipartisan response. Sadly, we haven't seen it. I encourage those opposite to look at the summer plan and perhaps start to work collaboratively for the good of South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:28): My question is for the newly minted Minister for Infrastructure and Transport on the topic of boating concerns in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary.

The PRESIDENT: Did you seek leave?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Much-loved Port River dolphin Rocket was found dead in late September, with a large gash having severed her spine. The cause of the injury is not yet revealed—we expect a necropsy—but it is likely that it was, indeed, a boat strike accident. Anyone who is aware of marine safety in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary is also aware that the Department for Infrastructure and Transport runs a portal to report marine safety concerns and that there are particular provisions, not just in the ADS but generally in our waterways, to protect whales and dolphins.

Reports in the media from the Department for Environment and Water in response to the death of Rocket claimed that no dolphin had died in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary for the last five years, something that the newly minted Minister for Environment and Water then repeated. This is not the case. In fact, there have been boat strike deaths of dolphins in the last five years. I also note that seven years ago the biggest baby boom of dolphins in some 11 years then saw, of the seven calves born, only three surviving, with boat strike and jetski-related injuries being the cause. My questions to the new minister are:

1. How many reports have been made in the last seven years with regard to marine safety concerns through her department's portal, what actions have been taken and will she undertake to provide full and transparent information so that other departments are not incorrectly informing the public about this serious safety concern?

2. Will she investigate the use of protective propeller guards on boats in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary, as many thousands have already signed a petition to do?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:30): I thank the honourable member for her question and sharing the sad news of Rocket's death. It has captured the attention of a lot of people because Rocket was a very well-known dolphin within the sanctuary. We know there are restricted speeds within the dolphin sanctuary—I am advised between four and seven knots—and we do hope that people abide by that, considering the wildlife that is living within that precious area of our sanctuary.

In regard to finding out further information, I am happy to look into that. I have already requested further information from the department in regard to this matter. I will work with the minister in the other place, the member for Adelaide, Lucy Hood, the new Minister for Environment. In regard to your question around guards and propellers, I am aware that it has been raised in the local community and that they are available to people, but in regard to whether they are mandatory, or making them mandatory, I am happy to look into how that would play out and get further information.

ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:31): Supplementary: will the minister also consult with Dr Mike Bosley and Mariana Borman with regard to this matter?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:32): I am happy to have further discussions with anyone of interest.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on brevetoxin testing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: The Florida experience of harmful algal bloom resulted in the deaths of multiple dolphins due to toxic toxin build-up in internal organs. We, too, have seen deaths of dolphins in our waters during the harmful algal bloom, including one in August at Henley Beach, which featured across multimedia and social media channels. My questions to the minister are:

1. Was that dolphin and other dolphins tested for brevetoxin accumulation in its organs, and, if not, why not? If so, what were the results?

2. Have other species, such as seabirds and turtles, which have also been found deceased, been tested for brevetoxin build-up?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:33): I thank the honourable member for his question. When there is a death of a significant sea creature, such as a dolphin, wherever possible an autopsy is done. That will determine or seek to determine the cause of death. I did not recall the date the honourable member referred to, so I would have to check the specifics of that particular one, but certainly in general I know that we have been releasing as much information as possible as soon as is feasible in regard to the cause of death of various creatures.

We have found that some deaths of creatures have been in relation to what appears to be starvation, which implies that their food sources are depleted. All of this information is constantly being collected so that we can learn as much as possible about the harmful algal bloom, its impacts, including its more, if you like, distant impacts because, as we know, the harmful algal bloom, the algae, affects the gills of fish. In terms of mammals, it doesn't have that impact as obviously mammals don't have gills. However, it is fair to say that we are constantly learning more and more. As I mentioned in an earlier answer in this place today, as the algal bloom evolves, so does our understanding of it. We are very pleased to be investing further in terms of research, and hopefully this will enable us to go into the future with more information and therefore more ability to support our communities.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:34): Supplementary question: can the minister bring back to the chamber the results of the autopsy on the dolphin we spoke about, specifically with regard to any accumulation of brevetoxin?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:34): I am happy to see what information is available that has not already been provided in the public domain.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:35): Supplementary: are brevetoxin levels now routinely tested as part of the necropsy process for deceased mammals across the coast?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you can answer, but I did not hear any reference to that in your original answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I will accept your ruling, Mr President.

KANGAROO ISLAND PORTS UPGRADE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:35): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister update the chamber about the Kangaroo Island ports upgrade project?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:35): I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in this project. This has been of special interest to Kangaroo Island residents and visitors and the broader South Australian community, and I am pleased to share with the chamber that the Malinauskas Labor government's upgrades to the ports at Cape Jervis and Penneshaw are now complete.

These upgraded ports mean safer and more efficient infrastructure to support ferry services between Kangaroo Island and the mainland. As a vital link for cars, freight and passengers travelling to and from Kangaroo Island, each year the Kangaroo Island ferry service carries over 500,000 passengers, more than 146,000 cars and 14,000 freight vehicles. I am advised these upgrades ensure that this essential service continues to meet the needs of our community and the South Australian economy.

The improvements include a fit-for-purpose facility designed to support an increased number of ferry services, faster turnaround times, and enhanced safety for passengers and crews, especially during adverse weather conditions. That is great timing, considering South Australians can now secure one of 30,000 travel vouchers for their summer holiday in the expanded round of the popular government-led travel voucher program Coast is Calling. This round will expand to include the Kangaroo Island ferry, for the first time, to support local industry and the community. Save the date: there will be a public ballot from 1 to 3 December, with the ballot draw on 4 December, for the period of travel between 5 December and 26 April.

These port upgrades will also accommodate SeaLink's new and larger vessel, which we have been advised will arrive in June next year. While it is disappointing to hear of the delays, our focus has been to provide confidence and certainty in terms of what is happening in regard to the

arrival of the ferries. In the meantime we have been able to step in, as a government, and ensure that Kangaroo Island residents start to see the benefits sooner.

Since I have been in this role I have been able to sit down with SeaLink and work through how we can get cheaper fares made available earlier. The current ferries will continue to operate, keeping tourism flowing and supporting local businesses, but we are bringing forward the Resident Vehicle Saver Fare originally planned to come in when the new ferries arrived. From 1 November Kangaroo Island residents will be able to book a vehicle on the ferry for just \$30.35—a saving of nearly \$50. This fare will be available on two morning departures from Penneshaw and two evening departures from Cape Jervis.

We also recognise the challenges our farmers have been facing during the drought, and that is why we have worked with SeaLink to keep livestock freight fees at a reduced rate of \$39.60 until the end of 2026, I am advised, even after the new ferries arrive. This fee change, that was signed in 2021, will now be phased in to provide time for the industry to see how the new drive-on and drive-off ferries will work.

These measures provide certainty for residents and industry as we head into the busy farming and tourism season. The \$73 million upgrade has supported around 135 full-time equivalent jobs each year throughout construction, boosting local employment and strengthening our regional economy.

I would like to also acknowledge the hardworking member for Mawson from the other place, Leon Bignell, for his sincere and dedicated advocacy and service to the KI community. We know how important this service is to local families, businesses and farmers, and that is why we are proud to deliver these new fit-for-purpose ports for Kangaroo Island and the South Australian community.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Deputy Premier regarding legal risk and work health and safety obligations in relation to algal bloom events.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Recent concerns have been raised by legal practitioners, which highlighted that employers operating in affected coastal areas may be exposed to significant legal risk if they fail to assess and respond to the health and safety impacts of harmful algal blooms. Specifically, concerns have been raised that relying on government rescue or delayed action could leave businesses vulnerable under work health and safety laws, particularly where staff, contractors or patrons are exposed to environmental hazards. My questions to the Deputy Premier are:

1. What legal guidance has been issued to employers regarding their work health and safety obligations in areas affected by harmful algal blooms, including risks to patrons?
2. Is the government considering updates to the work health and safety regulations or codes of practice to reflect emerging environmental risks, such as algal blooms?
3. How is the government ensuring that employers, particularly in tourism, hospitality and coastal business operations are aware of and compliant with their legal responsibilities in managing this environmental health risk?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:41): I thank the honourable for her question. Probably the best way to answer it is to just reiterate what our workplace health and safety laws require, and that is that those conducting a business or undertaking (the employers) provide a safe working environment.

Employers can do this in a number of ways. Similar to during the COVID-19 pandemic, employers would look at the advice that is issued by authorities and then make sure that they are providing safe workplaces and safe work practices. This is a responsibility that employers have. As has been discussed here today, there is information from the government on websites about any

potential risks that are posed, but that is an obligation that rests with employers to provide those safe workplaces and practices.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:42): My question to the minister is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Which minister? I beg your pardon. The Minister for Primary Industries. Will the minister commit to a voluntary licence and quota buyback scheme for fishers affected by the algal bloom to ensure industry adjustment and stock conservation in these difficult circumstances? Secondly, has the minister sought federal partnership funding or natural disaster recovery assistance to fund such a scheme?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:42): I thank the honourable member for his question. The issue that he has raised is certainly a topic of discussion. We have been working very closely with industry throughout the period of the algal bloom and that is one of the options that has been raised in some of those discussions. We will continue to engage in those discussions and give consideration as to what it might mean.

Of course, we would then need to take into account what would be lessons learned from when the former Liberal government implemented a buyback scheme and did so with such significant problems. Members may recall that the then minister, the member for Finniss, was found to have acted without any legislative basis on his treatment of exceptional circumstances through that buyback scheme. We would certainly want to be ensuring that any potential scheme was well considered and well looked into before making any such commitment.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:44): Supplementary: in those discussions, minister, have you been encouraged by those undertaking those discussions with you to declare the matter a natural disaster?

The PRESIDENT: A long bow. Nice try.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:44): I think it's fair to say that what people want is assistance from the federal government. Today, we have announced the summer plan. We have announced more than \$102 million in terms of assistance, investments and so on, and that has been met halfway by the federal government. I think that is what those in our communities and in our businesses are really keen to see. Today, they have been able to see that.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:44): Supplementary, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I have nearly had enough of this. The honourable Leader of the Opposition, I will listen. I will listen. I will listen. I will listen.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Why weren't voluntary buybacks announced as part of the summer plan?

The PRESIDENT: Did you mention volunteer buybacks in your original answer?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:45): The question was about them. As we see so often, the Leader of the Opposition in this place does not like to listen, so she didn't listen to the answer. I said that we have been having discussions and that those discussions would continue.

SA WOMEN OF IMPACT AWARDS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:45): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister tell the council about the South Australian Women of Impact Award winners?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:45):

I thank the honourable member for his very good question. The South Australian Women of Impact Award winners were announced at the end of September, following an extraordinary response of more than 100 nominations from right across the state. Held for the very first time this year, the awards were launched on International Women's Day as part of South Australia's first Women's Week. The awards were created to recognise and celebrate women across our state who are driving positive change, creating safer communities and shaping a more equitable South Australia.

The Women of Impact Awards acknowledge women leading across four categories: Aboriginal Impact Award, Impact in Community Award, Impact in Industry Award and Impact on Ending Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence Award. All winners across all categories were very worthy of the recognition, given the significance of their impact, but as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs I especially want to acknowledge the achievements of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women who were recognised. Their work embodies resilience, cultural strength and a deep dedication to their communities.

Jade Wilson was announced as the winner of the Aboriginal Impact Award. A Ngarrindjeri, Arabana and Pitjantjatjara woman, Jade grew up in Port Augusta and understands the realities of regional life, where access to opportunities can often be more limited. She has built an impressive career in the public sector, beginning as a trainee in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and now serving as Deputy Director for Aboriginal Strategy at the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. Jade has shown what leadership looks like, creating pathways for Aboriginal communities and businesses and contributing her voice to important initiatives such as The Power of Her, Women in Sport Taskforce and the SACA Aboriginal Cricket Advisory Committee.

Congratulations also go to other finalists in the category: Debra Moyle, Katie Coulthard, Sarah Decrea and Tiahni Adamson, each of whom continue to make an impact and an important difference in their communities.

Tiahni Adamson was also recognised and won the Impact in Community Award category. She is an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander woman from Thursday Island and is nationally respected as a conservation biologist, science communicator and climate justice advocate and was named the 2024 Young South Australian of the Year. She has worked closely with traditional owners to embed cultural governance in land management, ensuring that caring for country is guided by First Nations knowledge and leadership.

The other categories also recognised incredible contributions across our state. The Impact in Industry award went to Assistant Chief Fire Officer Ann Buesnel, who has led on the frontlines of fires and emergencies across South Australia and the nation for a quarter of a century. The Impact on Ending Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence Award was presented to Dr Kristina Birchmore, Manager of Cedar Health Service at the Women's and Children's Health Network. Congratulations to all winners who have inspired others to follow and remind us that creating impact begins with one person deciding to make a difference.

SACE RESULTS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, representing the Minister for Education, regarding the release of SACE results.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: The SACE Board no longer publicly releases data showing the disparity in results between boys and girls. This policy follows the last published results reported in *The Advertiser* in 2021 that showed the number of females who achieved an A grade for a SACE subject was 13,692, compared to 7,638 males. In the same year, the average ATAR for females was 74, compared to 68 for males.

In 2021, *The Advertiser* reported the SACE Board had commissioned research on the problem of boys' educational outcomes, with the current Minister for Education, who was then the shadow minister, commenting that the Liberal government was too distracted to pursue any timely

reform. My questions to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, representing the Minister for Education, are:

1. Can the government explain its reasons for no longer publishing SACE data that shows the difference between boys' and girls' results?
2. Given this data is available to schools but not to mums and dads, does the government believe keeping parents in the dark and uninformed is the best way to address the imbalance in SACE results between boys and girls?
3. What is the government's commitment to bridging the educational gap between boys and girls?
4. Is it reasonable to assume that the non-publication of these results indicates the continuing decline in SACE achievements for boys, and that the SACE Board doesn't want the public to know the extent of this decline?
5. When will the results be released of research the SACE Board told *The Advertiser* in 2021 it would commission into fixing the imbalance in results between boys and girls?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:50): I thank the member for her question. I am happy to seek further advice from the minister from the other place.

SNAPPER RESTOCKING PROGRAM

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:50): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of snapper spawning at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: As we all know, snapper is an iconic and highly valued species in South Australia. The government's restocking program was established to help rebuild depleted snapper populations in Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent. The program relies heavily on the broodstock's ability to spawn successfully each season, with egg and larval production underpinning the program's overall effectiveness. Given the significant investment and the importance of this species to both commercial and recreational fishers, the community rightly expects this program to be closely monitored and transparently reported. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister advise whether there have been setbacks with the snapper restocking program or whether it is currently meeting its expected spawning and production targets for this season?
2. Has broodstock spawning commenced in line with seasonal expectations, and how does the timing, frequency and scale of the spawning this year compare with previous years?
3. Can the minister provide details on the number of viable eggs collected and larvae produced so far this season, and whether these figures are on track to meet program objectives?
4. If spawning activity or outputs are below expectations, what are the causes and what specific contingency or remedial measures is the department implementing to safeguard the success of the program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:52): I thank the honourable member for his question. The specifics I am happy to take on notice and bring back a response to this place. More generally, certainly the snapper restocking program was an important part of the snapper science that we invested in early in our term, due to the fact that snapper stocks in all parts of the state, except for the South-East fishery, were depleted. There was initially a snapper closure implemented under the previous government, which then needed to be further extended. The restocking program, which involved the growth of and release of fingerlings, was part of that, and I am happy to provide additional information in terms of the detail.

SNAPPER RESTOCKING PROGRAM

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:53): Supplementary: just going back to the original question, can the minister advise whether there have been any setbacks with the snapper restocking program? The question wasn't answered.

The PRESIDENT: No; the supplementary question has to be arising from the answer, the Hon. Mr Pangallo, and the minister didn't touch on that.

LIMESTONE COAST BUSHFIRE SEASON LAUNCH

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:54): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister please update the council about the recent Limestone Coast bushfire season launch?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:54): I thank the honourable member for his question. South Australia faces an increasingly complex bushfire environment shaped by climate change, cross-border risks and the interaction of landscapes, industries and communities. The upcoming 2025-26 bushfire season will once again be a challenging time for our agricultural industries.

For these reasons, I was pleased to jointly open the Limestone Coast Bushfire Season 2025 Summit in Mount Gambier with the Minister for Emergency Services, which was recently hosted by the South Australian Forest Products Association. I was particularly grateful to see the new Minister for Emergency Services in attendance after only a few days of becoming minister for that portfolio.

The purpose of the summit was to bring together all key stakeholders from federal, state and local government, emergency services, land managers, industry, First Nations representatives, community leaders and cross-border partners to ensure a shared understanding of bushfire risks, investments and preparations. By working in partnership, we can strengthen coordination, close capability gaps and build a unified approach to protecting lives, property, jobs, biodiversity and the wider landscape.

The Limestone Coast is home to 130,000 hectares of plantation forests and, as one of the state's largest regional employers, the sector is both an economic driver and a critical fire stakeholder. Bushfires are the single biggest risk to the South Australian forest industry, which is, I am advised, worth \$3 billion to the South Australian economy and directly and indirectly supports over 18,000 jobs.

The industry has demonstrated national leadership through long-term investment in fire towers, AI-enabled detection technologies and a dedicated firefighting workforce—now the second largest paid firefighting capability in South Australia after the MFS. Together, industry and government have co-invested millions of dollars in fire detection, prevention and response infrastructure.

I am sure members in this place will recall previous updates about the Malinauskas Labor government's investment in a suite of fire towers protecting our forest plantation in the region in conjunction with the forest industry. This collaborative model shows the value of public-private partnerships in building regional resilience.

I was pleased to hear from Tammy Auld, Chair of the South Australian Forest Products Association, on the role that the forest industry plays in fire prevention. I also want to thank Paul Seager, Deputy Chief Officer of the South Australian Country Fire Service, who provided a presentation on the regional bushfire outlook, providing the latest forecasts and climate risk assessments for the 2025-26 season. Early detection is the key element of the Green Triangle Forest Industries' rapid response fire management process, which helps to identify and extinguish any potential fire outbreaks before they become a threat to the wider region.

The summit also covered the importance of regional connectivity and communications technology in enhancing preparedness, detection, response and post-fire recovery efforts. I was pleased to be able to inform the summit of the South Australian government's ongoing commitment to addressing regional connectivity in the Limestone Coast. I provided an update to attendees that

the contract to improve regional connectivity with Telstra was signed earlier this year and will deliver 27 new Telstra towers across the region.

I understand the summit was considered so successful that it will now become an annual event. I commend the South Australian Forest Products Association and its chief executive officer, Mr Nathan Paine, on a well-organised event. It is critical that all key stakeholders continue to work together to ensure a coordinated whole-of-government approach that leverages the strength of government, emergency services, industry and community to meet the bushfire challenges of the coming season and beyond.

Motions

DECRIMINALISATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Adjourned debate on motion of the Attorney-General:

That this council—

1. Notes that on 27 August 1975, South Australia became the first jurisdiction in the nation to decriminalise male homosexuality, with the passage of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Act 1975, which commenced operation on 2 October 1975;
2. Expresses its regret to the many South Australians who were charged with and convicted of criminal offences simply for being their authentic selves;
3. Recognises that in making these reforms, our state began a process which would be repeated in every Australian state and territory;
4. Acknowledges that in 2025, South Australia will commemorate this nation-leading legislation and mark its 50th anniversary;
5. Expresses its support for the community coming together to celebrate this anniversary, and our state's role in leading the way on LGBTQIA+ law reform;
6. Celebrates the passage of other landmark LGBTQIA+ law reform in South Australia; and
7. Commits to continuing to work toward equality for all South Australians.

(Continued from 4 September 2025.)

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:58): I rise to speak in support of this motion, acknowledging an important milestone for our state: 50 years since South Australia led the nation and finally decriminalised homosexuality. As an out and proud gay man, one of only two in this place, this is an opportunity for me to give thanks—thanks to the brave activists who led the charge for equality and campaigned for years to make this happen, and the brave legislators who also made this reform possible. Without their vision and their leadership, I would not have had the remarkable opportunities that I have had in my life: chief among them, the opportunity to live an out and proud, happy gay life.

I acknowledge the Hon. Peter Duncan, whose private member's bill finally delivered this reform, and the Hon. Anne Levy, who introduced that bill into this very chamber 50 years ago, and also, of course, the Hon. Murray Hill, who attempted reform in this area with an unsuccessful private member's bill a few years prior. As has so often been the case in South Australia, gay law reform has been a multiparty effort in our state.

I have always believed, however, that while the parliament makes the laws it is the community that drives social change, and so it was with this reform. I salute those courageous activists who fought to advance gay rights at a time when it was so challenging to do so: brave activists like Will Sergeant OAM—and I note that Will is present in the gallery today—Dr David Hilliard OAM, Dr Roger Knight and John Ruwolt. Gay men of my generation owe these leaders a huge debt for their work.

It is easy, when one looks at major social reforms in hindsight, to consider that these changes might be inevitable, but the story of social change is that nothing is ever certain. It takes perseverance, courage, conviction and leadership to make change possible. I hope this 50th anniversary gives today's activists hope and inspiration and that they can draw strength from the courage of our LGBTI elders who fought for their rights half a century ago.

The motion also rightly expresses its regret to those South Australians who were charged and convicted. Many gay men had their lives destroyed by homophobia and discrimination. They are owed an apology for what was done. The serious threat of criminal conviction and social ruin loomed large over the lives of gay men at that time. Indeed, when one considers this oppressive environment, the efforts of those activists back in the 1970s were even more extraordinary. These people risked a lot.

Might I also say that this milestone provides us with an opportunity to reflect on what else has been achieved on the road to equality in our state. We have seen major law reform in South Australia: reforms like equal opportunity laws, anti-discrimination laws, same-sex parenting rights, innovations in HIV medication and the availability of things like PrEP, relationship registration, de facto relationship rights, same-sex marriage, the end of the gay panic defence, and a ban on conversion practices.

Many members of parliament have played a role in delivering these reforms, and this chamber is well represented when it comes to activists in this area. I want to in particular acknowledge the leadership of the Hon. Ian Hunter, the first out gay man elected to this parliament and, might I say, a giant of our movement; the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC for her work in this area; and the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC, who has also been a strong advocate in this space within the Liberal Party.

I also want to acknowledge the many leaders in our community who have fought for these changes over many years, people like the late Ian Purcell, and also those out-and-proud LGBTI voices in our state, like Greg Mackie. I also acknowledge historian Tim Reeves, who has done so much to document the voices and stories of our community over the years. I note that Tim is present in the gallery today as well.

I should note that I have had the privilege of being on the Premier's committee to commemorate this occasion over the last year, under the leadership of the Hon. Ian Hunter. It has been a real honour to participate in the multiparty committee and to be here for the re-enactment that occurred last fortnight in recognition of 50 years since this law reform came into effect. This is a truly significant milestone for our state and one that has been worthy of reflection and celebration within this parliament.

We still have work to do in order to deliver full equality for LGBTI South Australians, and I will continue to advocate for action on a human rights charter, further recognition of same-sex parents and, of course, strengthening our state's anti-discrimination laws. As a sprightly 41 year old, I look forward to participating in the 100-year anniversary, but in the meantime I am proud to be here and queer today and to have the chance to say a big thankyou to those activists who fought to give people like me our fundamental human rights. I commend the motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:03): I rise to support and associate myself with the previous speakers on this motion. Indeed, it is timely to remember that, 50 years ago, South Australia did lead the way in being the first jurisdiction in Australia to decriminalise male homosexuality. That came about through a terrible event, as often things do, which was in fact the killing of Dr George Duncan.

The killing of Dr George Duncan, which we know, although it was never found so in court, was done by the vice squad of the South Australian police, in what they dubbed, according to former Attorney-General the Hon. Peter Duncan in his re-enactment speech, as 'poofster swimming lessons'. Of course, we know that Dr George Duncan, as a newly arrived academic to this state, was not a capable swimmer and in fact died from that activity of throwing gay men into the River Torrens.

What many people are not aware of, other than the fact that the police were never held accountable for their actions that killed not just this man but harmed so many others, is that Dr Duncan, once retrieved from the Torrens, was then thrown back in to be retrieved again for the media who arrived later that day. We continue in our law reform to require those who are othered in our society, who are marginalised because of their identity, their sexuality, their gender—their otherness, somehow, when we are all different—to perform and to be performative to get equality.

I reflect on the words, and I thought the most compelling contribution in the re-enactment of the debates around the 50th anniversary of the decriminalisation of male homosexuality was former

Attorney-General Peter Duncan's contribution, which was a modern reflection. In fact, I understand he refused to rehash his old speeches from when he took leadership 50-plus years ago, and reflected on where we are now, stating in that contribution:

Well, this is a proud moment of reflection on a great achievement. It's not often in public life or post-public life that you are able to achieve something worthwhile and live long enough to see the successful outcomes of that reform. How lucky I am to be here today to mark 50 years since the passage of the homosexual reform bill.

South Australia led the nation, and of course now every jurisdiction has cast aside the criminal sanctions.

Mr Duncan reflected that:

A wise leader once said, 'Ask yourself if the generation in 100 years will thank you for the decisions you make today.' Well, we are halfway there, and in relation to homosexual law reform, the answer unarguably is a resounding 'yes'.

Mr Duncan then reflected on something that I have often reflected on in this place: where we once led, we often in South Australia now lag. He went on to say:

Subsequently, South Australia has not always led. It took 30 years before legislation to expunge homosexual convictions was passed. South Australia was the last state in the country to abolish the gay panic defence, passing reforms through the parliament in December 2020.

Hate crime laws that explicitly include 'sexual orientation, gender identity, and intersex characteristics' within South Australian sentencing legislation were passed and implemented in November 2021. The state parliament recently passed legislation explicitly banning gay conversion therapy.

'That was nearly 50 years after the pioneering legislation' that this motion reflects upon and that we indeed now celebrate. I note, both on hate crimes and in the abolition of the gay panic defence, that the defence for murder that simply because somebody might be accused of being gay—in fact, regardless of whether they were gay or not—and making a sexual advance that was unwanted could somehow warrant that murder being treated as a lesser crime is abhorrent in itself.

It should have been abolished long before it was, and I am proud to have not just played my part in ensuring that we now have hate crime legislation in this state in terms of sentencing but to have led reform around rainbow parenting, marriage equality and a number of other areas. But we have so much more to do.

I note that during the debate on the abolition of what is now called conversion practices rather than what used to be euphemistically called 'gay conversion therapy', there was homophobia in the debate on those days. It was an extraordinary occurrence, almost 50 years after this chamber had seen fit to ensure that homosexuality was no longer viewed as a criminal activity, that it was still derided and that homophobic language entered that particular debate. It was a sad day, I thought, although of course we continue to progress, and that is what I shall look towards.

We do stand on the shoulders of giants in this place—people who have been at the vanguard. There is much talk, of course, of former Premier Dunstan. I note also that former Attorney-General Peter Duncan noted that he and the former Premier had numerous discussions about his bill. He is quoted in his contribution saying:

Don's influence in the debate was obviously of vital importance, although not necessarily in the way implied in some publications.

Don's strategy of creating a coalition of electoral support from workers [Italians, Greeks] and the intelligentsia was critical. Without that...support base I think it was unlikely that [all the] Labor members of the parliament would have been brave enough to support the measure, given the bill's...unpopularity. Opinion polling at the time indicated that more than 60 per cent were in opposition, with only 17 per cent in favour. It is not true, however, that Don played any role in initiating the bill, as some people have suggested. As I said, he gave it his enthusiastic support once the bill had been announced and introduced.

It is often the case that people in retrospect are all happy to claim a great achievement of progress but are not necessarily willing to initiate and lead it.

I echo the contribution of my colleague the Hon. Robert Simms just now in acknowledging the work of people such as the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Ian Hunter in this chamber but also people like former Attorney-General Vickie Chapman for her leadership in a party possibly more hostile than we currently see in this particular parliament.

I reflect also on the final contribution of former Attorney-General Peter Duncan when he quoted former Prime Minister Paul Keating that 'The reward for public life is public progress.' Public progress does come at great cost, often, to those who lead the charge, and it is a great benefit for those who benefit from it. But it is something that is always fragile.

Fifty years on from the debate where we as a chamber and parliament decriminalised male homosexuality, for it to have taken many decades to see those spent convictions of historic crimes actually expunged and even then for the administrative ability for those crimes to be expunged to be limited to only family members of those gay males who were criminalised by a much more moralistic parliament of the past is not good enough.

We cannot simply rest on our laurels. South Australia must continue to lead. We should not lag, and we should have the courage and bravery in this place to stand up for those who are marginalised and othered more often rather than waiting for the opinion polls to lead us. We as members of parliament should be leading more often. With that, I commend the motion.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:12): I rise today also to speak in support of the motion to honour a landmark moment in our state's history—the 50th anniversary of the decriminalisation of male homosexuality in South Australia. On 27 August 1975, our parliament passed the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Amendment Act, which came into effect on 2 October that year. While the federal government had passed a motion supporting decriminalisation in 1973, this had no real legislative impact, and two years later South Australia became the first jurisdiction to take the momentous step of reforming its criminal code.

This reform was not just legislative; it was deeply personal for many South Australians who had lived under the shadow of criminalisation simply for being their authentic selves. They faced arrest, conviction and public shame simply because of who they loved. The impact of such fear and isolation cannot be underestimated, and I join honourable members in expressing my sincere regret to the many South Australians who were convicted and impacted by laws that denied their dignity and humanity. As someone who has always championed diversity and inclusion, I believe that this commitment must extend to every corner of our society. Every person in our community has the right to feel safe, to live freely, to live peacefully and to belong, no matter who they are and who they love.

Celebrating our LGBTQIA+ community reflects my commitment to putting community first, recognising their contributions and ensuring that every South Australian feels seen, heard, valued and respected. In 2025, we commemorate this nation-leading legislation and celebrate the resilience, strength and perseverance of the LGBTQIA+ community.

We stand proudly with all South Australians who continue to advocate for visibility, inclusion and equality. We also celebrate the many other milestones of law reform that South Australia has achieved, from anti-discrimination protections to equal rights for same-sex couples, banning conversion practices and beyond. These reforms have helped build a society based on fairness, respect and compassion where diversity is not just accepted but embraced.

I wish to extend my sincere thanks and congratulations to trailblazers, advocates and activists, whose fierce determination and courage have changed our society for the better by being more inclusive. I also join other honourable members to acknowledge and give special thanks to the Hon. Ian Hunter, the Hon. Robert Simms, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Michelle Lensink for their strong leadership and advocacy in this area.

There are still many challenges and barriers faced by the LGBTQIA+ community, and this anniversary is an important opportunity to reflect on how far we have come and make the commitment, because we still need to do a lot more work towards equality, inclusion and respect for all South Australians. With those remarks, I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:16): I rise very briefly to associate myself with the remarks of the honourable members in this place today and honourable members who were here well before us in terms of all the work that went into these reforms and to thank them for their tireless advocacy, their persistence and their determination. I, too, would like to extend my thanks to members who are here today—the Hon. Ian Hunter, the Hon. Rob Simms, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Michelle

Lensink and former Attorney-General Vickie Chapman—amongst so many others, who have all stood firmly in support of these laws and all the other reforms that have taken place since then.

I take this opportunity to thank each and every individual who was involved in these law reforms. I think it is fair to say that most of us strive to leave this place having achieved something, and very few of us leave this place having achieved something so historic. We owe a debt of gratitude to each and every individual, whether they were in this place or outside of this place, and in every capacity and in every role that they played. As the Hon. Jing Lee just said, these are trailblazers and this is what South Australia is best known for. I extend my thanks to everybody for their tireless advocacy, work, determination and persistence. Let's see more of it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Bills

NORTHERN PARKLANDS BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I have a question for the minister in relation to levies that would be imposed on property acquisitions, or levies that would be proposed that would need to be collected by local government or councils. Why is that in there?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The levy has been in place so that the Northern Parklands Trust can be self-sustainable. This practice is there so that the funding from the levy can go back into the Parklands, I have been advised.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Why does local government have to act as a tax collector for the government? Does the minister see that it would add additional costs to those local government agencies that will be required to collect that levy?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised this is a model that has been used in the Landscape South Australia Act. It would also enable the councils to receive payment back and not to be out of pocket, that is my understanding.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Does the minister see that that levy would be showing on rate notices that go to ratepayers, who would not have a clue where that money is going, and it would seem that their rates are higher than what they would expect? Why doesn't the government collect the levy itself? Why is it imposing more costs on local government to do this?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: At the outset, the local community itself is going to very much physically see the benefit of this new Northern Parklands. Not only do we have this incredible asset that we see in the city that surrounds our CBD, having parklands here, but the northern suburbs will also have an incredible asset in the Northern Parklands.

My understanding, and the advice I have received here, is that neither the City of Playford nor the Town of Gawler have raised any concerns with this concept. As I have said, it is a model that has been used through the Landscape South Australia Act, and to support those programs.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Has the Local Government Association raised concerns about it?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I understand that the LGA SA is a member of the minister liaison group that has had a number of meetings to discuss this incredible project and the benefits it will bring to the community. My understanding is that, while there were no concerns raised throughout those discussions, there have been concerns raised more recently.

We have been in contact with the local councils that will be benefitting from this incredible investment and project, where their community will have access to parklands that will really define their community and build on its character, enabling them to have something that we see here in our CBD. We will be taking it to the northern suburbs for them to also enjoy this wonderful open space.

For people to now know what it is going to be and where it is going is an incredible commitment by this government, showing that we are investing in open green space.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: What are these amazing projects that the minister alludes to?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The Northern Parklands project.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Sorry, I did not hear that, minister.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The significance of building the Northern Parklands.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: What does the government intend building on these Parklands?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I was referring to the establishment of the Northern Parklands. The master plan itself is there to be developed at this point in time. You might be trying to find ways to put a negative spin on this, but for me and the government this is about establishing open green space, an area for the community to know that it will be there and it is available to them, and also to have benefits to not only the residents but people who are wanting to do more recreation and get out and about and enjoy their community.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I assure the minister I am not seeking to put a negative spin on the proposal but rather just trying to understand what precisely is in contemplation. Is it not the case that, as part of these new powers, the government would have the authority to bill ratepayers for the development of some of the green space in order to facilitate a commercial development? Can the minister detail precisely what kind of developments might be in contemplation?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Putting my old portfolio hat on, the West Beach Trust is a really great example of what this has been based off, where the caravan park is a part of that trust, which generates an income that is able to be put back into that incredible facility that is there to not only support recreational use but open space for the community. It is having that balance of open space but the ability to be self-sustainable.

This is an incredible asset that will be available in the community. I understand at an environmental level, with respect to planting, about 13,500 new trees is what I have been advised within the first three years of the Parklands being established, and the final Parklands will have up to 1,000 hectares of land under its control. There will be lots of opportunities that are available where the community can have an opportunity to be a part of the master plan process too.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Will the minister rule out hotels, resorts or private accommodation?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I said earlier, we have looked at the West Beach Trust and that is what we are basing it off with the caravan park and how successful that has been in being able to generate the support that is required to keep that as a sustainable open space for the people to enjoy.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Will the minister rule out the other forms of development that I mentioned—so hotels, resorts, private accommodation—and narrow the focus simply to leisure and the example that she provided?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: At this stage, I am advised we are going with the West Beach Trust model and that is what has worked.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yes, but is it not the case that the legislation provides much broader powers than simply the erection of caravan parks?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I said earlier, this has been based on the West Beach Trust model, which we know has been successful. I am sure the honourable member himself may very well acknowledge that as well. Any development, I have been advised, on the Parklands would require approval through the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. The priority for this side is to have an open space that has an ability to be able to support itself and be self-sustainable but provide a sporting, recreational and defining character for the northern suburbs.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I have a supplementary on that. Can the minister just confirm: does the West Beach Trust collect levies through their local council?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I understand, as I mentioned earlier, that the model is based on the Landscape South Australia Act and that the West Beach park model is self-sustainable.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Sorry, just a supplementary: do they collect levies through their local council currently in that sustainable model?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that, again, this has been based on the modelling of the Landscape South Australia Act, but the current West Beach Trust does not have the modelling to enable that to happen.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: So just to be clear, that is a no?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: This is based on the Landscape South Australia Act.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Sorry, just to be clear: does the West Beach Trust currently collect levies through their local council?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: That is not achievable through the current legislation.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Is any compensation going to be paid for any compulsory acquisitions for these Northern Parklands?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that, if any land was required, it would be worked through the Land Acquisition Act.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Does that mean, or does it not mean, that compensation is going to be paid?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: My understanding is that compensation is made through the Land Acquisition Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: It is my understanding, and please correct me if I am wrong, that amendments Nos 2 and 3 are consequential to amendment No. 1. So I will move amendment No. 1 and speak to it, but obviously if that fails I will not be moving amendments Nos 2 and 3 [Centofanti-1]. I move:

Amendment No 1 [Centofanti-1]—

Page 5, after line 33 [clause 4(3), after paragraph (a)]—Insert:

- (ab) before a variation to add land to the Northern Parklands is made, the eligible land proposed to be added must be identified in the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan applying under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*; and

These amendments ensure that any proposal to add new land to the Northern Parklands or to other statutory parklands in the future can only proceed if that land is identified in the relevant regional plan prepared under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*. Specifically, amendment No. 1 inserts new paragraph (3)(ab) in clause 4 so that land added to the Northern Parklands must already appear in the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan.

Amendment No. 2 makes a technical cross-reference correction to clause 4(4), and amendment No. 3 inserts an equivalent requirement in clause 6 for all other trust parklands, including using the phrase 'relevant regional plan'. Together, these changes prevent arbitrary or politically driven expansions and align future parkland boundaries with South Australia's long-term planning framework. They anchor the Northern Parklands within strategic metropolitan planning and provide transparency to local communities and councils.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the honourable member for bringing these amendments to the chamber. I am advised that these amendments were filed very recently, but whilst we appreciate the opposition's attempts to put these amendments in, we will not be able to support them at this time. As we have already made mention, this is based on the successful Linear Parks Act,

which we have found has worked well, and the amendments that are being put forward would require the GARP to be amended in the first order and would be an administrative burden.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I indicate I will support the amendments. I consider those to be a safeguard that is worthy of consideration.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I do note that I believe these have been filed today, and it has put an undue amount of stress on the crossbench to try to work our way through them, which I understand some of my colleagues are doing out in the corridor, as well as myself now here. I understand the concerns about consultation, but is that not addressed by the ability of the parliament to intervene should things go awry?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: My understanding, in terms of these amendments, is this is about them going into regional plans. It just ensures that there is another level of planning consultation, particularly with councils and local communities.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
 Noes.....10
 Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)
 Hood, D.G.E.
 Simms, R.A.

Girolamo, H.M.
 Lee, J.S.

Hood, B.R.
 Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
 Game, S.L.
 Maher, K.J.
 Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
 Hanson, J.E.
 Martin, R.B.

Franks, T.A.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Ngo, T.T.

PAIRS

Lensink, J.M.A.
 Henderson, L.A.

El Dannawi, M.
 Scriven, C.M.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Simms-1]—

Page 6, after line 19—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) A commercial development comprising a hotel, resort or other form of accommodation cannot be established or operated on or over the Northern Parklands, or a part of the Northern Parklands.

I do not think the amendment requires a great deal of explanation because, as I indicated in my second reading remarks, I do have some concern around the legislation in effect requiring local ratepayers to contribute towards the upkeep of space for private resorts and hotels, which I think is a little bit further than what the government envisaged when they spoke about the caravan park example. This just refines the focus a little more.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I appreciate the work that the honourable member has put into this, but the government will not be supporting his amendments. As I have highlighted in previous comments, I am advised that taking away this ability would remove the financial sustainability of the

Northern Parklands. As I mentioned earlier, when we have seen things like the West Beach Trust, where they have been able to have places like the holiday park, it really has been able to generate that support, so it is self-sustainable.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I, too, want to acknowledge the work that the Hon. Robert Simms has done on these amendments. I indicate the opposition will not be supporting the Hon. Robert Simms' amendments Nos 1 to 4, but we will be supporting his amendments Nos 5 through 12 in his first set.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: My amendment No. 3, largely, is not consequential but it is very similar, so I will not be moving it.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

The CHAIR: There is an amendment No. 2 [Simms-1].

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: This is a very similar amendment to the other amendment I advanced, and therefore I will not progress it, given the numbers

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 13 passed.

Clause 14.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Simms-1]—

Page 9, line 36 [clause 14(1)(a)(ii)]—Delete 'and resort'

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the honourable member for his amendment. As stated previously, this is about keeping the ability for the park to be self-sustainable, as we have seen with the West Beach Trust.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Simms-1]—

Page 10, lines 10 and 11 [clause 14(2)(a)]—Delete 'accommodation, refreshment, sport or entertainment and any other' and substitute 'refreshment, sport or entertainment and any other similar'

Again, what this amendment is seeking to do is to narrow the focus of what the government is proposing. I know the minister has insisted that this is more about car parks—sorry, not car parks but caravan parks. It is often about car parks with this government, but in this instance it is about caravan parks. What I am seeking to do is to ensure that this power is not going to be used in a broader way.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the member for the amendment he has put forward, but again we will not be supporting it, for reasons similar to those stated before. I would also like to confirm that the LGA has brought to my attention the actual name of the reference group that was mentioned earlier: it is the ministerial liaison group.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: As previously indicated, we will not be supporting the Hon. Rob Simms' amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 15.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Simms-1]—

Page 11, lines 34 to 36 [clause 15(4)(a)]—Delete 'where it has not required such a contribution in relation to the financial year immediately preceding the relevant financial year'

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I indicate that the opposition will be supporting this amendment by the Hon. Rob Simms.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Apologies, would the honourable member repeat the amendment you just mentioned?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The amendment is clause 15, page 11, lines 34 to 36:

Delete 'where it has not required such a contribution in relation to the financial year immediately preceding the relevant financial year'

The ACTING CHAIR (The Hon. T.A. Franks): We are on amendment No. 5 [Simms-1].

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised this amendment would mean the prescribed levy proposal would include any levy, even if the levy is the same as the previous year. This would mean a levy would need to go through full public consultation and parliamentary oversight processes every year, even if the levy is not increased or only increased by CPI. This would be an unreasonable administrative burden on the imposition of the levy.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Simms-1]—

Page 11, lines 37 to 39 [clause 15(4)(b)]—Delete paragraph (b)

The ACTING CHAIR (The Hon. T.A. Franks): It is probably consequential but that does not mean that the mover cannot continue to pursue their arguments. Any further contributions? If people indicate how they are going to vote, that might help the calling of the vote.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: As I have previously stated, the opposition will be supporting the Hon. Rob Simms' amendments Nos 5 to 12.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I have previously stated, we will not be supporting this amendment.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I also will not be supporting the amendment.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Simms-1]—

Page 12, lines 8 to 11 [clause 15(5)(b)]—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

- (b) in a case where the proposal relates to the payment (or proposed payment) of contributions by constituent councils under Part 4—obtain the consent of each constituent council to the proposed contributions; and

This is in recognition of the fact that this in effect does give the government some quite significant powers. I have heard, certainly, concerns expressed to me by the LGA on behalf of their members that this could put a significant cost burden on councils. All I am proposing in this instance is that when the government is seeking to do this, they would obtain the consent of councils in relation to the contributions. I think that is appropriate given this model potentially creates a template for acquiring parts of green space.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I understand that, as we are going to be making amendments to have both houses of parliament have oversight of this, this amendment is not supported by the government.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7

Noes.....10
Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, D.G.E.
Simms, R.A. (teller)

Girolamo, H.M.
Lee, J.S.

Hood, B.R.
Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Game, S.L.
Maher, K.J.
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
Hanson, J.E.
Martin, R.B.

Franks, T.A.
Hunter, I.K.
Ngo, T.T.

PAIRS

Lensink, J.M.A.
Henderson, L.A.

El Dannawi, M.
Scriven, C.M.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Centofanti-1]—

Page 12, after line 14 [clause 15, after subclause (5)]—Insert:

- (5a) In addition, before including in its annual business plan a prescribed levy proposal that relates to the payment (or proposed payment) of contributions by constituent councils under Part 4, the Trust must take into account—
- (a) the likely impact of the prescribed levy proposal on—
 - (i) ratepayers in the Northern Parklands region; and
 - (ii) the long-term financial performance and position of the constituent councils for that region; and
 - (iii) issues concerning equity within the community in that region; and
 - (b) the extent to which the Northern Parklands are provided for the enjoyment and benefit of users that do not live within the boundaries of the constituent councils for the Northern Parklands region, and the corresponding extent to which it is reasonable for ratepayers in that region to be responsible for paying a levy in respect of the Northern Parklands; and
 - (c) the proportion of the Northern Parklands that are (or will be) available for unrestricted community use and are not (or will not be) operating under a lease or other arrangement restricting open community access; and
 - (d) the proportion of the Northern Parklands that was previously under the care, control or management of a constituent council for the Northern Parklands region and the level of service to the community provided by the constituent councils in respect of such land (such as the extent and standard of facilities and amenities provided at the land).

Amendment No. 4 inserts a new subclause, 15(5a), requiring the Northern Parklands Trust to take into account explicit fairness and equity considerations before including a prescribed levy proposal in its annual business plan. Amendment No. 5 is consequential in my understanding, so, Mr Chairman, are you happy for me to explain amendment No. 5 now?

The CHAIR: Yes.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Amendment No. 5 then adds subclause 15(8a), obliging the minister to consider those same factors before approving such a plan. Under these amendments

both the trust and the minister must examine the likely financial impact on ratepayers and on the long-term fiscal sustainability of Playford and Gawler councils, broader equity issues within the community, the degree to which the Parklands are used by non-residents and whether it is fair for local ratepayers to bear those costs, how much of the Parklands were previously managed by councils and the level of service those councils provided. These provisions introduce an explicit fairness framework into the levy-setting process, ensuring any charge is reasonable, transparent and financially sustainable.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised there will be parliamentary oversight of the annual business plan, as well as the minister having to have oversight of that plan as well. As we stated earlier, the purpose of this modelling that we have put together as a government is to have long-term financial sustainability. As we have heard already today, these amendments have only been presented today and we have not had time to consider them and will not be supporting them.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I support the amendments.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
 Noes.....10
 Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Girolamo, H.M.	Hood, B.R.
Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.	Pangallo, F.
Simms, R.A.		

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S. (teller)	Franks, T.A.
Game, S.L.	Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.		

PAIRS

Lensink, J.M.A.	El Dannawi, M.
Henderson, L.A.	Scriven, C.M.

Amendment thus negated.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I will not move amendment No. 5 [Centofanti-1] as it is consequential.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I move:

Amendment No 1 [EmergCorr-1]—

Page 12, line 24 [clause 15(10)]—Delete 'The House of Assembly' and substitute:

Either House of Parliament

Amendment No 2 [EmergCorr-1]—

Page 12, lines 29 to 32 [clause 15(11)]—Delete subclause (11) and substitute:

(11) If, at the expiration of 6 sitting days, neither House of Parliament has made a resolution under subsection (10), it will be conclusively presumed that there is no objection to the prescribed levy proposal and that there are no suggested amendments to it (and in this case the prescribed levy proposal may proceed).

My understanding is that this came up in the other house in the committee stage about having further oversight, and we will now be having oversight provided by both houses of parliament.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I indicate that the opposition is supportive of the government's amendment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am supportive of it, too. I think this is an important accountability measure, so I do welcome the government taking on board that feedback.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I welcome and support the government's amendment. This is why it went to the heart of my question about having that important parliamentary oversight. These debates are incredibly controversial. Rather than minutiae, they should in fact be in the delegated legislation of the parliament, and a public debate in that way is most fitting.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I rise to indicate that I too will be supporting the amendments.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: This amendment relates to the principle that I raised earlier in relation to consent of constituent councils, therefore I will not be proceeding with it given the numbers in the chamber. I will not proceed with amendments Nos 8 or 9.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I move:

Amendment No 3 [EmergCorr-1]—

Page 12, line 36 [clause 15(12)(b)]—Delete 'House of Assembly' and substitute:

House of Parliament that suggested the amendment

Amendment No 4 [EmergCorr-1]—

Page 12, line 37 [clause 15(12)(b)]—Delete 'the House of Assembly' and substitute:

that House of Parliament

Amendment No 5 [EmergCorr-1]—

Page 12, line 42 [clause 15(13)]—Delete 'the House of Assembly' and substitute:

either House of Parliament

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Simms-2]—

Page 13, lines 19 to 21 [clause 16(1)]—

Delete 'the Northern Parklands Trust's annual business plan specifies an amount to be contributed by the constituent councils for that financial year for the purposes of this section.' and substitute:

—

- (a) the Northern Parklands Trust's annual business plan specifies an amount to be contributed by the constituent councils for that financial year for the purposes of this section; and
- (b) the constituent councils have consented to the making of a contribution of the amount specified in the annual business plan.

The CHAIR: This is actually a suggestion to the House of Assembly to amend the clause.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the member for his feedback today, but we will not be supporting the amendment that has been put forward. I understand that a requirement to consult with the impacted councils already exists within the bill. In addition, both houses of parliament will provide oversight of the new increased levy. This consultation oversight is considered sufficient.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate that the opposition will be supporting the Hon. Rob Simms' amendment No. 1 [Simms-2].

Suggested amendment negatived.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I will be moving my amendment No. 1 [Centofanti-2]. This amendment adds wording to clause 16(5) so that the minister, before approving a business plan involving council contributions, must have taken into account the matters referred to in section 15(5a)(a) to (d).

This amendment directly links the minister's power under clause 16 to the fairness and equity considerations inserted by [Centofanti-1]. In effect, this ensures the minister cannot approve any annual business plan or levy arrangement without explicitly considering the new fairness—I do not think I can move this because it is consequential to [Centofanti-1]—

The CHAIR: But we love hearing your dulcet tone, so thank you.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: So I will not be moving this amendment.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 to 30 passed.

Clause 31.

The CHAIR: This is another suggested amendment to the House of Assembly.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: It is a very good suggestion. I move:

Amendment No 2 [Simms-2]—

Page 21, after line 35—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) However, regulations for the purposes of this section cannot have the effect of allowing a statutory trust to require a constituent council to make a contribution towards the costs of the statutory trust performing its functions without the consent of the constituent council.

I outlined the rationale for the amendment earlier.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The government will not be supporting this amendment as we have provided that there will be parliamentary oversight of the business plan.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: As previously indicated, the opposition will be supporting the Hon. Mr Simms' amendment.

Suggested amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 32.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 10 [Simms-1]—

Page 22, after line 13—After subclause (2) insert:

- (2a) Despite subsection (2) (and section 31), regulations providing for an annual business plan of a statutory trust to set out a proposal relating to the payment (or proposed payment) of contributions by constituent councils under the applicable provisions of Part 4 towards the costs of the statutory trust performing its functions under this Act relating to the region for the trust parklands must require the consent of each constituent council to the proposed contributions to be obtained by the statutory trust.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The government will not be supporting this amendment for similar reasons that I have already outlined.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: As indicated, we will be supporting this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Centofanti-1]—

Page 22, after line 13 [clause 32, after subclause (2)]—After subclause (2) insert:

- (2a) Despite subsection (2) (and section 31), regulations providing for an annual business plan of a statutory trust to set out a proposal relating to the payment (or proposed payment) of contributions by constituent councils under the applicable provisions of Part 4 towards the

costs of the statutory trust performing its functions under this Act relating to the region for trust parklands must make provision requiring the statutory trust to take into account—

- (a) the likely impact of the proposal on—
 - (i) ratepayers in the region; and
 - (ii) the long-term financial performance and position of the constituent councils for the region; and
 - (iii) issues concerning equity within the community in the region; and
- (b) the extent to which the trust parklands are provided for the enjoyment and benefit of users that do not live within the boundaries of the constituent councils for the trust parklands region, and the corresponding extent to which it is reasonable for ratepayers in that region to be responsible for paying a levy in respect of the trust parklands; and
- (c) the proportion of the trust parklands that are (or will be) available for unrestricted community use and are not (or will not be) operating under a lease or other arrangement restricting open community access; and
- (d) the proportion of the trust parklands that was previously under the care, control or management of a constituent council for the trust parklands region and the level of service to the community provided by the constituent councils in respect of such land (such as the extent and standard of facilities and amenities provided at the land).

I will also speak to amendment No. 7, which I understand is consequential and, if this fails, I will not be moving amendment No. 7. Amendments Nos 6 and 7 replicate the fairness and equity tests introduced in clause 15 within the general provisions of the bill. Amendment No. 6 inserts new clause 32(2a) requiring any future statutory parklands trust to apply the same fairness factors when preparing its annual business plan, while amendment No. 7 inserts clause 32(3a), requiring the minister to consider those same matters when approving such a plan. Together, these amendments ensure that the fairness framework applies not only to the Northern Parklands but to all future parkland trusts established under this legislation. They establish a consistent statewide benchmark for fair and transparent parkland funding and governance.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The government will not be supporting this amendment. As previously outlined, this has an annual business plan that has oversight, on my understanding, from both parliament and the minister.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
 Noes.....10
 Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)
 Hood, D.G.E.
 Simms, R.A.

Girolamo, H.M.
 Lee, J.S.

Hood, B.R.
 Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
 Game, S.L.
 Maher, K.J.
 Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
 Hanson, J.E.
 Martin, R.B.

Franks, T.A.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Ngo, T.T.

PAIRS

Lensink, J.M.A.
 Henderson, L.A.

El Dannawi, M.
 Scriven, C.M.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 33 to 41 passed.

Clause 42.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 8 [Centofanti-1]—

Page 26, after line 6 [clause 42, after subclause (2)]—Insert:

- (2a) A statutory trust must, before submitting its long-term strategic plan to the Minister for approval, consult with each council in whose area trust parklands for which the statutory trust is the responsible statutory trust are located on the long-term strategic plan.

Amendment No. 8 requires a statutory trust to consult directly with each affected council before submitting a long-term strategic plan to the minister for approval. It gives councils, as financial contributors and community custodians, a legislative voice in shaping the Parklands' long-term direction, priorities and management. By embedding formal consultation, the amendment strengthens cooperation between the trust and local government, ensuring Parkland planning reflects local need service levels and community expectations.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am happy to support the amendment based on the principles I outlined earlier.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The government will not be supporting this amendment. I have been advised that there would be members of the council who would be on the trust, so there would be natural consultation that would occur anyway.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
 Noes.....10
 Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Girolamo, H.M.	Hood, B.R.
Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.	Pangallo, F.
Simms, R.A.		

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S. (teller)	Franks, T.A.
Game, S.L.	Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.		

PAIRS

Lensink, J.M.A.	El Dannawi, M.
Henderson, L.A.	Scriven, C.M.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 43 to 45 passed.

Clause 46.

The CHAIR: There is amendment No. 3 [Simms-2].

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Reading the tea leaves, the numbers are clearly not there. These amendments relate to the principle that I have made reference to a number of times. That is around councils being consulted and ensuring that there is not acquisition of land without their consent. In light of the numbers, I will not proceed with the amendments.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (47), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (17:23): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 August 2025.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:24): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) Bill 2025, introduced to this chamber on 21 August by the deputy leader and Attorney-General, the Hon. Kyam Maher. This bill makes a series of technical but important amendments across a number of acts within the Attorney-General's portfolio. While varied in subject matter, these amendments share a common purpose to strengthen the integrity and operation of our justice system, remove obsolete provisions and ensure our laws keep pace with contemporary practice.

Clauses 3 and 4 would amend the Bail Act 1985 to require that electronic monitoring of people on bail be undertaken by a public sector agency. This largely reflects current practice in South Australia, but is a prudent and timely measure. It follows the sudden collapse of BailSafe Australia, a private operator, which left people on bail in Victoria and NSW without any monitoring. Those jurisdictions have now moved to prohibit private monitoring altogether and it is appropriate that South Australia provides the same assurances to the community.

Clause 5 amends the District Court Act 1991 to allow a resigning judge to continue solely for the purpose of finalising part-heard matters. This mirrors the existing provision in section 13A(3) of the Supreme Court Act 1935 and will promote judicial efficiency, preventing costly rehearings and avoid trauma for parties that would otherwise need to relitigate matters from scratch.

My understanding is that clause 6 amends the Legal Practitioners Act 1981 to allow the Attorney-General to delegate authority to make payments from the fidelity fund, and I indicate that I just have a few clarifying questions at clause 6.

Clause 7 introduces a new section 19A of the Legislation Interpretation Act 2021. This will clarify that an amending act or instrument is to be read as part of the instrument it amends, providing certainty for courts and practitioners. This responds directly to concerns arising from the *Deripaska v Minister for Foreign Affairs 2024 FCA 62* decision and will ensure our state legislation operates with the same clarity as its commonwealth counterparts.

Clause 8 repeals section 35 of the Summary Offences Act 1953, which restricts newspaper reporting on so-called immorality in legal proceedings. This offence is not only archaic and unused, referring quaintly to '50 lines of 13 ems wide', but sits uneasy with modern notions of press freedom. Its removal is overdue.

Clause 9 extends the review period for the Surrogacy Act 2019 from five to seven years so that our review can be informed by the ongoing national inquiry into surrogacy by the Australian Law

Reform Commission. This is a sensible alignment of resources that will avoid duplicating work and ensure our law is informed by the best available evidence.

Finally, clauses 10 and 11 extend the sunset clauses for both the Terrorism (Police Powers) Act 2005 and the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 by a further 10 years to 2035. These powers have regrettably become part of the ongoing legal architecture we require to combat terrorism, and their continuation remains necessary for community safety.

In summary, this bill is largely technical in nature, but it makes prudent and measured improvements across a number of statutes. It strengthens public confidence, promotes efficiency, removes obsolete provisions and ensures our laws continue to serve the South Australian community effectively. The opposition commends the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:28): The Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) Bill contains a number of amendments. The first one is to the Bail Act 1985 to provide that electronic bail monitoring services must be provided by a public sector agency or an entity acting pursuant to a contract for services that has been approved by the Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services. This is in response to the recent collapse of BailSafe Australia and the implications of this in Victoria. No such incidents have occurred in South Australia, but we want to prevent this from happening here. It ensures that DCS approve and oversee a private provider, if engaged.

In regard to the District Court Act 1991, there are amendments to clarify that a person who resigns from judicial office or from their term of appointment may continue to act for the purpose of completing the hearing and the determination of any proceedings that were part heard before their resignation. Currently, there is no power in the District Court for a judge or an associate judge to hear remaining proceedings after resignation. There is currently an ability for such continued acting in circumstances of retirement but not of resignation. This amendment ensures consistency with equivalent provisions in the Supreme Court Act.

In regard to the Legal Practitioners Act 1981, there are amendments to enable the Attorney-General to delegate powers and functions in relation to the authorisation of payments from the Legal Practitioners' Fidelity Fund. Such payments are largely for providing compensation to people as a result of solicitor malpractice. Currently, there is no power for the Attorney-General to delegate powers to make payments from the fidelity fund to any persons in the absence of an express provision. Delegations must be in writing and are revocable at will.

In regard to the Legislation Interpretation Act 2021, there are amendments to provide certainty regarding the validity of the listing technique that is used by parliamentary counsel to give effect to declarations and designations made under legislation. The validity of this listing technique was challenged in a recent High Court matter, *Deripaska v Minister for Foreign Affairs*. While the judgement ultimately found the listing technique to be valid, this required reliance on section 11B(1) of the commonwealth Acts Interpretation Act. As there is currently no equivalent section in our state act, this amendment creates such a section, equivalent to the commonwealth act, to safeguard against future challenges of this listing technique.

In regard to the Surrogacy Act 2019, there are amendments to defer the upcoming statutory review of the act, which must be completed by 1 September 2026, for a further two years, so that it must be completed by 1 September 2028. The Australian Law Reform Commission is currently undertaking a review of this act, which is due to be published in July 2026, and this statutory review is therefore being deferred to await the findings of that review.

In regard to the Summary Offences Act 1953, there are amendments to repeal section 35 of the act, which imposes on certain newspaper reports restrictions on immorality, unnatural vice and indecent conduct. The original offence was enacted in 1929 under the now-repealed Indecent Reports (Restriction) Act 1928. It is believed to have originated at a time when homosexuality was illegal and the government at the time wanted to prevent corruption of public morals. It can only be prosecuted with the consent of the Commissioner of Police and no longer serves a purpose in modern society. Victoria is the only other Australian jurisdiction to still have this offence.

There are several other existing offences that will be retained that will continue to protect the publication of inappropriate content, such as in part 8, divisions 3 and 4 of the Evidence Act and section 33 of the Summary Offences Act.

In regard to the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 and the Terrorism (Police Powers) Act 2005, there are amendments to extend the expiry and sunset provisions in those acts by a further 10 years; that is, until 8 December 2035. This ensures that the Terrorism (Police Powers) Act will continue to operate and will ensure the state would be unable to use these provisions to prevent or respond to potential terrorist acts.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (17:34): I thank honourable members who have contributed to the debate on this bill and look forward to questions during the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I have some questions about clause 6, but if the Attorney is happy to take them now, then we can just get along. Can the Attorney please explain what about the current delegation of payment arrangements was not workable, and did the request for this change come from the Law Society itself?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, this was not a request from the Law Society; this was from internally within the Attorney-General's Department. The genesis of this is every single payment made from the fidelity fund, no matter how small, has to be personally approved by myself as Attorney-General. When there are payments from lawyers—payments as low as a few hundred dollars—I have to sign off on them personally as Attorney-General. This is an efficiency measure, so that a lot of those very small amounts can be delegated for approval rather than the Attorney-General having to approve every single one of them.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I thank the Attorney for his answer. Can the Attorney just clarify—sorry, for my purposes—does the Law Society currently have delegation? So does it go through you and then it goes to the Law Society or just through you?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is just through me.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Will the Law Society be resourced by the government to fulfil this role, given the fact that they will now have delegation to authorise those payments? Does the Attorney feel that it will require any additional resourcing?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: For the sorts of ones I am describing, it will not be the Law Society delegated; it will be something like the Chief Executive of the Attorney-General's Department or an office holder within the Attorney-General's Department. As I have said, the genesis of this is payments for even several hundred dollars need to be personally approved by the Attorney-General. This creates that efficiency where it can be delegated and the intention is that it be within the Attorney-General's Department—the chief executive or a delegate of the chief executive—for those.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I thank the Attorney for clarifying.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 5 passed.

Clause 6.

The CHAIR: Clause 6 is a money clause. I point out to the committee that, this clause being a money clause, it is in erased type. Standing order 298 provides that no question shall be put in committee upon any such clause. The message transmitting the bill to the House of Assembly is required to indicate that this clause is deemed necessary to the bill.

Remaining clauses (7 to 11) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (17:40):
I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VEHICLE PARKING AND URBAN RENEWAL) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (17:40):
I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Parking is a significant and contested problem in our neighbourhoods, especially in areas where substantial general infill development is occurring. Ongoing feedback to the Government has been clear—parked cars need to be off our streets and back on driveways and in garages.

The Malinauskas Government made an election commitment to 'bust congestion and improve amenity in Adelaide's neighbourhoods'. The Statutes Amendment (Vehicle Parking and Urban Renewal) Bill 2025 seeks to implement a strong, but fair response to these critical issues which have been raised by the community and local governments alike.

Our consumer preferences have changed with 9 of the 10 top selling cars in Australia being SUVs or dual cab utes. Our cars are getting bigger, but garages have not followed suit.

The Government has engaged extensively with both industry and the community to develop a response to vehicle parking which balances housing affordability, construction costs and design.

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

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

The Scheme as drafted specifies that single vehicle parks must be 3.5 meters wide and 6 meters in length. This is a change in dimension from 3 meters wide and 5.4 metres in length and allows for the accommodation of wider and longer vehicles. Additionally, the Bill seeks to include a minimum garage door size of 3 meters with industry standard size being 2.4 meters.

Consultation on the Bill and associated Scheme was undertaken for a two- week period from 24th of February to the 10th of March 2025.

Extensive feedback was received from both community and industry during this consultation period. I would like to thank all who participated and shared their views. This process has helped shape the balanced and fair approach to vehicle parking in this Bill.

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

The following amendments to the Planning and Design Code will be progressed to reduce impacts on the cost of new housing:

- Remove the requirement to have a habitable room that is 2.4 metres in width with a 2 metre wide window facing the street.

This will now be replaced with a requirement to replace it with a 1 metre x 1 metre window facing the street to ensure that there will be no increase in the width of housing, impacting on yield and housing affordability.

- Remove the requirement for garage door widths to not exceed 50 percent of allotment frontage for single storey dwellings on an allotment with a frontage of less than 6 metres.
- Remove the requirement to have a front door visible from the street. As an alternative, the entrance then being required through the garage on allotments with a frontage of less than 4.5 metres.

The Bill allows the Minister to, by notice published on the SA planning portal, declare that forms of development do not need to comply with the Scheme or specified provisions of the Scheme.

In relation to meeting minimum vehicle parking numbers, I propose to declare that:

- Dwellings in the Adelaide CBD, retirement facilities, residential parks, co-located housing that supports ageing in place and workers' accommodation do not need to meeting the minimum number of vehicle parks specified in the Scheme.
- Dwellings in strategic infill sites, apartment buildings and affordable housing are to have reduced requirements and only need to have 1 vehicle park in all circumstances irrespective of number of bedrooms.

The basis for the reduced requirements for strategic infill sites is that they are close to the city or are close to high frequency public transport. Often enough, private car ownership is reduced at these locations.

The list of strategic infill sites that have reduced requirements will be determined prior to commencement of the Bill.

The Bill also makes amendments to the Urban Renewal Act 1995 to streamline precinct planning processes. This will enable for parking requirements to be addressed at a precinct level, across multiple buildings or areas. This will drive efficiencies in how parking is addressed, lowering construction costs and improving housing affordability.

Dwellings within a precinct under that Act will not need to comply with the minimum number of vehicle park requirements specified in the Scheme in these circumstances.

It is proposed that the amendments to the *Urban Renewal Act 1995* commence as soon as possible after the Bill passes Parliament to allow precincts to be established as a priority.

The vehicle parking provisions will commence 12 months after the Bill passes Parliament to provide time for the development sector to adjust to the changes and allow time for the amendments to the Planning and Design Code to be finalised.

I also propose to defer commencement of the Bill in greenfield locations until 2028 to align with the commencement of the next SA Water regulatory cycle.

The Bill goes a significant step in addressing concerns regarding carparking in our streets, however, Local Government has the primary role in helping respond to the concerns of the community for vehicle parking issues.

Local Government must continue to develop and manage their on-street parking policies through consultation with their communities. Management and enforcement by Council is key to ensuring that car parking remains fair for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

Upon commencement of the legislation, I will be writing to both Mayors and CEOs of metropolitan Councils to ensure that they are developing strategies which compliment this legislation to achieve the full intent of our election commitment.

The Bill provides an opportunity to reduce congestion by ensuring sufficient carparking is provided with all new residential developments going forward, without impacting on housing affordability and supply. Cars belong back in garages and off our streets to improve amenity and reduce congestion within our neighbourhoods.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank key stakeholders who provided input and feedback to this Bill and its development:

- The Local Government Association of South Australia
- The Property Council of South Australia
- The Master Builders Association
- The Urban Development Institute of Australia
- The thirteen Councils across greater Adelaide who provided detailed responses regarding parking issues in their suburbs.
- And the submissions made by home builders and construction firms.

Additionally, significant efforts have been made through the research undertaken by the State Planning Commission, led by Craig Holden and the Department of Housing and Urban Development led by David Reynolds.

Additionally, thank you to the University of South Australia for their contributions and research to ensuring the fair, but effective outcome we have achieved in this Bill.

I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in Hansard without reading. I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

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

3—Insertion of section 127A

This clause inserts new section 127A as follows:

127A—Mandatory vehicle parking conditions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4—Insertion of section 200A

This clause inserts new section 200A as follows:

200A—Vehicle parking fund

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

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

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

Part 3—Amendment of *Urban Renewal Act 1995*

5—Amendment of section 7G—Preliminary

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

6—Amendment of section 7H—Establishment of precincts

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

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

7—Amendment of section 7I—Precinct plans

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

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

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

9—Insertion of section 35A

This clause inserts section 35A as follows:

35A—Recovery of costs of certain infrastructure

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

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

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

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

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

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti.

NURSE AND MIDWIFE TO PATIENT RATIOS BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (17:41):

I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

The *Nurse and Midwife to Patient Ratios Bill 2025* will, for the first time in South Australia, enshrine nurse and midwife to patient ratios into legislation.

The legislation confirms the Government's continued commitment to ensuring the safety of our nursing and midwifery workforce within the public health system.

It further supports the safety of the public health system and optimises health outcomes for patients.

Transparent, mandated minimum staffing has been recognised both nationally and internationally as a critical factor in delivering high-quality hospital care and ensuring best patient outcomes.

The model outlined in this Bill is based on the successful model implemented in Victoria, tailored to the South Australian context.

It also aligns with the global push towards establishing transparent and consistent staffing standards, including mandated nurse and midwife to patient ratios.

This not only supports the delivery of high-quality care but also helps to ensure that the South Australian health care system is resilient, sustainable and able to meet both current and future demands.

This Bill seeks to establish minimum nurse and midwife to patient ratios per shift across key clinical areas, including General Medical and Surgical, Coronary Care, High Dependency, Oncology, Stroke, Rehabilitation, Birthing and Labour, Neonatal Intensive Care, and Palliative Care Wards.

The Bill will apply to all South Australian public hospitals, including aged care, where it will mirror the Federal Government requirements of care minutes for all aged care beds.

This Bill includes a two-year moratorium in which a hospital cannot be the subject of a finding that it failed to meet a prescribed ratio. This will enable SA Health to embed the new staffing approach and support the implementation as efficiently as possible.

The Bill also applies the principle of 'rounding up' where the number of occupied beds is not divisible by the prescribed ratio. It will allow operational flexibilities informed by clinical decisions to optimise the efficient use of nursing and midwifery resources.

Our nursing workforce will be able to rely on any higher minimum staffing requirements that apply under the *Nursing/Midwifery (South Australian Public Sector) Enterprise Agreement*, as these will be preserved under the Bill.

Nurses and midwives are the cornerstone of South Australia's public health system. They play a vital role in promoting health, preventing illness, and delivering care across both acute and chronic settings.

Collectively, nurses and midwives comprise nearly 50% of the state's healthcare workforce, underscoring their essential contribution to the health and wellbeing of the South Australian community.

This Bill will ensure that the appropriate minimum number of nurses and midwives are available on a shift by shift basis, enabling staff to meet patient care needs in a working environment that supports our dedicated nurses and midwives.

Our Government has worked closely with the ANMF-SA to deliver this bill, and I want to take this opportunity to thank them in this Place for their collaboration and support in finalising this work. In particular, I extend my thanks to the leadership of the ANMF-SA: Adjunct Associate Professor Elizabeth Dabars – CEO/Secretary, Adjunct Associate Professor Jackie Wood – Director, Nursing and Midwifery Practice, Ms Roslyn Hewlett and Mr Rob Bonner, whose tireless advocacy on this has resulted in the introduction of this legislation today.

Our Government will continue to work in partnership with the ANMF-SA and our Local Health Networks to ensure the sustainable implementation of this bill.

I would like to extend our sincere gratitude to Judith Formston, Deputy Chief Executive Corporate and Infrastructure in the Department for Health and Wellbeing and Gabrielle Starr, Director of Strategic Industrial Relations and Policy and her team, in leading the work on this initiative.

I also acknowledge the efforts of the Chief Nursing and Midwifery Officer, Jenny Hurley, and her team in supporting the work required to achieve this reform.

This Bill is a positive change that delivers a key election commitment by the Malinauskas Labor Government to enshrine nurse and midwife to patient ratios into law. It reiterates our commitment to supporting the safety of our patients in public health system. And it delivers on our promise to ensure the safety of our valued nurses and midwives.

I commend the Bill to the Chamber.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

Definitions are provided for key terms used throughout the measure.

4—Objects of Act

This clause sets out the objects of the proposed Act.

5—Act not to affect employment contracts

This clause provides that nothing in the proposed Act is intended to affect or require the alteration of any employment contract.

6—Application of *Fair Work Act 1994*

Following the commencement of the Act, SAET may not approve an enterprise agreement which would provide for a minimum staffing level applying in a ward or other hospital site to which a ratio or minimum staffing requirement applies pursuant to the proposed Act.

Part 2—Staffing requirements in incorporated hospitals

Division 1—Nurse and midwife to patient ratios

7—Application of ratios

This clause imposes the obligation on an incorporated hospital to staff a ward in accordance with an applicable ratio (set out in the Schedule). It also provides further guidance as to how ratios are to be applied, including imposing an obligation for an additional nurse or midwife where the application of a ratio to the number of patients on the ward does not result in a whole number of nurses or midwives.

8—Ratio for mixed wards

A process is set out for the staffing of wards to which more than one ratio would otherwise apply. An incorporated hospital must nominate such a ward as a mixed ward and staff the ward in accordance with the provisions of this clause.

9—No breach in circumstances of emergency

This clause provides that an incorporated hospital will not be in breach of a ratio if the failure to meet a ratio arose from an unanticipated emergency situation, and the hospital determined the actual staffing level to be safe.

Division 2—Variations from ratios

10—Quality of care paramount

11—Agreement to vary a ratio

These clauses provide a process by which a ratio applying to a specific ward can be varied by agreement between the Chief Executive and a union. A ratio as varied would then apply to the relevant ward instead of any ratio applying under this measure.

Division 3—Other staffing requirements

12—Minimum staffing requirements

This clause imposes the obligation on an incorporated hospital to staff a hospital site, ward or bed in accordance with an applicable minimum staffing requirement (set out in the Schedule).

Division 4—Effect of existing enterprise agreement

13—Relevant enterprise agreement of no effect

The enterprise agreement applying to nurses and midwives at the time the Act commences is to have no ongoing effect to the extent it provides a requirement for minimum staffing in the same setting as a ratio or minimum staffing requirement imposed by this measure. Proceedings which relate to disputes as to minimum staffing levels contained in the enterprise agreement will not be able to be brought.

14—Preservation of existing higher staffing level requirements

Despite the preceding clause, a minimum staffing level imposed by the enterprise agreement which requires more nurses or midwives than would be required through the application of the Act will be preserved. These requirements will be treated as if they are a ratio or minimum staffing requirement imposed by the Act.

Part 3—Dispute resolution

15—Local dispute resolution

A dispute arising under the Act is to be initiated through notification to the relevant incorporated hospital and resolved in accordance with prescribed procedures and policies. Such a dispute may be initiated by a nurse or midwife employed to work at the relevant hospital, or by the union.

16—Dispute resolution by South Australian Employment Tribunal

If the parties to a dispute initiated under clause 15 are unable to resolve the dispute in accordance with that clause, they may apply to SAET (constituted as an industrial relations commission) to resolve the matter. The clause also sets out the procedures and powers of SAET in dealing with such a dispute.

Part 4—Civil penalties

17—Civil penalty for breach of ratio or other staffing requirement

A nurse, midwife or union may also apply to SAET (constituted as the South Australian Employment Court) to have a civil penalty ordered against the incorporated hospital for a breach of their obligation to comply with a relevant ratio or minimum staffing requirement. A civil penalty may only be ordered where the contravention was deliberate and part of a systemic pattern of conduct by the hospital. Any penalty ordered is payable into the Consolidated Account.

18—Civil penalty rules and procedure

This clause provides that a civil penalty is not a criminal offence and that the Court in hearing an application for such a penalty must apply the rules of evidence and civil procedure.

19—Costs

The Court may only award costs against a party to proceedings under this Part if of the opinion that the party has acted unreasonably, frivolously or vexatiously.

Part 5—Miscellaneous

20—Certain information to be included in annual report

Information relating to dispute resolution and civil penalties must be included in each incorporated hospital's annual report.

21—Regulations

This clause provides a regulation making power. Regulations made under the Act may amend hospital category sites, and add new wards to which a ratio is to apply.

Schedule 1—Staffing requirements at incorporated hospitals

Part 1—Categories of incorporated hospital sites

1—Category 1 hospital sites

2—Category 2 hospital sites

3—Category 3 hospital sites

4—Category 4 hospital sites

These clauses categorise certain hospital sites across the State. Some ratios require a different number of nurses or midwives depending on the category of the hospital site.

Part 2—Nurse and midwife to patient ratios

5—Acute stroke wards

6—Antenatal wards

7—Birthing suites

- 8—Coronary care units
- 9—General medical and surgical wards
- 10—Geriatric evaluation and management units
- 11—Haematology wards
- 12—High dependency units
- 13—Neonatal intensive care units
- 14—Oncology wards
- 15—Palliative care inpatient units
- 16—Postnatal wards
- 17—Rehabilitation inpatient units
- 18—Special care nurseries

These clauses provide ratios requiring a certain number of nurses or midwives per patient on certain wards of incorporated hospitals.

Part 3—Minimum staffing requirements

19—Small hospitals

This clause provides a minimum level of staffing for a hospital site that is not a Category 1, 2, 3 or 4 hospital site.

20—State aged care

This clause provides a minimum level of staffing for aged care beds in State hospitals.

Schedule 2—Related amendments and transitional provisions

Part 1—Related amendment to *Fair Work Act 1994*

1—Amendment of section 79—Approval of enterprise agreement

This amendment to the *Fair Work Act 1994* is consequential on proposed clause 6 of this measure.

Part 2—Transitional provision

2—Moratorium on applications to SAET

Disputes arising under the Act may not be resolved through SAET and proceedings for civil penalties may not be initiated for a period of 2 years after the Act is assented to. During this time, staffing requirements imposed by the existing enterprise agreement will be enforceable, despite the operation of proposed section 13.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CLAIM FARMING) BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

FAIR WORK (WORKER ENTITLEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the House of Assembly desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

No. 1. Clause 4, page 3, lines 21 and 22 [clause 4, inserted paragraph (aa)]—Delete inserted paragraph (aa) and substitute:

- (aa) employment with a national system employer (within the meaning of the Commonwealth Act), other than in relation to an excluded subject matter (within the meaning of the *Fair Work (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2009*); or

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

**PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND
COMPENSATION**

The House of Assembly appointed Mr Hughes to the committee in place of Hon. R.K. Pearce (resigned).

At 17:45 the council adjourned until Wednesday 15 October 2025 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***SA WATER**

435 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (1 May 2025).

1. How much water entitlement (gigalitres) is held by SA Water?
2. How much water allocation (gigalitres), which the minister and SA Water is responsible for, has been utilised?
3. What was the water used for in the following financial years?
 - 2022-23
 - 2023-24
 - 2024-25 (1 May)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised by the Minister for Housing Infrastructure:

1. In total, SA Water holds 354 gigalitres of permanent entitlement for consumptive uses. This is spread across the metro River Murray and Western Mount Lofty Ranges (335 gigalitres) and regional groundwater resources (19 gigalitres) across the state.
2. Up to 30 April 2025, SA Water has used 235 gigalitres of allocation and desalinated water to supply customers across the state—158 GL from the metro River Murray and Western Mount Lofty Ranges and regionally the country River Murray licence has used more than 40 gigalitres with 11 gigalitres from regional groundwater systems. An additional 26 gigalitres of desalination water has been used in the metro and regional systems.
- 3.

Metro			
User	2022-23	2023-24	2024/25 (up to Q3)
Residential	71%	70%	68%
Public Services and Other	13%	12%	11%
Primary Producers	8%	9%	11%
Commercial and Industrial	8%	9%	10%

Regional			
User	2022-23	2023-24	2024/25 (up to Q3)
Residential	40%	41%	40%
Public Services and Other	27%	24%	24%
Primary Producers	19%	21%	21%
Commercial and Industrial	14%	14%	15%

LOWER EYRE PENINSULA AQUACULTURE ZONE

439 The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (19 August 2025).

1. In regard to PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture, Lower Eyre Peninsula Aquaculture zones (Budget Paper 3, page 103).
 - (a) How many applications have been received to date?
 - (b) Is this number more or less than anticipated by the department?
 - (c) Given the uncertainty around the future of the aquaculture industry on the lower EP, due to the decision by your government to build the desalination plant at Billy Lights Point, an active aquaculture bay, do you think your government can achieve growth in the aquaculture industry?
2. In regard to Lower Eyre Peninsula Aquaculture Zones Allocation Review, (Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 56):
 - (a) Has the government formally accepted all of the Allocation Review Committee's recommendations? If not, which recommendations have been rejected or deferred, and why?
 - (b) What timelines have been set for the staged implementation of these new management arrangements?
 - (c) How will the government ensure a fair and transparent process when reallocating access between commercial and recreational sectors?

(d) What consultation has taken place with stakeholders across both sectors regarding the proposed changes, and how have those views been incorporated into the implementation strategy?

(e) Will transitional support be provided to fishers—commercial or recreational—who may be negatively impacted by the new allocation framework?

(f) How will compliance and enforcement arrangements be adjusted to reflect any changes in access or quota allocations?

(g) Is there funding in the current budget to support implementation, including administrative changes, stakeholder engagement, and potential compensation?

(h) How will the government monitor and evaluate the outcomes of these new management arrangements to ensure sustainability and economic viability?

3. In regard to the electronic catch and disposal records, marine scale fishery, (Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 56):

(a) Given the government's continued transition of all quota fisheries to electronic submissions of catch and disposal records in 2024-25 and continued in 25-26, will this result in decreased compliance costs to industry?

(b) Has the draft harvest strategy framework for the marine scale fishing sector received positive feedback from industry?

(c) If not, what have been the major concerns?

(d) Is there a suggestion in the draft harvest strategy that there may be a reduction in the value of the quota for licence holders?

(e) Do you think that is just and fair for those fishers who have purchased additional quotas and now will be potentially told they have a reduced value of their quota?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

1. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) received 16 applications during the public call.

The Aquaculture (Zones—Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023 is one of the most diverse and in-demand aquaculture areas within state waters around Port Lincoln and was made to support the sustainable growth of aquaculture for both the existing established aquaculture sectors, such as tuna, yellowtail kingfish, and mussels, and the emerging sectors, such as seaweed. It is therefore not surprising that the number of applications received was a record number compared to previous public calls undertaken across the state's twelve aquaculture zone policies.

In regard to the desalination plant, marine science research undertaken by the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) and other external providers for SA Water has demonstrated a 12 gigalitre per year desalination plant can be built at Billy Lights Point, near Port Lincoln, with minimal impact on the marine environment, including the local aquaculture industry. The science delivery to SA Water was undertaken in collaboration with industry stakeholder groups and was reviewed by an independent expert marine science panel. The record number of applications received during the recent public call in the Aquaculture (Zones—Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023, which included applications covering the yellowtail kingfish, mussel, oyster, and seaweed aquaculture sectors, demonstrates confidence to invest and stimulate further growth in the state's most in-demand aquaculture area.

2. In regard to the Allocation Review Committee, (Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 56):

I approved all the recommendations of the Allocation Review Committee on 25 February 2025.

These approved recommendations were:

- Black bream—The recreational sector be managed back to within their allocation (their proportional share of the total five-year catch average) and consider regional management of the species with a focus on the Lakes and Coorong.
- Sand crab—The sectors be managed back within their allocations, ideally though increasing the recreational access to the species
- Yellowtail kingfish—The commercial sector be managed back within their allocation
- The assessments of King George whiting and southern garfish be put on hold until the new harvest strategy, management plan, and new recommended biological catch model are finalised.

The allocation policy provides that management arrangements required after an assessment should be introduced within two years following the outcome from a review.

To manage stakeholder expectations, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) is implementing the arrangements for yellowtail kingfish, sand crab and black bream as soon as possible—with it noted that arrangements for yellowtail kingfish were introduced on 1 July 2025 to constrain the commercial take of yellowtail kingfish ahead of the next fishing season.

For the assessments of King George whiting and southern garfish, it is anticipated that updated models for estimating recommended biological catch will be available in April 2026. The Allocation Review Committee will reconvene as soon as practical following the availability of the new models.

No allocation assessment to date has resulted in the recommendation that shares be reallocated.

It is noted the Allocation Review Committee is an independent committee and that membership is inclusive of a representative of each fishing sector. Further, fishery representatives can attend meetings as observers to ensure positions are adequately represented. Chair reports from meetings of the Allocation Review Committee are published on the PIRSA website.

Prior to implementing arrangements for yellowtail kingfish, PIRSA consulted with the peak bodies for the marine scalefish fishery on proposed management arrangements and refined the arrangements in consideration of their positions.

Ahead of changes to sand crab and black bream for the recreational fishing sector PIRSA will seek the views of RecFish SA on appropriate limits or other potential arrangements to increase access to sand crab and decrease access to black bream in the lakes and Coorong.

Where appropriate and available, PIRSA will also seek advice from the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) on the potential impact of different management arrangements.

PIRSA undertakes consultation with relevant stakeholders before management changes are made to ensure that impacts are minimised. Licence holders experiencing financial or emotional distress may access flexible payment plans, apply for a financial hardship assessment, and receive free counselling and business advice through PIRSA's Family and Business Support, and Rural Financial Counselling Service programs

Compliance arrangements remain consistent following changes in allocations or adjustments to manage within shares. Where changes are applicable to the recreational fishing sector increased education is undertaken by compliance officers as well as Fishcare volunteers and required changes made to signage and promotional material. Costs associated with managing a sector back within allocations are absorbed within regular PIRSA budget.

In the event of a reallocation of shares, provision for compensation is specified in the Fisheries Management Act 2007 and allocation policy, with any reduction in shares treated the same way as an acquisition. The allocation policy further provides that an adjustment in favour of the recreational or Aboriginal traditional fishing sectors will be funded by government, while an adjustment in favour of the commercial fishing sector will be funded by the commercial sector.

3. In regard to the electronic catch and disposal records, marine scale fishery, (Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 56):

Over the past two years, as well as this financial year, PIRSA will have committed \$1.65 million on digital initiatives to benefit the commercial seafood industry:

- \$770,000 eCDR—now complete, fishers submit catch and effort returns electronically which enables them to monitor their quota holdings in real time.
- \$130,000 Quota Trading Platform—now provides a user-friendly platform that enables fishers to trade quota privately, or to advertise quota for trade.
- \$750,000 eLogs—will enable fishers to record and submit required catch and effort data on a daily basis, allowing PIRSA stock status reporting to be created using the most up to date information.

The overall impact of these projects is significant, resulting in greater efficiencies for industry and PIRSA. These projects will also allow for improved and more efficient decision-making surrounding the management of South Australia's aquatic resources. These specific initiatives assist in the timely management of fisheries, however, do not directly correlate to reduced compliance costs to industry as audits and inspections will still be required as a part of a risk-based compliance program. It is acknowledged there may be associated administration cost reductions as a result of the efficiencies gained through the digital submission of data.

The harvest strategy framework (HSF) for the marine scalefish fishery was developed over the last two years under the guidance of the Marine Scalefish Fishery Management Advisory Committee (MSFMAC) which comprises of representatives of the commercial marine scalefish fishery (MSF) and other sector representatives together with an independent chair, independent economist, independent scientist and independent conservation scientist. The draft harvest strategy underwent consultation with peak industry bodies in 2023-24 which included a series of information sessions provided at Ceduna, Port Lincoln, Port Broughton, and Adelaide. The harvest strategy also underwent public consultation from 18 November 2024 to 31 January 2025 as a major component of the replacement management plan for the MSF which took effect from 1 July 2025.

Public and industry feedback on the management plan on balance was generally supportive, and the issues raised were carefully considered by PIRSA and the MSFMAC before a final version was endorsed.

The aim of the harvest strategy framework is for robust, transparent, and defensible mechanisms to maintain species within the MSF at sustainable levels and the fishery is managed consistent with the Fisheries Management Act 2007 and the South Australian Harvest Strategy Policy (PIRSA 2015a).

Importantly, the harvest strategy includes transitional arrangements and mechanisms to reduce impacts in the industry where large changes (up or down) in TACCs are required under to respond to increases or decreases in the size of fish stocks.

Quota unit values for species subject to a total allowable commercial catch may change each quota (financial) year, depending on available information including stock assessment reports, stock status classification and the overall performance of that species. Information regarding each stock is considered by the MSFMAC who makes recommendations to the minister on suitable catch limits each financial year.

Quota unit values (in terms of kilograms per quota unit) may increase or decrease relative to the performance of that fish stock on a financial year by year basis. This means that when a fish stock is performing well, quota unit values may increase and concurrently, if fish stock performance is decreasing, quota unit values may decrease.

Quota unit values are determined and communicated to licence holders in advance of each new quota period, allowing them to consider the economic value of temporarily increasing their quota holdings.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

444 The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (19 August 2025). Can the Minister for Health and Wellbeing advise—

1. What was the average overdue wait times, in days, for
 - (a) For category 1 elective surgery patients on public hospital waiting lists in South Australia in the financial year 2024-25?
 - (b) For category 2 elective surgery patients on public hospital waiting lists in South Australia in the financial year 2024-25?
 - (c) Category 3 elective surgery patients in South Australia on public hospital waiting lists in the financial year 2024-25?
2. How many patients in South Australia experienced adverse outcomes as a result of their elective surgery being overdue?
3. How many public hospital waiting list elective surgeries in South Australia were cancelled in 2024-25?
4. What savings did the state government make as a result of elective surgeries cancellations in 2024-25?
5. What would be the estimated cost of eliminating the waiting list for overdue elective surgeries in South Australia as of 1 June 2025?
6. What is the earliest date the elimination of overdue waiting lists could be achieved by?
7. How many elective surgeries from public hospital waiting lists has the state government agreed to perform at the Western Hospital in the financial years 2025-26; 2026-27; 2027-28?
8. How many elective surgeries from public hospital waiting lists were performed at the Western Hospital in 2024-25?
9. What was the total cost of public funded elective surgery in South Australia in 2024-25?
10. What was the median cost for a public funded elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
11. What was the median cost for a general surgery elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
12. What was the median cost for a ophthalmology elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
13. What was the median cost for a neurosurgery elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
14. What was the median cost for a orthopaedics elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
15. What was the median cost for a ENT elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
16. What was the median cost for a urology elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
17. What was the median cost for a gynaecology elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
18. What was the median cost for a vascular surgery elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?

19. What was the median cost for a plastic surgery elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
20. What was the median cost for a thoracic surgery elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?
21. What was the median cost for a cranio-facial surgery elective surgery procedure in 2024-25?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Statistics on elective surgery are regularly reported by the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare, the Productivity Commission Report on Government Services, annual reports of local health networks, state budget papers, and reports from the Independent Hospital and Aged Care Pricing Authority.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (5 March 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): I have been advised:

Each year the government tables a significant volume of annual reports in each house of parliament. It is not my practice to edit or remove pages from these reports prior to tabling.

The document to which the honourable member refers was one page included amongst the 2021-22 and 2022-23 annual reports of the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal. It was included amongst the other pages of the report and tabled accordingly.

I was subsequently made aware that the tribunal hadn't intended for this particular page to be tabled with the rest of the report. Following this, I asked my department to ensure processes were in place to review future annual reports for this issue in future.

I have also corresponded with the presiding member of the tribunal and am advised that the tribunal has revised its processes. Further, I note that the Legal Practitioners (Disciplinary Matters and Fidelity Fund) Amendment Bill is currently before the council. This bill proposes to abolish the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal and transfer its functions to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

NATIONAL AGREEMENT ON CLOSING THE GAP

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (20 March 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Child Protection has advised:

Significant efforts continue to be made by the Department for Child Protection to improve outcomes against target 12 of the Closing the Gap framework. We are seeing results with the growth rate of the Aboriginal in-care population dropping from 13.1 per cent in 2019-20 to 2.3 per cent in 2024-25, after seeing no growth at all in 2023-24.

The Children and Young People (Safety and Support) Act 2025 embeds the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle to the standard of active efforts, requiring that steps taken must be timely, practicable, thorough and purposeful, consistent with the explanation provided by SNAICC. Part 4 of the new act further:

- requires active efforts be made to explore reunification between an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child or young person and their parents;
- embeds the principle of family-led decision-making in legislation, including the requirement to promote self-determination, participation and shared decision-making;
- mandates that regard be given to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child rearing practices when considering the best interests of an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child or young person; and
- enables the progressive delegation of authority to Aboriginal entities, supporting greater self-determination and cultural-specific service delivery through the use of ACCOs and Aboriginal organisations across the sector.

The government further continues its significant investment in family group conferencing as another mechanism through which safety can be achieved through family-led decision-making, with the 2023-24 state budget allocating an additional \$13.4 million to expand family group conferencing services, including culturally specific offerings to Aboriginal families in partnership with AFSS.

Further initiatives continue to achieve positive outcomes in supporting Aboriginal children and young people to transition from residential care into family-based care placements. In partnership with Kornar Winmil Yunti (KWY), the Finding Families program recognises the importance of Aboriginal children being connected to family, culture, country and community.

Understanding the importance of privileging the voices of Aboriginal children and young people and to learn from their experiences and insights, as part of the 2022-23 budget, the government invested \$3.2 million over five years to support the establishment of Wakwakurna Kanyini the peak body for Aboriginal children and young people.

The peak, along with representatives from SAACCON and key government agencies, as members of the Child Protection Subcommittee of the South Australian Partnership Committee on Closing the Gap, will be critical partners in co-designing the department's ongoing reform work to progress achievements towards target 12.

The subcommittee, formed under the SA Closing the Gap governance structure, provides a dedicated, cross-agency focus on enabling Aboriginal-led governance, decision-making and service delivery across the child protection and family support system.

Since June 2024, the department has entered into a memorandum of understanding with SAACCON to co-design policy and place-based initiatives to address the overrepresentation of Aboriginal children and young people in care.

The government recognises that delivering genuine and lasting change requires a deliberate shift in how we support Aboriginal children and families. The government continues its reform efforts and continues to drive key initiatives to address the rate of Aboriginal over-representation as part of our steadfast commitment to making meaningful advancements towards the achievement of target 12.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (13 May 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): I am advised that Premier's Direction—Induction requires all new SAES executives to participate in a SAES induction program within the first 12 months of a SAES contract.

The executive induction program is offered twice a year by the South Australian Leadership Academy within the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. The South Australian Leadership Academy also delivers the Executive Excellence Program which is designed for executives to advance their capability and extend their leadership impact and influence.

Individual government agencies also deliver tailored training for their executive teams and encourage executives to participate in other professional development programs to support their development.

Additionally, leaders in the public sector who fall within the SA Executive Service classification (SAES) must adhere to their employment contract, which provides that the executive will undertake their duties in accordance with the South Australian Executive Charter (the charter), the South Australian Executive Competency Framework (the framework) and various pieces of legislation.

The charter requires leaders to model the highest professional standards and live the public sector values.

The framework requires leaders to demonstrate and integrate values and ethics into organisational practices and model and build a culture of respect.

It provides the mechanism by which the SA Executive Service links attraction, recruitment, development, performance assessment and retention of executives across the public sector to a set of competencies that articulate the specific behaviours required to achieve optimum performance levels.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES, WORKPLACE CULTURE

In reply to **the Hon. B.R. HOOD** (13 May 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): I have been advised that following the People Matter Employee Survey (PMES) conducted by the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment in 2024, public sector agencies were provided with their results and were asked to progress the implementation of agency-specific action plans to respond to issues identified in the survey.

A sector-wide engagement plan to drive improvement in priority focus areas is also being prepared which will complement the agency-specific action plans.

The Consumer and Business Services (CBS) PMES results are included in the results for the Attorney-General's Department, who are responsible for determining any appropriate actions in response to the survey results across all its business units, including CBS. Generally, the CBS survey results reflected the broader agency results.'

ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (15 May 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Local Government has advised:

Councils, including the City of Adelaide, are responsible for determining the parking controls that apply on their roads, and are authorised to issue expiation notices for parking infringements on these roads.

Any person with concerns about the parking controls put in place by the City of Adelaide should engage with that council, including the council's elected members, to put their views forward.

ALGAL BLOOM

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (3 June 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

Stansbury commercial shellfish harvest area was closed on 5 May 2025 due to the detection of Brevetoxins in oysters, a neurotoxic shellfish poison.

Brevetoxins are not produced by *Karenia mikimotoi*, the algae linked to fish deaths in waters around Fleurieu Peninsula, specifically near Waitpinga and Parsons Beach.

The presence of *Karenia mikimotoi* does not exclude the presence of brevetoxin-producing species of algae. More than one *Karenia* species can be present.

Brevetoxin is produced by specific microalgae species, such as *Karenia brevisulcata*, *Karenia brevis* and *Karenia concordia*.

Neurotoxin shellfish poison levels in shellfish above regulatory limits are harmful to humans if consumed.

Levels of brevetoxin initially detected in Stansbury were below regulatory limits. Following the initial detection, the South Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (SASQAP) initiated weekly monitoring of oysters and has since detected levels above the regulatory limits.

This is expected as oysters are filter feeders and will accumulate the toxin while the algae remains in the water. It is expected there will be a delay between decreasing levels of algae in the water and the reduction of the toxin within the oysters.

Stansbury has remained closed since 5 May 2025.

Brevetoxins have also been detected in shellfish from harvesting areas of Coobowie, Port Vincent, American River and within the exclusion zone of the Coorong. These areas remain closed for commercial shellfish harvest and continue to be monitored weekly by SASQAP.

During the closure period, oysters remain viable with accredited oyster producers able to continue farming and grading oysters.

The reopening of any closed harvesting area will be in line with the South Australia Biotxin Management Plan. This requires two consecutive weeks of shellfish samples showing a decline in brevetoxin levels that are below the regulatory limits. Water samples must also show a reduction in *Karenia* species.

Once the reopening process is complete, shellfish harvested from these areas will be available on the market as they will have met the food safety requirements and be safe to eat.

SASQAP has not received any reports of loss of oysters associated with the brevetoxin detections.

ALGAL BLOOM

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (3 June 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

Whilst there has been a marine heatwave affecting South Australia since September 2024, this does not mean that a harmful algal bloom has been present in South Australian waters since this time. A marine heatwave may contribute to a harmful algal bloom forming, but often it will not.

PIRSA investigates all reported fish kill events to rule out infectious and notifiable diseases, establish the cause and coordinate a response where necessary.

On Sunday afternoon, 16 March 2025, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) received a report via the FishWatch hotline of up to 100 people having fallen ill after surfing at Waitpinga on the Fleurieu Peninsula.

Further information was received on Monday morning, also via the FishWatch hotline, indicating that there had been fish kills at Waitpinga and Parsons Beach.

A PIRSA officer attended Waitpinga and Victor Harbor on Monday 17 March 2025 to investigate the fish kills. The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) also attended the Waitpinga site.

Water samples collected as part of those investigations were able to positively identify microalgae *Karenia mikimotoi* as the cause of the event within one week of the event first being reported.

ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IN CARE

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (17 June 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Child Protection has advised:

The Children and Young People (Safety and Support) Act 2025 ('the CYPSS Act'), passed by parliament in June 2025, represents a landmark reform of the child protection and family support system and enacts key elements of the government's response to the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People's Holding on to Our Future Inquiry Report. The CYPSS Act reframes the system to ensure Aboriginal self-determination is supported as a foundational principle enlivened throughout all stages of its operation and enforcement.

Implementation activities to support the full realisation of the act over the transition period will be co-designed in partnership with Aboriginal peak organisations and representatives. During this period, investment and reform opportunities to support the delegation of key functions and powers to recognised Aboriginal entities will be explored as part of the new powers of delegation provided for at section 54 of the act.

In addition to enshrining its responses to a number of the Holding on to Our Future recommendations in the CYPSS Act, the government has established a Child Protection Subcommittee under the South Australian Partnership Committee on Closing the Gap. The subcommittee is providing oversight of further activities to support implementation of the government's response to Holding on to Our Future.

While the new legislation provides a transformative framework within which government will work with Aboriginal service providers, representative bodies, families, children and young people, the state government will also work closely with Wakwakurna Kanyini, SAACCON and other key stakeholders to explore further policy and practice improvements in all areas of activity within the child protection and family support system, including the use of various types of guardianship orders.

The 2023-24 state budget allocated an additional \$13.4 million over five years to expand family group conferencing (FGC), including culturally specific models delivered in partnership with Aboriginal Family Support Services. FGC outcomes remain strong.

The act mandates that an FGC must be convened before the court can make final custody or guardianship orders for Aboriginal children.

DCP is also addressing the over-representation of Aboriginal children in residential care through various programs which are successfully reconnecting Aboriginal children and young people with family, culture, country, and community.

Supplementary: the state government is committed to working in partnership with Aboriginal people and organisations to deliver meaningful change within the child protection and family support system, which is what the former Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People sought in her Holding on to Our Future Report.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT CENSORSHIP

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (17 June 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Local Government has advised:

The *Behavioural Standards for Council Members* requires that members must, when making public comments including comments to the media, on council decisions and council matters, show respect for others and clearly indicate their views are personal and are not those of their council.

As set out in the behavioural standards, the community expects council members to put personal differences aside, to focus on the work of the council and to engage with each other and council employees in a mature and professional manner.

The Ombudsman acts impartially and is independent of ministers and the government.

MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORT FOR FARMERS

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (17 June 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

Under the \$1 million wellbeing initiative allocated to PIRSA, regional activities are being delivered by Breakthrough Mental Health Research Foundation, Fat Farmers, Grain Producers SA, ifarmwell and Livestock SA.

Under the \$2.5 million mental health strategy allocated to SA Health in the second drought support package announced in April 2025, activities include expanded mental health services in drought affected regions that provide additional referral pathways for rural people needing support.

COUNCIL CEO SALARIES

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (17 June 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): The Minister for Local Government has advised:

Under section 99A of the Local Government Act 1999, the remuneration of the chief executive officer (CEO) of a council will be determined by the council. A council must ensure that the remuneration of its CEO is within the relevant minimum and maximum remuneration determined by the Remuneration Tribunal of South Australia (the Remuneration Tribunal).

On 16 May 2025, the Remuneration Tribunal made its most recent determination of minimum and maximum remuneration for council CEOs.

The Remuneration Tribunal is independent and not subject to ministerial direction regarding its determinations on council CEO remuneration.

SEAGRASS TRIALS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (18 June 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

That SARDI has recently undertaken a three-year seagrass restoration project off Port Gawler with the assistance of the University of Adelaide, and funded by the Commonwealth Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water through 1 of 5 Blue Carbon Ecosystem Restoration grants awarded nationally.

During this project, 100,000 hessian sandbags were deployed in May/June 2023 and 2024 to provide stable substrate for naturally present seagrass seedlings (wireweed) to attach to and gain a foothold that helps them to withstand winter storms. A further 5,000 bags were deployed in January 2024 and 2025 with seedlings of another species (strapweed) planted into them. The sandbags were deployed over 14 hectares. Few seedlings attached in the winter of 2023, with higher numbers attaching in 2024.

While the remaining seedlings have shown good growth, it is expected to be around a decade before the site returns to a natural looking seagrass meadow, as this requires the seagrasses to mature and send out runners to colonise bare sand in between the bags. The biodegradable bags will rot away within two years, but by this time the seedlings should be large enough to survive on their own.

In addition to seedlings on the bags, summer 2025 was an exceptional year for natural settlement of strapweed seedlings into both the restored area and nearby bare sand, with the presence of bags doubling the number of seedlings settling into adjacent bare sand. A detailed report is currently being produced and will be made available on the PIRSA website once completed.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

In reply to **the Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition)** (18 June 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

Neither the funding agreements with the charities nor the scheme guidelines state that hay cannot be provided to a farmer more than once.

In round 2 of the scheme, the aim is for primary producers who have not yet received any donated hay to be targeted in future deliveries.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions has had discussions with the participating charities regarding spread of distribution so that hay deliveries are not concentrated in only certain areas and those most in need do not miss out.

ALGAL BLOOM

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (19 August 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

Over 80 marine and environmental experts attended all or part of the Algal Bloom Science Forum, held on 3 June 2025 at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre in Adelaide and online via Microsoft Teams. A total of 24 scientists attended the entire four-hour forum in person; another 32 accounts (of experts and expert groups)

attended online. The 55 (in-person and online accounts) participants are listed on the forum summary document, which is publicly available on the PIRSA website.

Some participant names are not captured in the document because some online accounts had multiple participants, and some people attended only part of the forum addressing their area of expertise.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (20 August 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Since opening, the Transition Care Service (TCS) has admitted 231 patients and successfully discharged 211, with an average length of stay of just over 20 days. This represents more than 4,500 patient care days delivered and has eased demand on acute hospital beds by supporting timely discharge into a subacute recovery environment.

The service is designed with clear length-of-stay targets by patient cohort, and discharge dates are actively monitored through joint clinical decision-making between Amplar Health and SALHN. A target of less than 20 per cent of patients exceeding their planned stay ensures the model remains focused on throughput, timely discharge, and preventing bottlenecks.

It is acknowledged that timely access to residential aged care, disability supports, or private care services is becoming more challenging across the health system. The Transition Care Service has been specifically designed to address this gap by providing safe, high-quality subacute care while longer term pathways are arranged. Early discharge planning, estimated discharge dates, and proactive social work involvement are embedded into the model, with strong partnerships being developed with aged-care providers, NDIS supports, and community services. This ensures patients and families are supported to transition into the most appropriate next stage of care, while protecting hospitals from unnecessary bed blockages. The TCS provides an end-to-end, multidisciplinary model of care that optimises patient function and quality of life while ensuring person-centred discharge planning. This approach reduces the risk of readmission and strengthens connections to primary and community care.

To further strengthen system flow, the service is expanding from 24 to 48 beds. This expansion is supported by an uplift in workforce, including an increase in clinical leadership and the addition of a dedicated service manager, alongside expanded allied health input.

Through these measures, the TCS is delivering high-quality, efficient, and appropriate care while supporting broader health system objectives to reduce ambulance ramping and improve hospital access.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing are working closely with the AMA in the development of a shared action plan to deliver practical solutions across the South Australian healthcare system that will support the interface between acute hospital care and primary health care.

This action plan will include opportunities for increased collaboration on key improvement areas including access to information for general practice, navigation to out of hospital services, outpatient reform, and virtual and in-home care for residents in aged-care homes.

COVID-19 VACCINATIONS

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (20 August 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

SA Health recommendations for COVID-19 vaccines have always reflected those of ATAGI, including this most recent update to recommendations for healthy infants, children and adolescents aged less than 18 years.

Information published on the SA Health website links to the current advice from the commonwealth Department of Health, Disability and Ageing.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS, MULTICULTURAL PATIENTS

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (21 August 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

1. SA Health has transitioned to a digital survey, improving accessibility and significantly increasing sample size.

Recent patient reported experience measures (1 January 2025 to 30 June 2025) show that over 90 per cent of inpatients across three metropolitan local health networks reported their cultural and spiritual beliefs were 'always' or 'mostly' respected during their hospital stay.

2. Hospitals across the state have measures in place to ensure CALD patients are supported from the point of admission. Admission areas display accessible information and inclusive imagery via posters to raise awareness of cultural needs and empowers patients to voice their individual preferences throughout their inpatient stay. Interpreter services, multilingual resources, and bedside communication boards are readily available to support patient engagement.

In addition, all SA Health staff are mandated to complete a compulsory cultural competency training module, designed to equip them with the essential skills to provide culturally appropriate care. This training is reinforced by the consumer engagement framework, which ensures consistent and meaningful engagement with patients from diverse communities.

Hospitals across the state are progressing several ongoing initiatives, including co-designed cultural care planning tools, consumer-led listening posts, improved access to spiritual care services, and enhanced data collection to inform culturally responsive service planning.

SA Health remains committed to strengthening these measures and working with CALD communities to ensure care is responsive to their needs.

3. Recent patient reported experience measures (1 January 2025 to 30 June 2025) show that over 90 per cent of inpatients across three metropolitan local health networks reported their cultural and spiritual beliefs were 'always' or 'mostly' respected during their hospital stay. This demonstrates strong foundations in equitable care.

SA Health recognises that new and emerging communities may have evolving needs, and remains committed to continuous improvement to ensure our services are inclusive and responsive for all consumers.

RSPCA

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (2 September 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA), RSPCA and DEW are operating under an MOU that was negotiated and signed off by the chief executives of RSPCA, DEW and PIRSA in 2015. All departments and the RSPCA continue to operate within the scope of the MOU. I am advised the MOU is due to be reviewed this year—2025.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL ACCESS IN REMOTE SOUTH AUSTRALIA

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (2 September 2025).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

Ambulance services in many remote communities in South Australia are provided by the Royal Flying Doctor Service (RFDS). This is especially so in very remote communities such as Innamincka. Innamincka RFDS clinic is staffed by remote area nurses who are employed by the RFDS to provide emergency and primary healthcare responses to Innamincka and surrounding communities. Patients requiring additional clinical support are generally escalated through RFDS internal care pathways. Patients requiring aeromedical evacuation are also typically coordinated by the RFDS where they activate a RFDS primary response using fixed wing aircraft.

SAAS review their response capacity routinely in conjunction with the RFDS.

PIG DEATHS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (4 September 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

It is not appropriate for the government to make any comments in relation to potential breaches against the Animal Welfare Act as the matter is currently subject to an active investigation by the RSPCA.

PIG DEATHS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (4 September 2025).

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries): I am advised:

PIRSA received an email from a concerned member of the public, which contained both photos and videos of pigs allegedly taken from the Dublin site, owned by Andgar Props. The videos showed significant overcrowding of pigs in an 'eco shelter' and pigs covered in mud due to the shelter not being cleaned out.

A second video showed pigs struggling to walk through deep mud and wet shelter litter in what appeared to be a separate eco shelter. Both videos showed unacceptable living conditions due to overcrowding of pigs and inadequate cleaning of the shelters. PIRSA immediately passed the email and footage to the RSPCA, who are the lead agency for animal welfare investigations.