

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 16 October 2025

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 11:00 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.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (11:02): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers, the giving of notices of motion and questions without notice to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Bills

UNCLAIMED GOODS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 August 2025.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (11:03): I rise to speak in support of the Unclaimed Goods (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2025, an overdue reform that brings clarity, fairness and modernisation to a piece of legislation that has remained largely unchanged since 1987.

This bill responds to the practical realities faced by South Australians, particularly small businesses, tradespeople and service providers, who regularly find themselves in possession of goods that have been abandoned, forgotten or simply left behind. The current framework has been cumbersome, outdated and, in many cases, onerous.

One of the most vocal and constructive contributors to this reform has been the Motor Trade Association of South Australia. The MTA has consistently advocated for clearer, more efficient processes for dealing with unclaimed vehicles and parts. Automotive businesses, whether they are mechanics, panelbeaters or other businesses, often face the dilemma of storing uncollected vehicles for months, incurring costs, legal implications and uncertainty.

This bill provides a practical solution. By introducing a tier system based on the value of goods, the bill allows for proportionate responses. Low-value items can be dealt with more swiftly, while higher value goods are subject to appropriate safeguards, including court oversight. For motor vehicles, the requirement to search the Personal Property Securities Register and notify registered interest holders ensures that legitimate claims are respected while still allowing businesses to move forward when vehicles are clearly abandoned.

Beyond the automotive sector, the bill also addresses broader concerns. It updates terminology to reflect modern usage, replacing 'bailee' and 'bailor' with 'recipient' and 'provider', and introduces electronic communication as a valid method of giving notice. These changes make the law more accessible and more aligned with how people and businesses operate today.

Importantly, the bill also introduces record-keeping requirements, liability protections and a more equitable approach to recovering costs. For example, it removes the need to establish a lien in

order to recover expenses—an issue that has particularly affected those caring for abandoned animals in boarding facilities and other animal care businesses.

This is a well-considered reform. It balances the rights of owners with the practical needs of those left holding unclaimed goods. It reflects consultation with industry, legal experts and community stakeholders, and it brings South Australian law in line with contemporary expectations. With those remarks, I commend the bill.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (11:06): I rise to add to the already, I think, quite expansive comments by the Hon. Ms Lee in regard to this bill. It makes a range of amendments to the Unclaimed Goods Act, primarily focused on modernisation and reducing the regulatory burden on business, as Ms Lee has outlined.

Businesses and other persons with a lawful way to dispose of goods have often been left with those goods abandoned or in their possession, or indeed in the ownership of another person. As Ms Lee said, the Motor Trade Association was the first stakeholder to raise issues with the current act, largely in the context of them representing various members of their association who are often dumped with vehicles that are left by former clients who are not able to afford the fee for a car repair and so they never collect their vehicle.

This consequently places significant onus on the mechanic to abide by the law, which requires quite significant wait periods, which are often greatly out of proportion to the value of any vehicle left in their possession. Some of the most significant reforms contained in the bill include, obviously, the modernisation of language and recognition of prior agreement which allows parties to set their own conditions regarding the disposal of unclaimed goods prior to any goods being left in their possession.

As Ms Lee went somewhat to, there are changes of scales of value which determine the processes required for disposing of unclaimed goods. There are simplified methods of disposal in relation to how that scale operates and modernisation of processes for serving notices to the provider, the owner and any other interested parties. There is a reduction of various time requirements, meaning that unclaimed goods do not have to be retained for such long periods before they can be disposed of.

The scales specifically are set at scale 1, where goods are valued at \$200 or less, or, if in relation to a motor vehicle, \$1,000 or less. There is scale 2, which is goods valued between \$200 and \$20,000, or, in the case of a motor vehicle, between \$1,000 and \$20,000. Finally, there is scale 3, which is goods valued at \$20,000 or more.

The reduction of the collection period reduces the collection period to 14 days. Goods will be treated as unclaimed goods if the recipient has been unable to obtain the contact details of the provider or the owner for the purpose of providing notice, despite any reasonable attempts to do so. The bill prescribes differing holding periods, depending on the value of those goods; for instance, scale 1 goods is 14 days, scale 2 goods is 28 days, and scale 3 goods is 60 days.

The bill makes clear that the act only applies to the extent that there is no existing agreement between the parties about how any unclaimed goods can be disposed of. This will allow businesses to set conditions regarding the disposal of unclaimed goods prior to agreeing to any goods being left in their possession and this is, frankly, consistent with every other jurisdiction in Australia.

The bill contains a new requirement on recipients to give the provider of the goods and, where known, any owner of the goods notice of their intention to dispose of the goods under the act and the holding period does not commence until such notice has been given, unless the recipient is unable to obtain that person's contact details despite any reasonable attempts to do so.

The act currently requires notices to be delivered to the last known address of the provider. The bill modernises the approach to delivery of notices and other documents by permitting them to be given personally, by post, via email, or in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

Public notices: currently, where the identity or whereabouts of the provider of unclaimed goods is unknown, the recipient is required to publish a notice in a newspaper generally circulating throughout the state. This requirement is, these days, quite unduly expensive and no longer really

serves any apparent functional purpose. The bill abolishes the requirement and instead where a recipient is unable to serve a notice via any of the approved methods of communication they must attempt to contact the person via any available method of communication. If the recipient is unable to obtain any contact details of the person, despite reasonable attempts to do so, no further action to notify the person is required.

In regard to method of disposal, again we go back to the scales. For scale 1 goods, they are simply vested in the recipient at the expiry of the holding period. The recipient becomes the owner of the goods and can retain or dispose of goods on scale 1 as they wish. With scale 2 goods, the bill permits scale 2 goods to be sold by public auction or private sale for a fair value. Scale 2 goods may be otherwise disposed of in accordance with an order of the court. Finally, with scale 3 goods, the existing requirement in the act to obtain a court order before disposing of the goods remains in effect.

Where the recipient makes an application to the court, the court may give such directions in relation to the disposal of the goods or any other dealing with the goods as the court thinks fit. It may also permit the goods to be disposed of earlier than permitted under the act if compliance with the requirements of the act would be unreasonable in the circumstances.

The bill contains separate provisions for the disposal of special categories of unclaimed goods. Specifically, those are personal documents, perishable goods, rubbish and motor vehicles. If they are rubbish, they are automatically treated as unclaimed goods and do not require any notice to be given and can be disposed of in any manner.

Perishable goods and goods that are likely to cause risk to the health and safety of the person are automatically treated as unclaimed goods. The recipient must give any relevant person a notice of intention to dispose of the goods, which may be given orally or in writing, or through any available method of communication. The recipient may then dispose of the goods in any manner after a reasonable period of time, having regard to the nature and condition of the goods, I imagine, depending upon how perishable they are.

Personal documents, including, for example, passports, birth certificates, legal documents pertaining to the person and any documents containing personal or financial or medical information, must not be sold and may only be disposed of in a manner that protects the security of the document and any personal information contained therein. The recipient must give any relevant person a notice of intention to dispose of the goods in accordance with the act, after which the holding period of 28 days does apply.

Specifically, I will go to motor vehicles. Where the unclaimed goods consist of or include a motor vehicle within the meaning of the Personal Property Securities Act, that being a commonwealth act, the bill places additional requirements on the recipient before the goods are vested in the recipient or may be disposed of. These apply in addition to the usual requirements for scale 1, 2 or 3 goods.

The bill requires the recipient to search the Personal Properties Securities Register for data relating to the motor vehicle. If that search reveals any person with a registered interest in the motor vehicle, that person must also be given a notice of intention to dispose of the goods before the relevant holding period may commence. A number of changes were made to the bill as a result of consultation. This includes:

- setting a special scale 1 limit of \$1,000 for motor vehicles;
- extending the right to claim goods directly from the recipient to the owner of the goods, in addition to the provider of the goods;
- introduction of a mechanism for other parties claiming an interest in the goods to apply to the court; and
- clarification of the charges that a recipient may demand before handing goods over to the provider or owner.

Submissions were received from an extensive number of stakeholders: the Crown Solicitor, the Treasurer, the Commissioner of Police, the Commissioner of Consumer and Business Services, the South Australian Housing Trust, the Small Business Commissioner, the Chief Justice, the Chief

Magistrate, the State Courts Administrator, the Motor Trade Association, the SA Business Chamber, the Law Society, the Legal Services Commission, and Bridgestone. What an extensive list of people who took a great deal of interest in what seems to be a fantastic bill. I support it.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (11:15): I rise to speak in support of the Unclaimed Goods (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2025. This bill takes notable steps to recognise that the way South Australians do business and the expectation of customers have evolved significantly over the past 40 years. The pace of commerce, communication and service delivery today is vastly different from when the original act was written.

For many small and medium-sized businesses, dealing with unclaimed goods has become an unnecessary administrative burden, whether it is a mechanic, a drycleaner, a repair shop or a storage provider. These are everyday businesses trying to deliver efficient service, meet customer expectations and simply get on with the job. Under the current act, many of these businesses that hold unclaimed goods often face a cumbersome and outdated process before they can lawfully dispose of or sell unclaimed items. This can create unnecessary burdens and, at times, confusion about their legal obligations.

The bill before us introduces a more streamlined and modern framework. It establishes three value-based scales for unclaimed goods—scales 1, 2 and 3—providing clear thresholds and timeframes for disposal. Scale 1 goods, valued at \$200 or less, may be dealt with after 14 days. Scale 2 goods, valued between \$200 and \$20,000, may be dealt with after 28 days. Scale 3 goods, valued at \$20,000 or more, may be dealt with after 60 days, subject to court oversight. We also know that the bill contains separate provisions for the disposal of special categories of unclaimed goods, including rubbish, perishable goods and goods that are likely to cause a risk to the health and safety of a person, personal documents and motor vehicles.

The intent of this bill is to make that process clearer, simpler and fairer. It aims to ease the red tape that too often slows down business operations, while still protecting the rights of individuals to reclaim their property within a reasonable timeframe. In other words, it seeks to strike the right balance, a balance that supports both responsibility and practicality.

But, as with any reform, change should not be made for its own sake. Every change should be guided by the principles of improving efficiency, reducing unnecessary costs and removing duplication, not adding to it. We must always be mindful that, in trying to make things simpler, governments do not inadvertently create new complexities. This bill, in our view, largely meets that test. It provides businesses with the confidence to act lawfully and efficiently, and it gives customers the continued assurance that their rights remain protected.

This bill also deals with the kinds of situations that affect ordinary South Australians when items are left with a business for repair or cleaning, handed to a friend for safekeeping, or simply forgotten in a rental property or workplace. These are everyday circumstances and this legislation seeks to bring some clarity to how these goods should be managed.

While we acknowledge the need to update an outdated framework, it is important that any change genuinely improves certainty and fairness for all involved, rather than adding further complexity. For these reasons, the Liberal Party will be supporting the Unclaimed Goods (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 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) (11:18): I thank all members who have contributed to this debate. I want to thank all those who were involved in the consultation. The Hon. Justin Hanson has read out a comprehensive list of those who were involved in the thorough consultation, but I particularly want to acknowledge the Motor Trade Association, on whose members the burden regularly falls in terms of vehicles that are left and are very costly to dispose of. Certainly, the genesis of this bill was the discussions with the MTA, and then there was a lot of further input from a wide range of contributors. With that, I look forward to the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The Law Society in their submission noted anecdotal evidence—sorry, anecdotal experience, I should say—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The CHAIR: Deputy Premier, it is early.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Yes, settle down, Attorney.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: —from members of the society's Country Practitioners Committee raising concerns about livestock being left on land for extended periods beyond what was agreed, causing potential financial loss for landowners. My questions for the Deputy Premier are: has the government considered seeking further feedback on whether this is a significant issue in regional South Australia? Does the Deputy Premier intend to explore any legislative reform, possibly through alignment with or review of the Impounding Act 1920, to address these circumstances?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question; it is a good question. There are regimes that sit side by side in terms of disposal of goods under this act, under things like the Residential Tenancies Act and the Impounding Act, as the honourable member has mentioned. We certainly have taken into account the concerns that were raised. The disposal of livestock can be done under a couple of different ways—the Impounding Act or the Unclaimed Goods Act—so the changes we have made here go a long way to address the concerns, because, I am advised, this act can be used in those circumstances.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Just as a supplementary to that question: will the government commit to consulting with the farming and pastoral representative bodies to determine whether further reform or clearer guidance is required to address instances of unclaimed livestock?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that many of the issues the Law Society raised, specifically on the issue the honourable member talks about, we have addressed through the regime that deals with all goods, including unclaimed livestock, but if there are any other issues that are not covered by this regime I am sure that my colleague who has carriage of the other bits of legislation will be happy to look at other issues raised.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Similarly, we have also had feedback regarding horse agistment. Are there instances where an owner is no longer capable or willing to ensure the final upkeep of an agistment animal, particularly I guess horses—things such as feed, veterinary bills etc.—and therefore may abandon the animal altogether? Is this circumstance covered by this bill or is there a lien on the horse under contract law or any other provision?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that we have taken that into consideration. I am advised that, rather than the need for a lien to be created, we have taken that into account in this regime, so you can process that as unclaimed goods in this regime. So there is not that need, in the circumstances the honourable member raised, to create a lien.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 12), schedule 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) (11:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HIGHWAYS (WORKS FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 October 2024.)

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (11:27): I rise as the lead speaker for the opposition on the Highways (Works for Residential Developments) Amendment Bill 2024, and to outline our concerns and our opposition in regard to this amendment bill. While the government's intent to address incomplete residential developments is acknowledged, the bill itself raises several serious issues, so we cannot support it in its current form, as we have expressed in the other place as well.

The powers granted to the Commissioner of Highways and the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport in this bill go far beyond what is reasonable, in our opinion. The bill seeks to give sweeping authority to state bodies, while disregarding the fundamental role that local councils play in managing development within their communities, and that is certainly the feedback we have heard from a number of councils around the state.

The most glaring issue within this bill is the way that it bypasses local councils. Under this legislation the Commissioner of Highways is given the power to step in and complete infrastructure works if and when a developer fails. On the surface this might seem like a positive move, most especially given the issues around Felmeri that we saw a year or so ago. Of course, we would not want unfinished roads and essential services not completed.

However, the problem ultimately lies in how this will be done. The commissioner can bypass the usual planning processes under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Local councils, which are responsible for approving and overseeing development, are sidelined. The commissioner can intervene without the council's agreement or even without their full understanding of what is ultimately happening on the ground in their patch.

As a former deputy mayor and local councillor, I know that local councils know their communities. They are best placed to manage the needs of their residents and the specific requirements and developments within their regions. By allowing the state government to come in and override these local decision-makers, this bill does undermine local governance and erodes the ability of councils to represent their constituents. I guess the question is: how are local communities supposed to feel confident about their needs being met when the state government can push ahead without considering local input?

Another key issue of the bill is the lack of proper safeguards and oversight. The commissioner is granted significant powers to carry out roadworks and other prescribed infrastructure works in designated residential areas, but I guess the question remains: where are the checks and balances? As far as we can see, there is no clear mechanism to ensure the commissioner's actions are aligned with local government goals or the broader community interests.

The bill grants the commissioner power to recover costs from councils or developers, but there is no clear clarity around how disputes over the cost will be managed. What happens if a council disagrees with the commissioner's decision to step in or objects to the costs being imposed on them? This bill provides no clear process for remediation or appeal with regard to the council. It puts councils at a financial and administrative disadvantage, particularly smaller regional councils that may not have the resources to challenge the state's decisions. Without proper oversight, these powers could be open to abuse, and there is little in the bill that provides the necessary safeguards to protect against this.

On the financial burdens of councils, the financial implications of this bill for local councils, especially regional ones, cannot be overstated. The bill makes it clear that councils cannot pass the costs on for the works to ratepayers through additional rates, levies or fees. While we agree that ratepayers should never bear the financial burden of incomplete developments, this restriction does leave councils with no real clear way to recover costs. What happens when a small regional council

is forced to pay for roadworks or essential services in a development where the developer has failed and they cannot recoup the costs? This could lead to councils having to divert funds from other important local services, which ultimately affects the entire community.

In some cases, councils may be more risk-averse in approving developments altogether, which of course would be a very perverse outcome, most especially as we suffer through a housing crisis. If the fear is for the council that they will be left holding a bill for incomplete works they may impose stricter conditions on developers or delay approvals, which ultimately will negatively impact housing growth and development growth, particularly in regional areas where development is essential for economic and community development, and the capital costs to develop in the regions are obviously higher.

By granting the minister the power to designate areas for prescribed works, this bill does open the door for political interference. The minister can decide, at their discretion, to designate a residential development area for intervention, but what guarantees are there that these decisions will be made on a genuine need rather than political convenience?

Local planning authorities are already equipped to handle these decisions. By allowing the state to override their authority, we are creating confusion over who is ultimately responsible for the development outcomes. It is not just a question of good governance; it is ultimately about maintaining the integrity of the planning system and ensuring that local councils can retain the powers they need to serve their communities effectively.

Finally, the process behind this bill has raised concerns with regard to the level of consultation with key stakeholders. Consultation with local councils, developers and community groups: have they been adequately consulted? We know the former Minister for Infrastructure and Transport in the other place, during the second reading and committee stages, started off pretty bolshy on this bill but ultimately was saying that there might be some room for us to move. It does not seem like that has happened, and the concerns still exist there with the LGA and others in the drafting of this bill. From what we do understand, there has been little engagement with those who are ultimately affected by these changes, which only adds to our concerns that the bill will create more problems than it can actually solve.

To conclude, the Liberal Party recognises that the need to address the issue of incomplete residential developments is an important one, even though we have not necessarily seen it a lot, apart from when we speak to the \$3.5 million that was put into sorting out the Felmeri issue, as I stated earlier in the second reading. We should address the issue of incomplete residential developments, but we cannot support a bill that tries to do that by undermining local councils, which lacks proper oversight, places financial burdens on communities and can open the door to political interference.

What we do need is a legislative framework that empowers local councils, provides them with the tools to manage development correctly and efficiently, and ensures that the state only intervenes when absolutely necessary and always with the proper safeguards in place. This bill, as it stands, does not meet those requirements. We urge the government to rethink its approach and we will be opposing the bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:34): I rise to indicate my opposition to this bill. I consider it to be poorly thought through and something that poses significant risks to councils. The bill responds to a community title development at 1700 South Road, O'Halloran Hill, in the electorate of Davenport. Felmeri Homes went into liquidation in July 2023 before finishing the homes and the common infrastructure, including the common driveway and stormwater works.

The bill gives the highway commissioner the power to step in and undertake prescribed works on residential developments on approval from the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. It further allows the commissioner to recover the costs of these works from the relevant developer or any other person who is, in the opinion of the minister, responsible for undertaking the development, which can include any related body corporate.

However—this is the area that is of concern to the Greens, and I note the comments raised by the Hon. Ben Hood—costs can also be recovered by council if it is the relevant authority for the

development under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 or the Development Act 1993 and provided the development on the land is for residential purposes. Higher rates will then be incurred for late payments.

The bill also restricts the relevant council from passing on these costs to ratepayers by restricting recovery through a rate charge, levy, fee or other mechanism. It will therefore inevitably result in service cuts at a local council level, as they are required to carry the can for these developments that go wrong. City of Marion Mayor Kris Hanna said in a statement that the problem does not lie with the council planning approval but rather with the builder:

It is a driveway on private land which is uncompleted, not a public road. Council can't spend ratepayers' money to improve private property.

I must say I am inclined to agree with Mayor Hanna. Enacting a broad-ranging ability of the state government to impose financial impositions on councils sounds to me like cost shifting rather than consumer protection from the Malinauskas government.

The Greens, some time ago now, when we saw a series of builders collapsing in South Australia, advocated for the establishment of a public builder. This public builder could build public housing at the scale that is required, because we know there is a significant backlog in that regard, but it could also step in and complete construction of properties in circumstances where a developer goes bust.

I must say, I have a huge amount of sympathy for people in those positions. It must be an absolute nightmare to lose your life savings and to be in a situation where you have an unfinished home, it is not something that you can take possession of, and there is no end in sight in terms of getting it completed. The Greens' proposal meant that the public builder could step in and do that work and then the state would have equity in that home that could be paid down over time.

This is a model that has worked well during the financial crisis in places like the United Kingdom. It has also worked in countries like Singapore. That would be a sensible approach to getting this crisis under control and providing certainty to those home owners who are left high and dry when a developer goes belly up. Instead, what we have seen from the Malinauskas government is a poorly thought through populist brain fart that does not actually do anything to address the fundamental issues at work.

I understand this was the thought bubble of the previous minister. We have a new minister now, and I congratulate her on her elevation. I hope that our new transport minister, bringing the wisdom that she does, will look at this with fresh eyes and conclude that this is not an appropriate solution to this problem, because we know that it has been poorly thought through and it seems more about trying to get highway headlines rather than trying to address the fundamental problems that are endemic in our construction system. So I encourage the new minister to think again.

I recognise that the government has already announced changes to ensure that people building a home are better protected. I note the former Treasurer and the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs completed a joint review into building indemnity insurance to enhance protection for consumers and to support the building industry.

In July 2025, changes were announced that increased maximum insurance payouts to \$25,000 if a builder fails to deliver a finished home. Under the reforms that came into effect on 1 October, the policy limit for all QBE policies—which represent the majority of the SA market—will increase from \$150,000 to \$250,000. The 66 per cent increase will see home builders receive up to \$100,000 more in the event that their home is not completed. I recognise that this is an important step in the right direction. It is worth noting, however, that the average premium for a new build or renovation valued between \$500,000 to \$750,000 will increase from \$2,251 to \$2,814—a difference of \$563 or 0.1 per cent of the value of the build.

The state government has also said it intends to update the regulations and will make it mandatory for all insurance to provide the increased cover to better protect all people building or renovating their home. That is all progress in the right direction, but if we are serious about dealing with the issue of incomplete homes, if we are serious about providing certainty to those who have

invested in a new home but who are caught high and dry when a private developer goes under, then we do need to have a public builder.

Part of the reason we have this housing crisis is that the private sector has not been able to deliver the housing we need at scale. The Malinauskas government has brought back the Housing Trust—would a rose by any other name smell so sweet? It has been a change in name only: they have not restored the mission of the Housing Trust. That is why the Greens have been urging them to do so, to bring back the Housing Trust not just in name but in mission.

Re-establish it as a public builder that can build the housing we need at scale, and that can provide certainty to people who have invested in new houses but who find themselves in the invidious position of the private sector failing them. This highways bill is really not the answer, and I think all members of this place should think very, very carefully about this proposal and the implications it has for local councils.

Make no mistake, if this bill goes into effect and we see the collapse of private builders, we will see councils being stung with huge bills, and that will result in the slash and burn of public services. That is what this will do. It is very poor policy.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (11:42): I rise to speak on the Highways (Works for Residential Developments) Amendment Bill 2024. This bill introduces amendments to the Highways Act 1926 designed to clarify and strengthen the state's ability to respond to infrastructure shortfalls in residential developments.

It reflects lessons learned from recent events, most notably the collapse of Felmeri Builders and Developers Pty Ltd, which left shared infrastructure such as stormwater, services and roadworks incomplete at a residential development at O'Halloran Hill, with the owners of 20 unfinished homes left in limbo. In that case, the government stepped in to intervene and complete essential infrastructure works to enable owners to finish building and move into their homes.

From my understanding, the Marion council had allowed work to progress before the appropriate infrastructure works had been completed. The bill provides the Commissioner of Highways with the authority to undertake prescribed works—such as roadworks, water, telecommunications, stormwater, sewerage and other essential services—on residential developments subject to ministerial approval and after notifying the relevant council and landowners. This ensures that critical infrastructure can be delivered in a timely and coordinated manner when private developers are unable or unwilling to fulfil their obligations.

Importantly, the bill was introduced as a cost-recovery framework. The commissioner may recover costs from the responsible developer, including related corporate entities or from relevant councils if it was the authority for the development. However, the legislation explicitly prevents councils from passing this cost on to ratepayers through rates, levies or other charges. This provision protects the broader community from bearing the financial burden of private sector failures.

The bill also removes the requirement for a licence agreement from community corporations before works can proceed. The government has stated that these amendments are not intended to shift responsibility away from developers or councils, but rather to prevent future infrastructure failures like the one that occurred in O'Halloran Hill.

The minister has argued that the Commissioner of Highways will only step in to complete prescribed works if there is a failed builder, developer or an administrative failure by local councils. However, I also note that concerns have been raised during debate in the other place that the bill before us does not specify that there must be wrongdoing or failure before such powers can be enacted. This was brought up again during debate in this place by the Hon. Ben Hood and the Hon. Robert Simms.

The bill provides broad powers to intervene in developments and recover costs from developers or local councils, but does not appear to provide for any mechanism to resolve disputes between councils and the commissioner about cost recovery. I acknowledge that concerns have also been raised about the financial impact that such situations may place on councils, particularly smaller councils in regional areas.

While I am broadly supportive of the intent of the bill and the desire to avoid any potential future situations where home owners and residents could be left in limbo by incomplete residential developments, I do have some serious concerns regarding the broad powers, the lack of oversight or dispute resolution mechanisms, and the financial impact on local councils.

I congratulate the new minister who has been elevated to the position, but I do want the new minister to address the concerns that I and others have raised about the bill, and I will give careful consideration to the arguments put forward by all those concerned during the committee stage.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (11:47): The Highways (Works for Residential Developments) Amendment Bill 2024 amends the Highways Act 1926. The introduction of the bill aims to avoid situations where the government needs to step in, undertake works and construct for common infrastructure at residential developments at a cost.

The introduction of this bill supports the announcement by the Premier, the Hon. Mr Peter Malinauskas MP, in August 2023, for this government to provide an infrastructure solution to ensure builders could complete work on 20 unfinished homes in O'Halloran Hill after the builder, Felmeri Builders and Developers Pty Ltd, formerly known as Felmeri Homes, entered into liquidation. We all saw pictures on TV of people who had spent a lot of money and were trying to move into their houses, and there was obviously a problem with this developer. I think it is important that we have a responsibility to look after people who have dedicated a large part of their finances building a home, to ensure that the works are finished on time.

The bill provides the Commissioner of Highways (the commissioner) with the power to undertake prescribed works on residential developments on approval from the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, after notice has been provided to the relevant council and the landowners. Prescribed works include roadworks; the supply of water, gas, telecommunications, the provision of stormwater, wastewater, sewage management or other facilities and services prescribed by the regulations. The bill allows the commissioner to recover the cost of these works from either the:

- relevant developer, being the person granted development authorisation under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, or the Development Act 1993, or any other person who is, in the opinion of the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, responsible for undertaking the development and can include any related body corporate; or
- relevant council, provided the council was the relevant authority for the development under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, or the Development Act 1993, and the development on the land is for residential purposes.

The bill also restricts the council from passing on the cost to ratepayers by restricting recovery through a rate charge, levy fee or other mechanism. The bill also provides the commissioner with the authority to undertake these works without the need for a licence agreement from the community corporation, which occurred in O'Halloran Hill. I understand there has been some feedback raised by the LGA in relation to portions of the bill and the state government, as always, will continue to consult with the LGA on potential amendments to the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (DISCIPLINARY MATTERS AND FIDELITY FUND) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 August 2025.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (11:51): I rise today to speak on the Legal Practitioners (Disciplinary Matters and Fidelity Fund) Amendment Bill 2025, introduced by the Attorney-General on 21 August. This bill proposes a series of reforms of the Legal Practitioners

Act 1981, with the primary objective of modernising our legal disciplinary framework and strengthening protections for the public.

At its core, the bill makes three key changes. Firstly, it abolishes the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal and transfers its jurisdiction to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT). This move brings the legal profession into alignment with other regulated professions, placing disciplinary matters within a single independent body. It is intended to improve efficiency, reduce delays and ensure greater consistency in decision-making. Clauses within the bill remove outdated references to the former tribunal and provide SACAT with the jurisdiction and framework necessary to hear and determine complaints against practitioners.

Secondly, the bill enhances the powers of the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner. The commissioner will now be able to require practitioners to undergo health assessments where impairment is suspected, and the Supreme Court may order treatment, counselling or other measures where appropriate. Importantly, penalties are strengthened, maximum fines are increased and orders may be made against former practitioners, ensuring accountability does not simply end the moment a practitioner resigns or ceases practice. SACAT will also be empowered to review decisions of the commissioner, providing a further safeguard of fairness and transparency.

Finally, the bill increases the cap on the fidelity fund. The fidelity fund provides vital protection for clients who suffer financial loss due to practitioner misconduct. It also supports key regulatory bodies, including the Legal Services Commission. Raising the cap from \$7,500 to \$11,500 per practitioner will significantly improve the sustainability of the fund, addressing vulnerabilities exposed during periods of low interest rates and helping to avoid the need for future levies on the profession.

These reforms are, in essence, about integrity and ensuring that the legal profession remains accountable and transparent. Practitioners must be well equipped to uphold the high standards which the South Australian community expects of them. For these reasons, I indicate that the opposition will be supporting the bill.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (11:54): I rise today to speak in support of the Legal Practitioners (Disciplinary Matters and Fidelity Fund) Amendment Bill 2025. This bill follows extensive consultation with the Law Society, the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner and members of the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal. It seeks to modernise the framework for legal practitioners in South Australia by transferring tribunal functions to SACAT, expanding the commissioner's powers and increasing the statutory cap on the fidelity fund. It strengthens accountability and ensures that the public interest remains at the heart of our legal system. I acknowledge the important work of Ms Maurine Pyke KC and the tribunal members, and I welcome the two-year transitional period to ensure continuity and fairness.

One of the most significant changes introduced is new powers for the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner. This change allows for the commissioner to require a health assessment where there is reasonable belief that a practitioner may be experiencing a condition, such as mental illness, substance dependency or psychological impairment, that affects their ability to practise law. These provisions are designed to protect both the integrity of the profession and the wellbeing of practitioners, but they must be exercised with care. The process includes independent medical review, safeguards around disclosure and options for treatment or supervised practise.

While I support the intent behind these reforms, I would like to also point out some concerns around privacy, proportionality and the potential for misuse. Based on these concerns, it would be prudent to monitor how these powers are applied in practise, ensuring that they remain fair, transparent and focus on rehabilitation rather than punishment.

I have always been a strong advocate for a better and safer community and I am pleased that, in addition to safeguarding professional standards, the bill also addresses client protection. The increase to the fidelity fund cap, from \$7,500 to \$11,500 per practitioner, responds to economic conditions and ensures that clients who suffer financial loss due to misconduct are better protected. It also supports the sustainability of the fund, which underpins the work of both the commissioner and the Law Society's Ethics and Practice Unit.

While the expanded responsibilities are welcome, I note the concerns raised around SACAT's capacity. SACAT's ability to manage these additional disciplinary functions will depend on appropriate resourcing and the retention of legal expertise within its panels. While I support the transfer of functions, I trust that the government would ensure SACAT is adequately equipped to prevent delays and uphold the high standards of oversight expected by both the legal profession and the public.

These reforms reflect a collaborative approach and a commitment to continuous improvement. I believe this bill is a step forward to ensuring our legal system remains fair, transparent and responsive to the needs of South Australians. Based on the reasons I outlined, I support the bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (11:58): I thank all members for their valuable contributions on this important bill. In summing-up, I want to thank the Law Society in particular for their work and guidance. Much of this has come out of collaboration with the Law Society—the major things this bill does—and I look forward to the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It seems that this legislation has actually caught many in the legal fraternity by surprise. The question I have for the Attorney, as he mentioned the Law Society, is: why has there been no public policy position or consultation with the membership of the Law Society in relation to this? Why was it all done confidentially?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that this bill has been extensively consulted on with the Law Society in terms of how the Law Society conduct their consultations. I would invite the honourable member to take that up with them.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I made the point that, yes, there has been consultation with the Law Society, but the Law Society tells me that it was a discussion held on a confidential basis. Why has the government not gone to the wider legal fraternity or why has this not happened through the Law Society, where a public policy position has been stated? Normally, in situations like this when we are discussing matters that affect the legal profession, we usually get something from the Law Society regarding a public position. Why has there not been a public position on this?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that this was like any other bill that we have put in. There was consultation and draft bills were sent out to the Law Society, the Legal Services Commission and a whole lot of others that we usually send these out to.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you. But why was it confidential?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Can the honourable member let me know what he is saying, because the honourable member is representing that he has been told that certain elements were confidential. Can he let me know what he thinks was confidential, please?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I was told in fact this morning by the Law Society, when we contacted the Law Society, and this is what I have received:

The Law Society has had discussions and provided feedback on the Legal Practitioners (Disciplinary Matters and Fidelity Fund) Amendment Bill to the Attorney General, on a confidential basis.

The Society supports the amendments.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I have said, I am advised that the bill, as drafted, was consulted on like any other bill and sent to a range of stakeholders for input.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: So what you are saying is that the obligation was on the Law Society to inform its membership of this bill?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I said, this has been done in a way that is very consistent with many other bills in terms of consultation.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Can the Attorney explain: what are the rights of appeal in the SACAT hearings? Are there rights of appeal?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that it is the ordinary appeal rights under the SACAT Act, which I am advised are the appeal rights to the Supreme Court.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Does the Magistrates Court have jurisdiction if a complaint involves the federal jurisdiction? If there is a complaint against a practitioner that might be in a federal area, does the Magistrates Court have jurisdiction in this matter?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I get that what he is talking about is a restraint on administrative bodies dealing with federal jurisdictional matters. My advice is that this is about the practitioner, not the actual jurisdiction. So my advice to you is: regardless of where the practitioner actually practises it is about the practitioner, so it is difficult to see how the Magistrates Court would need to be invoked, with the administrative bodies not dealing with federal matters.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: If I am reading it correctly does this also mean that SACAT now has a costs jurisdiction?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that it is the usual provisions that apply to SACAT. There is nothing new, my advice is, about cost jurisdictions as a result of this that is not already within the purview of SACAT. Further to the honourable member's question, my advice is that we have not altered any costs provisions that have applied previously to legal practitioners' conduct matters.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Just going on a letter I have received from a well-respected lawyer, Greg Finlayson, who points out that on his reading of the bill it appears that practitioners only are granted a right to appear by counsel but even then only when a complaint is laid against them and not when conducting or responding to an appeal from a determination of the commissioner. Is that a correct interpretation of SACAT's jurisdiction when it comes to being represented by counsel?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the intent in terms of legal representation that has previously applied for legal practitioners' disciplinary matters is intended to apply, with the jurisdiction being transferred to SACAT.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Can the Attorney clarify whether members of the public can lay a complaint of unsatisfactory or unprofessional conduct against a practitioner?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that to make it as effective and efficient as possible, particularly for complainants, members of the public will first bring matters to the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner, who will then gather information before it finds its way to SACAT.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: So there is no guarantee, as there exists now, when people wish to make a complaint to the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner—they pay their \$100 fee and fill out the form—that their matter will necessarily be heard or referred? There is no guarantee now that these matters will be heard or referred?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There is no more nor less guarantee than there is now with it being heard by SACAT, I am advised.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The bill gives the commissioner power to impose a \$100,000 fine on a practitioner without any public hearing, any rules of evidence or any obligation to provide reasons; is that correct?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, with the consent of the practitioner.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I gather all these hearings will be held in camera?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Are you talking about the SACAT hearings?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, SACAT hearings.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that they are ordinarily a public hearing, unless there is a reason not to be.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Are they secret—are they going to be held in secret or not?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If the honourable member listened to my answer, these are SACAT hearings and ordinarily these, like other SACAT hearings, are public, unless there is a good reason not to.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 31), schedule 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) (12:11): I move:

That this bill now be read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

KIRK, MR C.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. B.R. Hood:

That this council—

1. Notes with deep sorrow the assassination of American political commentator Charlie Kirk on 10 September 2025;
2. Extends its sincere condolences to his family, friends, colleagues and supporters;
3. Affirms that political violence has no place in a free society;
4. Condemns all forms of political violence and intimidation; and
5. Calls on all South Australians, particularly political leaders, to commit to respectful and peaceful public discourse.

(Continued from 17 September 2025.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12:11): I rise today to speak in the strongest terms in support of this motion. It is a motion that goes to the very heart of our democracy, to the foundations of our society and to the values that we as a parliament must defend without hesitation or compromise. The assassination of Charlie Kirk in the United States on 10 September shocked the world. Charlie was a political commentator, a voice in the contest of ideas. Whether one agreed with his views or not is immaterial: he was a husband, a father, a friend and a son. He was a citizen exercising his right to participate in democracy and strongly encouraging others to do the same.

His brutal murder was not simply an act of violence against him personally; it was an act of violence against the very principle of free speech, free debate and free democracy. It is more shocking because he was not a career politician but a member of the public encouraging others to openly share their views. Political violence is not new, but it is profoundly corrosive. It silences voices, it narrows debate and it teaches citizens that fear, not persuasion, is the path to power. When violence enters politics, democracy itself begins to wither. We must be crystal clear: there is no justification ever for political violence—not in the United States, not in Europe and not here in South Australia.

What has struck me most deeply since this tragedy has not been the commentary of pundits or the headlines in newspapers, but the extraordinary courage of Charlie's wife, Erika Kirk. In the midst of unimaginable grief, Erika Kirk stood before the world and gave a speech in memory of her

husband. It was a speech that was not laced with vengeance, not laced with rage, but imbued with dignity, with conviction and with love.

Erika spoke of Charlie the man, Charlie the father, Charlie the dreamer and Charlie the believer in democracy. Her words cut through the fog of anger and confusion and reminded us, all of us, why we must not allow violence to define the future. Erika's courage should inspire us. Here was a woman who had just lost the man who stood lovingly and firmly by her side for years through a senseless act of violence, yet in her darkest hour she chose not to fuel division but to call for unity, not to curse the darkness but to hold up a light. That is leadership and that is faith, and that is the message that this parliament must hear, that even in grief we can choose a better way, that even in loss we can choose hope over hate.

This council must take her message to heart because while South Australia has not experienced an assassination, we cannot ignore the rising tide of hostility and intimidation faced by political figures here at home and, indeed, around the nation. Many of us in this chamber know what it is to receive threats. Many of us know what it is to have our families targeted with abuse, and many of us know with growing unease that public discourse is becoming harsher, more personal and more dangerous.

That is why this motion matters. It is not symbolic; it is necessary. It says that we, as leaders, will not tolerate violence in politics. It says that we, as members of parliament, will not normalise abuse, intimidation or harassment, and it says that we, as South Australians, believe passionately in a democracy where we argue fiercely over ideas, but we never dehumanise, we never silence, and we never harm those who disagree with us. It says that the ties that bind us together as people are more important than political differences.

In this state, we pride ourselves on a robust parliamentary tradition. Debate here is often fierce, often passionate, and rightly so, but that debate must always remain within the bounds of respect, and we must show South Australians that it is possible to disagree profoundly without descending into hate, because once hate takes root, violence is never far behind.

This motion also calls on us to look outward, beyond our own borders, and to remember that democracy is fragile everywhere. In too many countries political opponents are silenced, imprisoned or killed. In too many places the gun has replaced the ballot, and violence has displaced dialogue. Let us never take for granted the freedoms we enjoy here in South Australia. They are not guaranteed. They are maintained only by our vigilance and by our collective commitment to defend them. We, each of us as citizens, have a responsibility to pull our collective weight and vote.

I also want to address the role of community. Political violence is not just an attack on leaders; it is an attack on society. It robs families of loved ones, it robs citizens of voices, and it robs future generations of trust in democracy. The strength of our system lies in the belief that every voice matters, that every citizen can participate safely, and that ideas can be tested without fear. When that safety is stripped away, democracy is weakened for all of us. Erika Kirk understood this. In her speech, she called not for revenge but for resilience. She called not for hatred but for hope. She showed us that the antidote to political violence is not silence nor submission, but courage and compassion. That is a lesson for every one of us in public life.

Today, in supporting this motion, I say this: let us reject the politics of hate. Let us denounce intimidation in all its forms. Let us honour Charlie's memory and the courage of his wife, Erika, by committing ourselves to a South Australia where political debate is fierce but peaceful, where disagreement is robust but respectful, and where no-one need fear violence because of the views they hold or the office they occupy. Violence has no place in our democracy—none—not now, not ever. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Sitting suspended from 12:19 to 14:16.

*Petitions***NORTH ADELAIDE GOLF COURSE**

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Presented a petition signed by 120 residents of South Australia requesting the council to urge the government to:

1. Respect Acknowledgement to Country. Engage the Kaurna traditional owners and elders with regards to the destruction of their heritage in the Pirltawardli area.
2. Respect Australia's duty to reconciliation and stop the recurrent racist and destructive practices that we will witness of desecrating this part of the Adelaide Park Lands. Desist modern colonist actions and mentality. Commit to the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 at the North Adelaide Golf Course and stop uprooting and displacing all living past, present and future.
3. Respect integrity of governance. Commit to inclusive community engagement and consultation. Before legislative bills are introduced to the Parliament of South Australia on Pirltawardli, consult. Revoke the North Adelaide Public Golf Course Bill legislation. Relocate LIV Golf from North Adelaide. Don't substitute the LIV North Adelaide Golf Course for another development as happened with the Adelaide Aquatic Centre and then transferring its management.
4. Conduct traffic management surveys and traffic impact assessments surrounding North Adelaide Golf Course and review past data. Establish community reference groups for the continuum of consultation and design as happened with the South Road T2T Torrens Road to River Torrens development, and Ovingham Overpass.
5. Commit to securing paid employment for volunteers at LIV Golf tournaments.
6. Establish and refer to appropriate committee(s) the petition requests.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Department of the Premier and Cabinet South Australian Government Boards and Committees Information as at 30 June 2025
Travel Report for Minister for Housing and Urban Development from 31 July to 1 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for Minister for Child Protection from 15 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport from 6 August to 7 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for Minister for the Arts from 1 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for Minister for the Arts from 13 August to 15 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for Minister for Trade and Investment from 12 August to 13 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for Minister for Trade and Investment from 28 August to 29 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Office of the Chief Psychiatrist Review of the Operation of the Suicide Prevention Act 2021 dated 4 September 2025
Report for the Treasurer from 20 May 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for the Treasurer from 16 June 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for the Treasurer from 31 July to 1 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009

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

Travel Report for the Attorney-General from 14 August to 15 August 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009

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

Witness Protection Act 1994, Report: 2024-25

Essential Services Commission of South Australia 2025 Review of South Australian Rail Access Regime and Guidelines—Final Report

South Australian Housing Trust Triennial Review 2021-22 to 2023-24—Final Report

Question Time

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing questions to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding drought assistance for South Australian farmers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: For well over a year, South Australian farmers, peak industry bodies and the opposition have been calling on the government to provide no and low-interest concessional loans to assist drought-affected primary producers. These loans, described by farmers as a hand up, not a handout, are a proven mechanism used by state governments across Australia to help producers manage cashflow pressures and recover from prolonged dry conditions.

It is understood that the minister received formal departmental advice more than eight weeks ago, outlining options for such a scheme, yet to date no decision has been announced and no funding committed. Meanwhile, conditions across much of the state continue to deteriorate, with many farm businesses facing mounting debt and difficult decisions ahead of summer. So my questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister confirm whether she has received advice from her department on the implementation of a no and low-interest concessional loan scheme for drought-affected farmers? If so, when was that advice provided?
2. Why, after more than eight weeks since receiving departmental advice, has the government still not made a decision or commitment to implement a concessional loans program?
3. Does the minister accept that the absence of such a program is leaving drought-affected farmers without an essential financial safety net as they face rising costs and declining productivity?
4. Will the minister commit today to introducing a state-based concessional loan scheme?
5. Finally, given the urgency of the situation and the government's repeated claims of being drought ready, can the minister explain what is holding up cabinet approval for the measures that farmers have been calling for consistently for more than 12 months?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. Throughout this period of drought, which has been so difficult for so many farmers—indeed, farmers in some regions are looking at their third year of drought and potentially going into their fourth year—I have met with farmers, obviously throughout the state, as well as their representative bodies. I have continued to have information provided to me about loan products available elsewhere, and I have ongoing information and briefings coming to me at various intervals.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: when has that advice been presented to the minister?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): As I said, I have had ongoing information and briefings provided to me.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary: when was the advice first presented to the minister?

The PRESIDENT: We have talked about advice, minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): Considering I have just said that I have multiple briefings and information, the honourable member would need to say which advice she is referring to.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary: when was the minister first provided with advice on no and low-interest concessional loan schemes?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): Various information in regard to drought approaches across the country has been provided to me throughout the period of the drought.

SNAPPER RESTOCKING PROGRAM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of snapper spawning at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: On Tuesday in this place, the Hon. Frank Pangallo asked the minister a question regarding whether there were any setbacks with the snapper restocking program at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre, and in the minister's reply she said, 'The specifics I am happy to take on notice and bring back a response to this place.' My questions to the state fisheries minister are:

1. Has she since received advice regarding the success or otherwise of the snapper spawning program?
2. Has she sought advice, in any formal or informal briefing, on the matter since Tuesday?
3. If so, what was that response?
4. If not, why not, given the ongoing effects of the algal bloom and the importance of the snapper restocking program?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. As I said on Tuesday, I took the question on notice and would bring back a response to the chamber. That continues to be my intention. It is worth noting, however—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Do those opposite want to hear an answer, or do they only want to hear their own voices?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: What I was trying to say was that it is also important to note, however, that the snapper fingerling program is just one part of the snapper science program that has been put in place to address the depleted stocks of snapper.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: Oh!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: We hear from the Leader of the Opposition a sound of great surprise. Clearly she doesn't listen to any of the information that is provided in this place. When we announced the \$5 million in terms of snapper science back probably roughly three years ago now, probably a little bit more than three years ago, the production of from memory 900,000 fingerlings was a proportion of that, but of course there was a lot of other information and science that was involved, including looking at the various other ways of assessing the biomass.

Acoustic monitoring was part of it. Obviously that work has been underway. There was also research around whether the western coast snapper stocks were part of the Spencer Gulf fishery or indeed a separate fishery from Western Australia.

The \$5 million science program is very, very significant and has a number of different parts to it. We had already released—I am going on memory—I think it was about 450,000 fingerlings previously. As I mentioned on Tuesday, I'm happy to have a further update, which I will bring to the chamber.

SNAPPER RESTOCKING PROGRAM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary: when will the minister bring back a specific response to the opposition's question about the snapper spawning program, given its critical importance, particularly during the crucial algal bloom?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you have answered that. If there is anything else you are prepared to add? Okay.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Leader of the Opposition, you have asked that question repeatedly. You haven't got the answer you wanted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: You haven't got the answer you wanted; that's unfortunate, okay? It's question time, not answer time.

VINEYARD RESTING REBATE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): It's outrageous, Mr President. I seek leave—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Leader of the Opposition, do you want an early minute and head home? I'm not going to reward you, so play on.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries, which she will hopefully answer, about the Vineyard Resting Rebate, but I doubt it.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The Vineyard Resting Rebate scheme allowed subsidised access to ethephon for red wine grapegrowers to put their vines on production hold, opting out of the current vintage while maintaining optimal vine health during times of oversupply. The opposition have heard concerns from Riverland growers that this program has been discontinued due to low uptake in recent years but, given the continued and increasing oversupply challenges, wine industry experts expect higher grower uptake of the scheme this year, if it is to be made available. My question to their Minister for Primary Industries is: will the state government reopen the Vineyard Resting Rebate scheme in time for next harvest, and, if not, why not?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, try to compose yourself and give us an answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:30): I do think it is interesting that the honourable member's phone said that, because it certainly is reflective of so many questions that she asks here—she clearly doesn't understand. However, I am not sure she is sorry that she doesn't understand. I thank

the honourable member for her question. She may recall, but perhaps again wasn't listening very closely, that earlier in this session I have talked about the ethephon trial and where it was at. I suggest she refers back to *Hansard*.

VINEYARD RESTING REBATE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: if there was clear demand from industry, would the minister consider reactivating the rebate?

The PRESIDENT: I understand your supplementary question; however, it doesn't come out of the minister's answer.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I would like to thank the Deputy Premier for his help and guidance, I would be lost without him.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

AUTISM STRATEGY

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Autism, and I am looking forward to a very informative and substantial answer to this question. Will the minister inform the council about the recent launch of the action plan for the state's first autism strategy?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in this space. In June 2024, the Malinauskas Labor government launched our state's first autism strategy. The strategy set out a five-year road map to build understanding, knowledge and belonging in South Australia. The strategy was a gathering of extensive consultation and engagement with South Australian autistic and autism communities, with more than 1,000 submissions received to the South Australian government YourSAy platform.

On 29 September 2025, I had the honour of joining the Minister for Human Services in the other place, the Hon. Nat Cook, at the Adelaide Convention Centre, where the state strategy was put into action with the launch of the Autism Strategy Action Plan for 2025 to 2029. The launch event was attended by representatives from the Department of Human Services and the Office for Autism and, importantly, members of the South Australian autistic and autism communities, who helped make the strategy and the action plan come to life and become a reality.

The action plan outlines more than 200 actions that the Malinauskas Labor government has committed to undertake to help make South Australia an autism inclusion state across seven focus areas, including pathways to diagnosis, positive educational experiences, thriving in the workplace, access to supports and services, participation in the community, access to health and mental health services, and supports for the justice system.

Departments and agencies across the state government will work together to take action through the links and through enabling training and support services programs to be implemented and for communities to participate in these outcomes. The action plan outlines many commitments and actions based on the recent engagement, and is also designed to serve as a living document that can adapt to the needs of the South Australian autistic and autism communities as understanding, knowledge and belonging continues to grow.

The Department of Human Services will also work with other departments and agencies to report on actions implemented, so we will have the opportunity to monitor progress and actions across the coming years. The importance of the action plan was highlighted by members of the state Autism Strategy Advisory Committee, who shared their stories through speeches and at the event through a panel discussion.

Committee members, Jack and Sake, who participated in the panel events, were generous in sharing their stories of their respective families. Whilst they outlined challenges and barriers they had each encountered on their own journeys, they also outlined how important this action plan had

been for them to feel confident within their own community. I want to thank Jack and Sake and the many other members of the South Australian autistic and autism communities who so generously gave their stories to help make autism inclusion initiatives come to life in South Australia. It was really exciting to be a part of this incredible launch to see this come to life.

ASSISTANCE DOG HANDLERS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Deputy Premier regarding the refusal of service to guide dog handlers by rideshare drivers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The refusal of access to accredited assistance dog handlers is not only a breach of the federal Disability Discrimination Act 1992 but also a criminal offence under section 81 of the South Australian Dog and Cat Management Act 1995, with a maximum penalty of \$1,250. Despite this, recent reports suggest that such incidents continue to occur with limited enforcement or consequences for offenders. My questions to the Deputy Premier are:

1. How many complaints or reports have been made in South Australia over the past three years regarding the refusal of service to assistance dog handlers by rideshare or taxidriviers?
2. What enforcement actions or penalties have been issued under section 81 of the Dog and Cat Management Act in that time?
3. Will the government consider increasing penalties or introducing mandatory disability awareness training for drivers found to have unlawfully refused service to a person accompanied by an accredited assistance dog?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her question. The Dog and Cat Management Act doesn't rest with me as a minister; I think it is the Minister for Environment in another place, the Hon. Minister Lucy Hood, the member for Adelaide. I am trying to remember discussions I have had with the Equal Opportunity Commissioner from memory, and I will double-check if it's not correct that the Equal Opportunity Commissioner accepts complaints of discrimination such as this. I am happy to go away on both of those and find a bit more information and bring it back for the honourable member.

LIQUOR LICENSING

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:37): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, representing the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence in the other place, questions regarding the government's commitment to liquor licensing reforms.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Mr President, I might redirect that question to the Deputy Premier and Attorney-General.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In any event, the question is there for the taking from anyone who wants to answer it in government.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter; he always has something to say!

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I think the Hon. Mr Hunter would love to answer this question. Through you, Mr President—and to you, Mr Hunter—alcohol is one of the most significant drivers—on a very, very serious note—of domestic, family and sexual violence and this government has repeatedly said that it recognises that fact.

Following the rapid review of prevention approaches in 2024 and the national cabinet commitments that followed, the government pledged to lead the nation in reforming our liquor laws to better protect women and children. In December last year, it released a draft Liquor Licensing

(Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill proposing reforms to recognise gendered violence in the act's objects, restrict late night alcohol delivery and introduce a two-hour safety delay for online sales.

Those measures were, of course, later endorsed by the Royal Commission into Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence—recommendation 128—which called for their urgent passage. Advocates, including FARE, SACOSS, Embolden and SANDA, which have worked closely with survivors, are urging the government to honour its own commitments.

It has been 10 months since these commitments were made. There are a couple of sitting weeks left and there has still been no bill introduced in this place. My questions therefore, to anyone in government who cares to answer them, are:

1. With only two sitting weeks remaining, when will the Liquor Licensing (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill be introduced to parliament?

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: It's three weeks.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Three weeks—two, three, a handful of sitting days left. When will the Liquor Licensing (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill be likely to be introduced into this place?

2. Has cabinet approved the bill for introduction?

3. What is holding up the introduction of the bill?

4. Is the minister willing to give a guarantee that this bill will be tabled before parliament rises, as survivors and stakeholders were promised?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for her question. Technically, this falls within the purview of Minister Andrea Michaels as the Minister for Consumer Affairs, represented by the Hon. Clare Scriven in this place, but there are quite a few of the recommendations of the royal commission that relate to things that were within the broader Attorney-General's portfolio.

I don't have details on those. Of course, the honourable member will be well aware we wouldn't discuss our cabinet deliberations in answer to questions, but I am happy to take those on notice and bring back a reply. I do note that the Premier has committed that there will be responses to recommendations of the royal commission, as the honourable member has pointed out. There were elements of her question that were recommendations within the royal commission. I am happy to take it on notice and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

SCHOOL TRAFFIC ZONES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:41): My questions are to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport regarding school traffic zones:

1. How will the government monitor the effectiveness of these new speed zones and ensure they deliver real safety outcomes?

2. Has the department modelled the impact of introducing three separate school speed limits on driver compliance and pedestrian safety?

3. Why are no schools on or near Portrush Road, including Linden Park Primary School and Glenunga International High School, included in this rollout, despite this corridor being identified as one of the most dangerous roads in the state?

4. How can parents and teachers trust that the government is serious about road safety when even the highest risk crossings, such as Portrush Road, remain untouched and left out of this very important project?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for his question. As was highlighted yesterday, this is a program that will help bring us in line with most other states, as far as I am aware, which already implement this 40-k zone around their school sites. As was also highlighted yesterday, this is a rolling

rollout, so we will start with a small number of schools. We will build up to 25 schools and then we will build up to the 150 schools.

There is an opportunity here for this to cover a broad number of areas within our community but, most importantly, it will be bringing us in line with the rest of the country in making sure that we have safer school zones around our most vulnerable children. What we want to be doing is making sure that not only is it reminding motorists, maybe who aren't used to driving on those particular roads, to think and slow down but also giving students and parents that opportunity to know where the safer spots are to be crossing to be able to get them to school in a more safe way.

This is a policy that is under the road safety minister. It is obviously also a really nice package deal, with him also being the Minister for Education. If there is more information that you require I am happy to continue to work with him. Obviously, there is a role that we do play in regard to inserting the signs and putting in the infrastructure, but that will be in consultation with the appropriate minister.

SCHOOL TRAFFIC ZONES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:43): Supplementary: with respect to the 125 schools you mentioned, minister, have they been identified and are they publicly available?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (14:43): I didn't say 125; I said 150.

SCHOOL TRAFFIC ZONES

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary: when will the full list of the 150 schools be published on the DIT website?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (14:44): I appreciate the opposition's interest in this, as there is a lot of interest from the broader community in wanting to keep their communities safe. This is something we haven't done before. This will be rolled out and it will be rolled out, as I said earlier, with two schools, as I am advised, by the end of November, and the 25 other locations will be rolled out by the end of December this year. This is a program that is being implemented. It is starting and it will be scaled up to the 150.

SCHOOL TRAFFIC ZONES

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Supplementary: have the 150 schools been determined and, if so, when will they be published?

The PRESIDENT: You mentioned the 150 schools, minister.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (14:44): As I said earlier, this is about making sure that we can roll it out in an effective way. We are starting with these schools. The departments will work through to see what those other sites will be and continue to make that information available when it is.

ERNABELLA ARTS CENTRE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister tell the council about the upgrades to the Ernabella Arts Centre?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in matters to do with the APY lands and Aboriginal arts. Ernabella Arts Centre, located on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands, is Australia's oldest running arts centre, established in 1948. Since its inception, Ernabella Arts has been an Aboriginal-owned and run corporation, promoting and supporting Anangu and creating and selling their art. Amazingly, Anangu artists have since been represented in major collections, not just across Australia but across the world.

As I said, established in 1948 Ernabella Arts started off as a small craft room. The first craft products were hand-loomed woven fabrics and hand-pulled and knotted floor rugs with a unique pattern that became known as the anapalayaku walka style or Ernabella design. The centre's reputation was built on its innovative artists adapting to many different mediums. In the early 1970s,

a group of Ernabella artists travelled to Indonesia to learn the technique of batik, a technique Ernabella became renowned for over the decades.

In 2003, the batik studio was converted to a ceramics studio and since then artists have developed their own unique forms and styles. The artists are a varied group of old and young, men and women, always reinvigorating the centre to be a culturally strong independent contemporary art centre.

In recognising the importance of this arts centre and its community impact, in 2023 the government announced that Ernabella Arts would receive almost three-quarters of a million dollars in funding to extend and refurbish the centre. The funding was part of the state government's announcement of over \$1 million for a range of projects that year in the APY lands.

Since then, the upgrades have transformed the arts centre. Some of the upgrades included storage tailored to accommodate large-format media and unique art pieces that can withstand the harsh natural environment, particularly the 40°, or even 50°-plus, summer days. Key upgrades included making the roof watertight to handle seasonal weather and designing internal joinery that is both robust and long lasting.

Storage solutions were tailored to accommodate a range of artworks, with compact laminate used for its durability. Last week, the government held country cabinet on the APY lands. In addition to many other community visits, I, along with a number of other ministers, got the opportunity to visit the Ernabella Arts Centre and see the completed extensions and refurbishments. The new sales centre, the new refurbished ceramics centre—importantly, including air conditioning out the back—and the new museum area for significant artworks over the history of the Ernabella Arts Centre are just some of the renovations that have been included.

I know those who have spent time on the APY lands recognise the important role arts centres can play in remote communities, not just being places to create art but also passing on knowledge and law while giving the opportunity for economic activity and to encounter artists. The Ernabella Arts Centre is certainly a place that I know a number of members of this chamber have visited during their time on committees like the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee.

It is certainly an arts centre I have spent many, many, hours in, particularly the men's area of the arts centre, where Ernabella artist Kunmanara Ingkatji, the old man from Davids Well who passed away nearly a decade ago, became a world-renowned artist. His work sits directly behind me in my office and has done for close on a decade.

Other artists from the men's area include Kunmanara Carroll, who passed away only four years ago and whose ceramic works became world famous and whose paintings have sat behind both Premier Marshall and Premier Malinauskas in the Premier's office. More recently, Kunmanara Jack, who passed away earlier this year, had a long history as chair of the arts centre. In my house, one of his paintings is the first thing you see as you walk in the corridor. It is an exceptionally important arts centre and has been exceptionally important to me over many years.

PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport on the topic of public and active transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: In February 2023, the Select Committee on Public and Active Transport handed down its report—more than two years ago. The committee heard numerous submissions that expressed concern about the decline in services of public transport in metropolitan areas and the lack of public transport in regional areas. It also heard the community felt the state government prioritised car travel over other modes of transport and that state investment was biased towards building more roads.

The committee made numerous recommendations for the state government to improve public and active transport, including increasing the frequency of bus services, commencing planning

for a statewide integrated separating cycling network and trialling passenger rail services from Mount Barker to Adelaide. My questions, therefore, to the minister are:

1. Has the minister read the report of the Select Committee on Public and Active Transport?
2. What action has the government taken in relation to the recommendations to date and which recommendations does she hope to still implement?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for his question and all the work he has undertaken through the select committee that he chaired. Obviously, there were a number of recommendations put forward and I have had the great pleasure of reading them. I might have predicted this would be a question.

Obviously, as a government we have been investing heavily in this space. It is a really big privilege to take on a role where we know that we are already investing record levels in construction, particularly in transport construction. My understanding is that this is not just about the amount of money as a government we are investing: the Master Builders Association themselves back in this data that we are building more than ever before in transport construction.

My understanding through the Master Builders Association data is that this shows that transport construction is up 28 per cent year on year. This is an incredible achievement and is data that clearly shows we are doing more in this space because we know it is important to keep people connected and to keep people moving.

We know a number of things have been highlighted in your recommendations, things like active transport. Recently, since I have become the minister, I was able to be part of an announcement where we were able to roll out dedicated funding that has been made available through a \$2 million fund that is available for people to have bike lanes and bicycle projects that keep people moving and connected. There were 18 projects that were rolled out across nine councils.

As you have highlighted throughout your consultation and feedback, it is important to have this not just in metropolitan Adelaide but in regional Adelaide. There were quite a number of regional areas that were able to benefit from those. From memory, I think, Mount Gambier was one of those and I recall Victor Harbor and the Barossa were also, I believe. This is a program to make sure we can get that funding where it is needed, particularly in places that maybe we have not looked at before with those needs for bike tracks.

In regard to the cheaper fares, again it was raised about having more accessible support for people to access fares that are cheaper. As we highlighted yesterday, we have done targeted fares that support those who need it and have lower incomes generally, such as our seniors and also our students who are receiving fares the equivalent of 25¢. Our seniors are receiving free access to public transport.

But we also know that we have to be doing infrastructure investments as well and that is also what we are doing and that data from the Master Builders Association backs that in. It is not just about a government saying we are doing something: the Masters Builders Association data is backing in that we are.

PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:54): Does part of the construction work the minister referenced include rail to Mount Barker?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (14:54): I thank the member for his question and his interest in this space. Regional public transport is important and is something that we need to be looking at, and giving \$2 million to make it a permanent fixture of the Mount Barker bus service is also an investment that we have made. We are happy to continue to look at other ways that we can make public transport more accessible and are happy to continue these conversations.

TRAINING ORGANISATIONS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Deputy Premier about training organisations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The Australian Skills Quality Authority recently published a long list of registered training organisations whose registrations were cancelled due to noncompliance. Some were found to be ghost colleges, operating an immigration scam. They took substantial payments from foreign students on study visas for VET courses which were either never delivered, of poor quality or where the students failed to attend classes, yet certificates of qualifications were still issued.

One of those RTOs shut down in Adelaide in May was Spark SA Investment Pty Ltd, trading as Spark International College, Spark Automotive College and Spark College of Trades. ASQA found serious noncompliance with training, trainer and assessor practices and governance concerns, cancelling its registration for two years. What is most disturbing is that Spark had strong links to key state and federal ALP Party figures including Senator Don Farrell and Premier Peter Malinauskas, through its chief executive and director, Trimann Singh Gill.

Mr Gill is a Labor powerbroker, a former Senate and state candidate and, according to my sources, he helped stack party branch numbers. Mr Gill also controls a large taxi company where several drivers are on various visas, with some attending his now deregistered college. Following a tip-off, I visited Spark's Grenfell Street premises several times and I did not see any sign of student learning activity.

Mr Armarjit Grewal, another prominent member of the Labor Party and appointed by the Malinauskas government to the position of Deputy Chair of the SA Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, is a close associate of Mr Gill's, has worked on his campaigns and often presented qualification certificates to Spark students. There is no suggestion that Mr Grewal was involved with Spark's misconduct.

While Mr Gill is not barred from being involved with another training provider, he would still be required to meet ASQA's fit and proper person requirements should he seek to join another organisation. I seek leave to table some supporting photographs of what I have stated here.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: My questions to the minister are:

1. In light of the adverse findings against Mr Gill's dubious training business, will the ALP suspend or cancel his membership forthwith?
2. Does the Labor Party approve of Mr Gill's egregious conduct and believe he is a fit and proper person to be in their party?
3. Considering his important position on the SA Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, will the government seek an explanation from Mr Grewal about the extent of his involvement with this dodgy VET college and Mr Gill?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:58): In relation to the issues to do with training skills I will happily pass them on to the Minister for Training and Skills in the other place and see if there is any reply that can be given.

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S INFLUENCE IN THE SHEEP INDUSTRY FORUM

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister please speak to the chamber about the Celebrating Women's Influence in the Sheep Industry Forum?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for his question. Last month, I headed to Watervale to attend the opening of the Celebrating Women's Influence in the

Sheep Industry Forum. The roles that women play in the sheep industry are significant. The calibre of women in attendance at the forum last month was certainly a testament to that.

The roles women play in the sheep industry are also varied, which was reflected in the forum program, featuring shearers, wool classers, designers, chefs, producers and writers. Women have always been central to the sheep industry, alongside men, but for many years the stereotype of the industry has been far too focused and narrow. For many, the sheep industry conjures images of a male shearers in dungarees.

The speakers at the forum included an array of influential women who all challenged the stereotype of what it means to be part of the sheep industry. Liz Harfull was one of the speakers, a best-selling author who tells stories of people in rural and regional areas. She discussed the history of women's involvement in the sheep and wool industry, which dates back as far as the sheep and wool industries themselves, despite perhaps not being well acknowledged in the past. We also heard from Cathy Wendelborn, a trailblazer for women shearers, being the only woman inducted into the Shearers' Hall of Fame, recognised for being a clean, tough and efficient shearers.

Steph Brooker-Jones, Elders Wool Manager, with over two decades of experience brokering wool across the state, shared her experience and influence on the South Australian sheep industry. Steph's interest in wool and sheep started very early, back in 1979, when she was one of the first women to complete the full-time professional wool-classing course at Marlestone College School of Wool and Textiles. We also heard from Nikki Atkinson, who is the 2024 AgriFutures Rural Women's Award state winner, a fashion designer and an innovator, creating beautiful wedding dresses using Australian merino wool. Nikki is a trailblazer in the wool and sustainable fashion industry and is passionate about championing Australian agriculture globally.

While there is still work to do across all industries for gender equality, recognition of how far we have come is also important, and the diversity of the sheep industry is worth celebrating. Celebration also needs to be backed by the creation of future opportunities, which is exactly what this state government is doing.

In this place yesterday, I mentioned several state government supported initiatives that encourage women to step into leadership and decision-making roles across agriculture in rural and regional areas. One example is the Stepping into Leadership Program run by Women Together Learning and supported by PIRSA. Since 2012 more than 160 women from across South Australia have completed the program. Many of these women are now industry leaders, board members, business owners and mentors themselves. But it is more than professional development: the program is about building networks, creating role models and ensuring women are visible in leadership.

We know that diversity makes industries stronger, so by supporting women as well as men to take on new roles the whole industry benefits. This forum is a timely reminder of the enormous contribution that both women and the sheep industry make to our economy. It was also a delight to have Senator Don Farrell, Minister for Trade, attending the forum, as did the member for Frome. The state government, through PIRSA, is proud to stand alongside producers, industry and community leaders to build a strong future for the sheep industry and its participants and for regional South Australia.

CLOSING THE GAP IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on the topic of the role of land in our South Australian Closing the Gap Implementation Plan.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Aboriginal Lands Trust has this week made public comment, raising their concern that, as it currently stands, the role of landholding bodies, such as the Aboriginal Lands Trust, has not been included in our South Australian Closing the Gap Implementation Plan, despite the importance, of course, of land as a foundation for health, wellbeing, economic participation and cultural continuity. My question to the minister therefore is: what has or will the Malinauskas government do to ensure that the contributions of landholding bodies, such as the ALT

and others, are better recognised and embedded in our state's Closing the Gap efforts and specifically in our Closing the Gap Implementation Plan?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for her question. Certainly, the role that can be played by the care and control that Aboriginal people and Aboriginal groups and communities have over land is a central feature of the economic empowerment of Aboriginal people.

There is a saying in relation to Aboriginal people's care and control of land that many Aboriginal people are land rich but dirt poor. The ALT, for example, has invested in I think about half a million hectares of land. A vast percentage, and I think it's now a majority of the percentage, of the South Australian land mass has native title determinations over it.

It is something I have said recently in speeches—as late as this week at the South Australian Aboriginal business showcase—that I firmly believe, and there are many others, that the next wave of Aboriginal empowerment is an economic rights agenda. Making sure that the interest in land can be used for economic empowerment for Aboriginal people is a centrally important area.

I am happy to take it on notice to see the parties to the current Closing the Gap refresh, which, from memory—it was 2018 or 2019 I think that the current 17 socio-economic targets were decided on and as a joint enterprise between governments, commonwealth and state and territory governments, and the Coalition of Peaks, the peak bodies representing a whole range of different areas.

I am not sure if landholding authorities feature in the Coalition of Peaks in other jurisdictions. It might be that in the Northern Territory, where there are commonwealth statutory landholding authorities such as the central and northern land councils, there might be some input, but I am happy to take that on notice and go away and have a look.

EVANS, MR M.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:05): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport a question about recent employment decisions by the Rail Commissioner or his delegate.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Mr Mark Evans, a tram driver with more than 17 years' service who has received multiple written commendations for outstanding customer service, including performing CPR on passengers on two separate occasions, is currently facing an issue with regard to his employment with the Rail Commissioner.

Mr Evans was first employed by the state government as a tram driver in 2009 and continued that role until 2020, when he was then employed by Adelaide Metro operations until August this year, when tram services were returned to public operation.

I understand Mr Evans voluntarily disclosed a historical conviction from 2007 both when he was first employed in 2009 and again in his pre-employment declaration earlier this year. Despite this transparency and despite holding a valid working with children check issued in 2019 his conditional offer of employment with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport was withdrawn in August following a review of his police clearance.

It is further understood that no opportunity was provided for Mr Evans to explain the circumstances of his historical matter before the decision was made. Since the withdrawal of his employment, Mr Evans and his wife have reportedly experienced significant mental distress as a result of this process and its impact on their livelihood and wellbeing. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the minister aware of this matter?
2. Can the minister make inquiries on this issue, including whether the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and the Rail Commissioner's delegate followed proper procedures,

including the obligation to afford procedural fairness, in handling Mr Evans' employment matter and the circumstances that have caused such distress?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism)
(15:07): I thank the member for his question. I am happy to look further into it.

CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister update the chamber about the Malinauskas Labor government's recent investment in bicycle projects in South Australia?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism)
(15:07): I thank the honourable member for their question and interest in active transport in SA. Just yesterday, we celebrated National Ride2Work Day, which was a great reminder of the power of active transport, whether it is a family ride on the weekend or a daily commute to work.

I am proud to share that the Malinauskas government is making it a little bit easier to get on our bikes, with a \$2 million investment, as we spoke about just earlier, which was made available to 18 dedicated bike projects across regional and metropolitan Adelaide. The \$2 million State Bicycle Fund enables local councils to build more bike paths and lanes as well as improving existing ones, helping communities to stay active and healthy with more cycling options. These projects also make riding safer for cyclists, with wider paths for extra space to avoid collisions and new crossings to safely get to their destination.

This latest funding round will accelerate 12 construction-ready projects valued at around \$1.9 million, with an additional \$100,000 that will support six councils in developing plans to make future projects shovel ready and eligible for the upcoming future rounds.

Among the 18 projects we are upgrading 150 metres of the River Torrens linear trail just west of the Victoria Bridge, which will enable it to be widened to about 3.5 metres and also upgrading lighting on that path as well. We are undertaking a detailed design for the bicycle and pedestrian crossing on The Parade and constructing 530 metres of three-metre wide shared-use path along the railway corridors in Rosewater and Florence Terrace in Ottoway.

We are constructing 1.46 kilometres of three-metre wide shared-use path on Adams Road, Elizabeth Downs, and Yorktown Road in Craigmare. But this fund isn't just for the metropolitan area; we are also investing in bicycle infrastructure in regions too. Projects like The Barossa Council area are receiving funding to construct three kilometres of 2.5 metre-wide shared-use path through the disused rail corridor in Birdwood and also projects in Mount Pleasant, and construction of a 500-metre 1.5 metre-wide shoulder seal between Seagers Road and Cricks Mill Road in Mount Pleasant. We are also providing projects in Mount Gambier that will benefit their community.

I am pleased these projects will undertake either the design or construction phase during the 2025-26 financial year, meaning the benefits will be seen by the community sooner rather than later. When there is more cycling infrastructure in our communities, we know it can be a positive way to encourage people to get outdoors and be active.

CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:11): Supplementary: is the minister concerned about the failure of the Adelaide City Council to deliver the east-west bikeway in light of her ambitions in this regard and what action will she be taking?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I never heard anything about east-west bikeway, but up to you.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism)
(15:11): There was a lot about bikes and that is what I will be answering. We continue to be happy to invest in projects like this with this dedicated bicycle fund, where councils can put in their plans or even put in a request to help them get their projects to be shovel ready.

CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:11): Supplementary: can the minister advise the chamber how many applications were received by the government?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:11): I am happy to look into that further.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:11): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries regarding biosecurity. Do PIRSA or PIRSA inspectors routinely inspect beehives entering South Australia, particularly given the increased risk of varroa mite, and, if not, can the minister inform the chamber under what circumstances post-entry movement inspections are performed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for her question. Members would be aware of the destructive varroa mite, called in fact the varroa destructor, which was detected in NSW in 2022. There has been a lot of work done since that time and, particularly given we have moved to a management phase nationally in terms of varroa mite, it was essential that there be in place a plan or framework for dealing with varroa.

The national eradication response was initially established and led by New South Wales, but here in South Australia we established a South Australian Varroa Industry Advisory Committee (SAVIAC), which worked very hard in terms of developing the plan for how to deal with varroa. A number of different mechanisms are in place, and I have mentioned some of them in terms of Kangaroo Island, but appreciate that the question that the honourable member asked was about hives coming into South Australia.

Certainly, as a government we remain committed to working closely with interstate and commonwealth agencies, the pollination-dependent industries and the honey bee industry. As such, movement restrictions have been in place since June 2022 for entry of bees and bee commodities into South Australia, and these restrictions are regularly reviewed and updated. Entry of bees and bee commodities are subject to Chief Inspector of Stock permission, with individual applications assessed on a case-by-case basis.

In some ways you could say that South Australia's apiary industry is relatively self-sufficient, only requiring the introduction of queens and the movement of approximately 10,000 hives to support pollination from interstate. That being said, our advice from industry was that it would not be possible to service all of the pollination-dependent industry through the relevant time period without bringing hives in from interstate.

According to my advice, live bees and apiary commodities are permitted from Queensland and Victoria, while only apiary commodities—honey, wax, plant and equipment—are permitted from New South Wales. To minimise the biosecurity risk, these movements may require approved pre-entry treatment and/or testing combined with approved post-entry integrity inspections or testing, management, documentation and notification.

PIRSA also continues to undertake preparedness and planning considerations in preparation for subsequent varroa mite detections in South Australia, should they occur. In the case of the detection of varroa mite in the Riverland recently, that was detected through some surveillance of the particular site and we appreciate all of those who were involved with assisting with that detection and response.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Supplementary: can the minister take on notice specifically in what circumstances post-entry movement inspections are performed—appreciating the minister's comments earlier on pre-entry? The question was on post-entry. Can the minister please take it on notice?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:16): I am happy to take that on notice.

EUREKA PRIZE FOR EXCELLENCE IN FORENSIC SCIENCE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:16): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General inform the council about the recent awarding of the Eureka Prize for Excellence in Forensic Science?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:16): I thank the member for his question. I would be most happy to do so. The 2025 Australian Museum Eureka Prize Award ceremony was held in Sydney in early September. The Eureka Prizes are the country's most comprehensive national science awards, honouring excellence across the areas of research, innovation, leadership, science engagement and school science.

After 3½ decades, the awards have celebrated the creativity, dedication and collaboration that drive innovation and deliver solutions to some of the world's greatest challenges. The Eureka Prize for Excellence in Forensic Science was awarded this year to South Australia's very own Forensic Science SA and Flinders University for their work on producing a smart PCR machine. The project team developed a DNA amplification system that improves the quality of genetic data from degraded or low-level samples. This increases the chances of recovering usable results for forensic investigations and other scientific applications.

It was led by a forensic science team of Professor Adrian Linacre, PhD candidate Caitlin McDonald, with Associate Professor Russell Brinkworth and Dr Duncan Taylor from Forensic Science SA. I send my congratulations to Forensic Science SA and Flinders University for their exceptional achievement in progressing this world-leading innovation and the longstanding collaboration that Forensic Science SA and Flinders University has to the benefit of forensic sciences right across Australia and indeed the world.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. When and by whom was the minister advised that the algal bloom would clear up during the winter months?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his question. I must say, though, I think this question has been answered a number of times, but I am happy to reiterate that. Back when the bloom first became clear in roughly March of this year, there was a round table that was co-hosted by the then Minister for the Environment, the Hon. Susan Close, and myself, with a number of coastal councils.

We included in that, if I remember correctly, the information that we had been receiving from those with expertise in algal blooms and marine environments. That, of course, included people from within SARDI who, as I understand it, throughout this period have been liaising with their interstate counterparts and certainly with overseas experts as well.

The information that was provided—and I would stress that this was what was likely to happen, anticipated to happen, based on the knowledge at that time, and particularly based on previous experiences here in South Australia, remembering that we have had algal blooms here before. In 2014, in Coffin Bay, there was one of reasonable strength and duration but, at the time, the expectation was that with choppy weather, stronger winds, changes in temperature, those types of things would all contribute towards breaking up the bloom.

Since that time, we have been able to learn more and more about algal blooms. Obviously, here in South Australia, it has not behaved in the way that was, at that time back in March-April, anticipated. We have been able to bring in experts from overseas. We have been able to have more detailed interactions with experts in the fields, and look at the various ways that algal blooms do behave and, of course, we have been able to assess more information in regard to the type of *Karenia* that is causing the algal bloom here in South Australia.

I would certainly like to place on the record my appreciation, and I think the appreciation of the government and many in the South Australian community, for the hard work that SARDI does, and has continued to do, during this algal bloom. I think here, on this side of the chamber, we certainly

respect and appreciate the work that they do, the expertise that they bring, and the extremely hard work they have been putting in while they have attempted to find out more and more, and to learn more and more about the algal bloom, and how we may be able to be more prepared for however it behaves as we go forward.

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 14 October 2025.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:21): I rise to make some remarks in support of this motion, which is being moved by the Attorney-General to mark 50 years since the decriminalisation of male homosexuality in South Australia. On 27 August 1975, this parliament passed the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Amendment Act, making South Australia the first jurisdiction in Australia to decriminalise male homosexuality. The act came into operation on 2 October that year, and with it our state began a journey of reform that would be later mirrored across the nation.

Of course, we all know in South Australia that the catalyst for that was the drowning of George Duncan in 1972 on 10 May, which was obviously a tragic and horrendous act, and those who were responsible for his death have never been brought—justice has never been brought for George Duncan. It is certainly horrendous that it took that act for South Australia to change its laws and so less of it being about us as a state being naturally progressively minded, but responding to something that was as horrific as that.

On the positive side, it was a legislative change which has led to cultural shifts to recognise that people should be able to be living their best lives without being marginalised or criminalised or shamed simply for being who they are. It is fitting that we celebrate this 50th anniversary and also remember that there were many people who suffered under the laws that denied them equality, so the motion rightly expresses regret to South Australians who were charged and convicted of offences that should not have ever existed.

Earlier this month, a number of us had the honour of taking part in the re-enactment of the historic parliamentary debates at the time. There was certainly, I think, a sense of the history of the moment, particularly because we had some of the members of parliament who had participated in the passage of the legislation able to be there and speak in this place.

It was a momentous occasion which I do not think was lost on anyone. In particular, Peter Duncan flew back to South Australia to make his contribution, which was not actually the words that he spoke at the time but certainly reflected on the legal changes. We also heard from Anne Levy, who introduced that piece of legislation in the Legislative Council chamber. It was fantastic to hear from both of those individuals.

The Hon. Murray Hill, who introduced the first legislation in Australia, obviously passed away some years ago, but it was fantastic to have here his son, the Hon. Robert Hill, a former senator, and his wife, Diana, who were very instrumental in the 1972 Murray Hill legislation coming into being. I did ask Robert if he was prepared to do the speech, and in his dry way he said he was a bit too old to participate in acting effectively, so I had the great honour of doing the excerpt from his speech.

I would also like to, as part of that process, particularly acknowledge Tim Reeves for the fantastic work he did in making sure that the time that we spent speaking accurately reflected the debates at the time. Rather than us reading everything verbatim, he painstakingly went through all of the speeches that took place and was able to pull out the really important aspects of the debate.

I also acknowledge Ian Hunter, who chaired our multipartisan committee, and Rob Simms, both of whom I think have done a huge amount of work behind the scenes—and their staff, I might add. I acknowledge Kirby as well, from the Office of the Premier and Cabinet. Without all of their hard work, this certainly would not have happened.

Each of the members of the committee had the opportunity to speak. We also had Paul Starick read out a number of editorials and letters to the editor at the time, which I think also very well reflected the debates. *The Advertiser*, interestingly, took a very positive view of law reform. I think it was really important that *The Advertiser* showed that level of leadership, to ensure that the public debates reflected various views and certainly did present both sides of the argument.

Murray Hill was the first legislator in Australia, as I mentioned, to introduce such reform. It would have been very difficult for him to do that at the time, I think, certainly in that period and in times since. For him to have introduced a law which challenged the existing law and to do that in a jurisdiction for the first time, he would have been subject to whisper campaigns and all sorts of things.

I think both he and other people who had advocated for this law reform were forced to deny that they were homosexual, as if that was an issue, but that shows the level of pettiness that people would go to in order to undermine the debate. He spoke quite clearly to say that people come before other interests, and he had been very moved to introduce this law. Of course, Australia was not the first place where this law reform took place but had the advantage of the British parliament changing its laws previously, and he was able to lean very much into the Wolfenden report that had been tabled, which advocated for change.

I think it is worth also mentioning that as part of this process with our 50th anniversary committee Simon Royal was commissioned to do an essay, which covers all of this in great detail and which I think is available on the DHS website. Ian is nodding. Simon Royal is a master of telling a story, particularly historical stories. He has done a lot of work and interviewed a range of people and the essay is called 'Out Law to Just Law: SA's Path to Gay Law Reform'.

He interviewed the Hills as part of that process and in Simon's essay it details—and I heard this directly from Diana Hill myself—that, as a new psychologist, one of the first tasks Diana had was to convert a young gay man because at that stage, of course, homosexuality was considered a mental illness and had its own place in the DSM (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders). As a psychologist, she was tasked with trying to convert him from being gay, which, she actually said, she thought was completely ridiculous.

This thing had been a subject of discussion around the Hill family table. Robert Hill had a role working with the Crown Solicitor's Office to try to assist his father to put together a piece of legislation. Of course, that law was not to pass and it had amendments to it. I will not go into all of those details which made it not as desirable as it could have been, but I think it does demonstrate that there were attempts being made from my side of politics.

There have been a number of reforms since. Obviously, people who are members of the LGBTIQ+ community still continue to suffer marginalisation and discrimination, so we still have a way to go, but it is deserving to reflect on the history and over the passage of time that a number of the debates at the time do not stand up very well to scrutiny of the language. I think we would probably use quite different language in this day and age, but it does demonstrate that we have come some way in this journey and it was a very significant reform that is worth celebrating.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:32): On 17 September 1975, South Australia became the first jurisdiction in Australia to decriminalise male homosexuality with the passing of the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Amendment Act in the Legislative Council. We are here celebrating 50 years on, yet the path to legislative reform was not as easy as some people today think it might have been, nor was it inevitable that South Australia would have been first but for an unfortunate incident three years prior at around 11pm on 10 May 1972 when Adelaide University Law Professor Dr George Duncan was thrown into the River Torrens. He could not swim. He only had half a lung and received a broken leg on that occasion and consequently drowned.

The banks of the River Torrens were a popular gay beat for gay and bisexual men and married men who hooked up with men on the side, and it was known as the 'number 1 beat'. This was also a popular spot for vice squad officers to throw homosexual men into the river. The vice squad routinely called these evenings 'teaching the poofters how to swim lessons'.

Dr Duncan was not the first man to die for his sexuality, or because of his sexuality, but he certainly was not the last. But his death ignited calls that would bring resounding change not just to our state but later on to the rest of the nation—a long time later for states like Tasmania. For the benefit of the chamber, I will briefly summarise that pathway to legislative reform.

As the Hon. Michelle Lensink just outlined, the Hon. Murray Hill MLC, member of the Liberal Country League, introduced the Criminal Law Consolidation (Homosexuality) Amendment Bill in the Legislative Council. The original intent of that bill was to decriminalise male homosexuality; however, amendments moved by some of his colleagues essentially eviscerated that intent, leaving homosexual sex as a criminal act, albeit allowing for a defence if it occurred between two people or two men over the age of 21 in private. Later on, on 19 September 1973, Peter Duncan MP, the newly elected member for Elizabeth, introduced the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Amendment Bill in the House of Assembly. The bill was amended in the House of Assembly before being defeated in the Legislative Council. Between 1973 and 1975 the bill would be introduced and defeated two more times.

Throughout these years, there were numerous petitions tabled in both houses objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalise sodomy between consenting adults until such time as the parliament had its clear mandate from the people by way of a referendum. In total, there were over 11,264 signatures, I am advised, objecting to decriminalisation. Nevertheless, public support was growing and on 27 August 1975, Peter Duncan MP once again introduced an unamended Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Amendment Bill in the lower house. It passed all stages in one day and, on 28 August 1975, the Hon. Anne Levy MLC introduced the bill into the Legislative Council. Finally, on 17 September 1975, the bill passed, making our state the first state in the country to decriminalise male homosexuality.

When I was 14 this legislation passed, and I was 15 when it received royal assent. I remember at the time feeling that a huge weight had been lifted from my shoulders, and that I would not be growing up to be a criminal and subject to the criminal law. But, of course, the passage of that legislation did not remove prejudice or discrimination overnight. Indeed, it was still present and whilst it was reassuring to know that I would not be going to jail for who I am, I still knew that I had better keep myself quiet on the issues of sexuality and not 'come out'—as the term is—until certainly I was away from home and certainly away from school. It just was not safe.

A few years later, after that legislation passed, we were in a fight again to change more legislation, but we were fighting on two fronts: an attempt to change the equal opportunity legislation—or it was the anti-discrimination bill at the time—and also in a fight for our lives in terms of the AIDS crisis hitting us in the early 1980s. The Labor government, in 1984, introduced the anti-discrimination bill—that was an election promise—and the title would be later amended, I think in this chamber, to what we know today as the Equal Opportunity Bill.

For myself and a number of other young queer activists at the time, this was a call to arms and a call to be active politically. We advocated for the inclusion of a clause of sexuality into the bill as grounds for discrimination. Many of the honourable members in this chamber at the time were not too thrilled with those efforts. I made a speech to the Law Society a few months ago about the journey of this equal opportunity legislation. I read parts of the record from members who were outraged at

the suggestion that sexuality should be included in the Equal Opportunity Act as grounds for discrimination.

They wondered loudly in this chamber why on earth the government would be thinking to do that and who was instigating that call. They had heard no such call, received no such correspondence, and were flummoxed as to why it was needed. But, of course, it was the gay community at the time who said, 'We are still being fired from our jobs. We are still being refused our rental accommodation. We are still being thrown out of clubs because of who we are and who we love.'

After quite a heated debate, a lengthy debate and a long conference between the houses which finished I think at about 3am one morning, the bill was finally passed. I do not say this terribly often about the Hon. Robert Lucas, but he was instrumental, in fact, in having the numbers in the Legislative Council for maintaining that clause, that sexuality be included in the Equal Opportunity Bill.

The majority for that was I think 11 votes, and there was one other Liberal member who voted with him on this, and I cannot quite remember who it was, but the Hon. Mr Lucas was very clear in his contribution—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Martin Cameron.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: It was Martin Cameron, correct. With an amendment that he moved to satisfy himself that it would be properly phrased in the legislation, the Hon. Mr Lucas stood quite firm against considerable pressure from his own side to have that clause removed, and I thank him to this day because without those two votes—his vote and Martin Cameron's vote—we would not have that clause in that 1984 bill.

The inclusion of sexuality into that legislation was possibly a very simple inclusion, but it made a huge difference in the lives of the queer community in South Australia at the time. It meant that we were afforded the same protections as other South Australians in employment, in education and in life in general.

Most importantly for people at the time, they were discriminated against most egregiously in terms of the provision of accommodation. Many, many people lost their rentals because the landlords found out that they were gay. Many, many people were sacked and removed from their jobs because their employers found out that they were gay. These protections made it illegal for people to do that. Of course it still happened, but there were many cases taken to the equal opportunity commissioner to be rectified.

Alongside that ongoing political debate we also had to battle the issues of HIV/AIDS and, if anyone—well, not many of you here in the chamber were alive or around at that time. In fact, *The Advertiser* had reversed its previous policy of being small 'l' liberal to being incredibly hysterical. Page after page, on their front banner was a gay plague. The isolation of homosexuals, forced quarantining of them onto islands, compulsory testing and surveillance of gay men were calls that were printed in *The Advertiser* day after day. But luckily, because we had been organised as a community around the equal opportunity legislation campaign, we were pretty well-organised to meet and fight the campaign run by *The Advertiser* and others in the community about HIV/AIDS.

We were also blessed at the time with our health ministers. We know that South Australia had one of the best HIV/AIDS responses nationally and even internationally. That was due to the government's early engagement with the gay community and with evidence-led treatment from our experts, rather than responding to moral panic. We need to thank the Hon. Neal Blewett and the South Australian health minister John Cornwall for their considered response and their leadership at that time, which steadied the ship and allowed us as a nation to actually undertake responses to HIV/AIDS that were, as I said earlier, world leading.

Despite the crisis, or because of it, our community came together. We set up organisations to support each other, such as the AIDS Council of South Australia, the Gay Community Centre, the Gay and Lesbian Counselling Service, and the Darling House Community Library. These community-led initiatives built our strengths and our resilience to enable us to pursue these campaigns

throughout the eighties. But, as I said earlier, hate and vilification did not disappear overnight; in fact, they got a new lease.

I spoke in this chamber, not too long ago, about recent attacks across the nation against gay men, same-sex attracted men, who have been lured into orchestrated attacks through online platforms and dating apps, largely by groups of young men. It is unsettling for me that this online conservatism and bigotry has involved young men to use violence to attack, traumatise and blackmail men, still to this day.

It is true that there has been a very large shift in public opinion on homosexuality in this country over the 50 years. In 1975, opinion polls at the time suggested that only 57 per cent of the community supported decriminalising homosexuality. According to the long-term polls by Roy Morgan, from 2000 to 2001 only 36 per cent of respondents agreed that homosexuality was immoral. Around the time of the marriage equality debate in 2017, this dropped to only about 18 per cent of respondents around Australia thinking that marriage equality, homosexuality and the fight for our rights was immoral. That has subsequently edged back up to 21 per cent, I am advised, which is no surprise, I suppose, given the conservative attacks on young trans kids that have been happening in this country over the last 24 months, or three years.

The Advertiser's Paul Starick recently brought these stats to my attention and also to the attention of the Hon. Robert Simms. The Hon. Robert Simms expressed surprise that the figure was quite so high. I was surprised that it was so low. That probably reflects—I do not want to say our respective ages—our different life expectations and experiences; that sounds a little bit better! I lived through a worse time than perhaps the Hon. Robert Simms did.

There has been a steady stream of legislative reform for our community over the last several years, for which I am grateful. I want to acknowledge, without naming them all, the work of many of South Australia's parliamentarians for their efforts to better the lives of queer people in South Australia over the decades. Their work has led to several legislative changes aimed at removing areas of discrimination.

I will just briefly list some of them. On 14 November 2013, the Spent Convictions (Decriminalised Offences) Amendment Act was passed, allowing pre-1975 offences that constituted homosexual acts to be expunged from the record. In July 2016, the Statutes Amendment (Gender Identity and Equity) Act passed, which amended several acts to remove binary language regarding sex and gender, improved provisions on how the law applies to intersex or gender diverse people and removed language that was discriminatory from our legislation.

The Birth, Deaths and Marriages Registration (Gender Identity) Amendment Act, passed in August 2016, provided a simpler and less invasive process for people to change their registered sex or gender identity on formal records. The Adoption (Review) Amendment Act, which supported the adoption of children by same-sex couples, passed on 7 December 2016. One day before, on 6 December, the Relationships Register Act passed, which simplified processes for same-sex couples to demonstrate their relationship to government agencies and service providers. On 15 February 2017, the Statutes Amendment (Surrogacy Eligibility) Act passed, which altered access and eligibility provisions for surrogacy, assisted reproductive treatment and recognition of legal parentage.

The South Australian parliament passed the Statutes Amendment (Abolition of Defence of Provocation and Related Matters) Act in November 2020. The bill abolished the discriminatory defence for murder known as the gay panic defence. It came a decade too late. We were the last state in the country to eliminate this defence, and I am very grateful to the Hon. Vickie Chapman for moving on this when she was Attorney-General. In September 2024, we passed the Conversion Practises Prohibition Act, outlawing repressive conversion practices directed at changing or suppressing the sexual orientation or gender identity of individuals.

Notably, in December 2016, the Premier, Jay Weatherill apologised to the queer community in South Australia. I might just read into the record the motion. It is brief, but just to remind ourselves what we did in 2016:

1. That this house recognises that many lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer community members have been discriminated against by South Australia's legislation.

2. We accept that while South Australia has long been a leader in LGBTIQ reform, more must be done.
3. To LGBTIQ community members discriminated against in legislation, we offer you our unreserved and sincere regret and are sorry for those injustices.

The Premier went on to say in his contribution on that motion:

When our laws discriminate against a particular group of people, it sends a message that this prejudice written into law justifies treating people differently in our day-to-day lives. Such laws do not affect only the LGBTIQ community, they diminish our society as a whole. They diminish us by saying effectively that there are certain people who deserve to be treated differently, whose relationships are worth less, whose families should not exist, who are not entitled to the same fundamental rights as their neighbour.

The Hon. Steven Marshall, then Leader of the Opposition, later Premier, said:

I rise today to support the Premier's motion. It is not always that we can agree about matters before the house, but the Premier and I do so today because this motion is just and it is necessary. While it is a motion dealing with the past, I hope it will help lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer members of our community to enjoy a future of inclusion, allowing them to realise all of their dreams and all of their ambitions.

It is important today, as it was then in 2016 and as it was back in 1975, to remind ourselves that what we do in this place has real impacts on the lives of people, particularly, I think, on young people— young people who are starting to realise that their sexuality is not likely to probably be what we would call straight and who are looking for support, who are looking for inclusion and who are looking for recognition that they are valuable members of our community.

The Hon. Premier Jay Weatherill said in his closing remarks, when he introduced that motion into the chamber:

Finally, I spoke to a gay man earlier today and asked him what he felt this apology meant to him. He told me that he grew up in a time when homosexuality was unlawful. When he was growing up he could not see a future for himself, and that hurt him. So to him, and in particular to the young people who are here today, I especially want to address the young people who are not only in the chamber but perhaps listening to this or might find out about these remarks. I want you to know that who you are is okay and that you are a welcome part of the broader South Australian community. Today as Premier and as a member of parliament, I formally say sorry to all of you who have suffered injustices and indignities simply because of who you are.

I, here, with all of you today, celebrate the 50th anniversary of the decriminalisation of homosexuality with a feeling of joyfulness, but most importantly gratitude, because I lived through those 50 years and I know exactly what it means. We battled bigotry, homophobic comments, hostile rhetoric against ourselves and our community. Those of us who champion personal and human rights in this place have to continue to work and engage with our community, consider their perspectives and to right wrongs when they occur so that we can make their lives better—that is our job.

Over the past year, I have had great pleasure in chairing Premier Malinauskas' commemorative committee to celebrate the 50th anniversary of that 1975 legislation. The committee oversaw a series of events throughout May to November of this year to commemorate the anniversary and produced a physical program, and throughout that process we engaged a large and diverse range of groups, stakeholders and individuals to participate in the celebrations.

Initially, members of the committee thought we would be organising a simple re-enactment in parliament, but once it got out to the community that we were doing this it became very obvious that many people and organisations wanted to be involved with us. It turned out that it grew bigger than Topsy, and a number of organisations and events participated in that program over six to eight months. Just some of them were as follows.

Leading the Nation exhibition, by the State Library; On the Move: Adelaide and LGBTQ Migration exhibition, by the History Trust of South Australia; It's In Our Nature: A Queer Trail of the Museum, by the South Australian Museum; The Pinnacle Foundation's Big Queer Charity Quiz Night; Pride Gala, with Pride Adelaide; Pride Round, by the Adelaide Uni Sharks; Pride Tennis Serving Pride Initiative; Lunch with Professor Barbara Baird AM, by Rainbow Hub SA; It's a Sin: Songs of Love and Shame, by the City of Marion; Australasian HIV and AIDS Conference, by ASHM; Annual Hardcourt Tournament, by Pride Tennis; Commemorative Walk, by Hike Society Adelaide (which I understand the Hon. Michelle Lensink was a participant in—I met them at the coffee shop later, due to my dicky knee); Breaking Barriers: 50 years since the Decriminalisation of Homosexuality in South

Australia, an exhibition at the University of Adelaide; Intrastate Volleyball Tournament, by the Adelaide Spikers Volleyball Club; Pride Cup, by the Murder City Roller Girls; Poppin Out Street Party, with Mary's Poppin; Better Together Conference, with Equality Project; Feast Festival; The 1975 Decriminalisation of Male Homosexuality Debate Re-enactment at Parliament House; Pride March; An Audience with Don Dunstan, with the History Trust of South Australia; Equal Opportunity South Australia: Looking Back and Looking Ahead, with the Law Society of South Australia and the Equal Opportunity Commissioner; From Decriminalisation to Future Reform: Fifty Years of LGBTIQ+ Legal Progress in South Australia, at the University Adelaide Law School; 50 Years since the Decriminalization of Homosexuality in South Australia discussion Panel, with the History Trust of South Australia; History Walk, with Dr Gertrude Glossip and Thorne Harbor Health; Dr Duncan Commemorative Run, by the Adelaide Frontrunners; Queer Perspectives in Art Trail, with the Art Gallery of South Australia; Civic Display of Archives, by the City of Adelaide; Rainbow Crows Quiz Night; and Bloomin' Fabulous Flower Power Runway, with Thorne Harbor Health.

Yesterday, I think Minister Blair Boyer was out on the steps in some pink shorts, driving Don Dunstan's Datsun up and down outside Parliament House, which caused a flurry out on the street.

For all of their hard work I thank the other members of the committee, including the Hon. Robert Simms, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Lucy Hood and the Hon. David Pisoni and our committee secretary, Kirby-Alyce Welk. It has been truly encouraging to watch as South Australia's queer community has come together to celebrate this great occasion. It was bigger than we thought it would be, but it just shows how impacting this 50-year celebration has been on our community.

I will end there. I think it is important for us to understand that, as I said earlier, the things we do in this place have real ramifications out there in the community, for ill or for good. I want to particularly remind younger members of the queer community, I want them to know that on their path and as they realise the person they are and will become there are people in this place and the other place who will be there for them. They are not alone. Members in parliament will stand up for their right to live their authentic lives. We will fight to protect their freedoms, to be who they are and love who they choose to love, and even if some of us individually will not be here into the future, we will make damn sure that our replacements do that job as well.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:55): I want to thank my parliamentary colleagues who have contributed on this motion: the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Jing Lee, and in particular my friends the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Ian Hunter. I also acknowledge a very similar motion in the other place that was moved by former Deputy Premier Dr the Hon. Sue Betty Close. When you look at that list of humans, it is a pretty remarkable list of pretty good humans who have spoken on this motion.

It is almost impossible for us today to imagine that only 50 years ago, in the lifetime of people who are in this parliament, being a gay man was effectively a criminal offence in South Australia. Since then, as has been noted by speakers, South Australia has continued to lead on LGBTQIA+ reform with the passage of legislation on equal opportunity, anti-discrimination, same-sex parenting rights, de facto and marriage equality, the ending of the gay panic defence and vital public health advances.

I am exceptionally proud to be part of a parliament that has contributed to our state's legacy of reform with the passage during this parliamentary term of the Conversion Practices Prohibition Bill last year. As the Hon. Ian Hunter read out, a quote from the Hon. Jay Weatherill referring particularly to young members of this community, 'Who you are is okay,' and that conversion practices bill reinforced that you are loved just the way you are. You do not need to change.

These achievements that we have heard about during the course of this motion did not happen by accident. They were driven by courage, compassion and unwavering belief in equality. I would like also to thank those advocates, community members and allies whose courage transformed the lives of those and whose efforts continue to shape a more inclusive South Australia. Your courage and leadership has brought us here. To those still fighting today: we stand with you.

Motion carried.

Bills

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

Second Reading

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism)
(15:57): 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.

I am pleased to introduce the Education and Children's Services (Inclusive Education) Amendment Bill 2025. This Bill implements part of the government's response to recommendations of the Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability.

In 2023 the Disability Royal Commission made 222 recommendations for preventing and responding to violence, abuse, neglect against, and exploitation of, people with disability, and for building a more inclusive society in which the rights of people with disability are respected, protected and fulfilled.

Fifteen of the Royal Commission's recommendations were directed towards promoting safe, quality and inclusive education for students with disability in all Australian schools. These recommendations followed the Royal Commission's sobering findings that students with disability face multiple barriers to inclusive education, underpinned by negative attitudes and low expectations. Some of the key barriers it identified included gatekeeping practices, which deny students with disability access to the school of their choice or informally discourage their attendance; the inappropriate use of exclusionary discipline, particularly from an early age; and the failure to provide students with disability with appropriate adjustments, supports and individualized planning.

To overcome these barriers, the Royal Commission recommended a range of legislative and policy changes, improved procedures and support services, and changes to culture, capability and practice.

Last December, the South Australian Government, together with Catholic Education South Australia and the Association of Independent Schools of South Australia jointly announced a cross-sector response to implementing key recommendations of the Royal Commission related to preventing discrimination and exclusion and ensuring a more inclusive education for students with disability in South Australia. Implementation of two of the recommendations, 7.1 and 7.2, requires amendments to the *Education and Children's Services Act 2019*. These recommendations specifically addressed providing equal access to mainstream education and enrolment, and preventing the inappropriate use of exclusionary discipline against students with disability. The Bill I am introducing today will amend the Act to support the implementation of those two recommendations in all South Australian schools.

The Bill will insert a new object into the Act to make clear that education and children's services provided under the Act are to be inclusive by enabling the participation of children and students with disability and supporting them to develop to their fullest potential.

As disability is not currently defined in the Act, the Bill will also insert a definition of disability, aligned with that in the Commonwealth *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*.

The Bill will remove the existing power of the Chief Executive of the Department for Education to direct that a child be enrolled in a specified government school because of the child's disabilities or learning difficulties.

The Bill will prohibit a government or non-government school from refusing a child's enrolment on the basis that the child has a disability, unless the enrolment of the child would impose an unjustifiable hardship on the school. In determining whether a hardship imposed on the school would be an unjustifiable hardship, all relevant circumstances of the case will need to be taken into account, including the matters referred to in section 11 the Commonwealth *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* and any relevant provisions of the *Disability Standards for Education* made under that Act.

Government and non-government school principals will be required to report to the Minister, annually, on the number of children with disability who had their enrolment refused on the basis that it would impose an unjustifiable hardship on the school. They will also need to report on the number of students with disability whose enrolment was cancelled and any measures taken by the school to reduce the number of refusals or cancellations of enrolments of children or students with disability.

The Bill includes provision for the regulations to prescribe other information that must be included in the reports to the Minister. I note in this regard that we intend to prescribe that reporting should also include the number of children with disability who had their enrolment refused on the basis that the school was at enrolment capacity, recognizing that this is another reason that a school may need to refuse an enrolment application. As there are multiple

factors that determine how enrolment capacity is defined and managed by different schools, it was determined to include this detail in regulations rather than in the primary legislation. The Government is committed to working with the non-government schooling sector on those regulations.

The Bill further requires that the Minister publish a report setting out the number of times children with a disability were refused enrolment at government schools, and the number of times children with disability were refused enrolment at non-government schools, on the ground that it would impose an unjustifiable hardship on the school, as well as the number of times students with a disability had their enrolment cancelled in each sector. The Minister's report will also need to include information regarding any trends identified in relation to the refusal or cancellation of the enrolment of children or students with a disability, and any measures taken by the sectors to reduce the number of refusals or cancellations of enrolments of children or students with disability by government or non-government schools.

Government and non-government school principals will also be required to report to the Minister, annually, de-identified information on the use of exclusionary discipline against students with disability at the school. This will include, for example, the number of times a student with disability was suspended, excluded or expelled, the grounds for the disciplinary action and the number of schools days impacted. The Minister will be required to publish sector-level reports of the information provided in relation to government and non-government schools.

The use of exclusionary discipline in government schools is regulated by the Act and associated regulations, however Catholic and Independent schools are not subject to those provisions and are able to determine their own approaches. To support the implementation of Recommendation 7.2, the Bill will insert a new requirement that all non-Government schools have a published policy regarding the use of exclusionary discipline in relation to students of the school. The policies will be required to set out the general approach of the school to managing student behaviour and the purpose for which exclusionary discipline may be used; the types of exclusionary discipline that may be used, when they may be used, and by whom, the maximum length of time for which a student may be suspended, and the process for a student to return to school following a period of suspension.

In relation to these matters, the policies must be, as far as is reasonably practicable, commensurate with any policy relating to exclusionary discipline that applies to Government schools.

The Bill sets out that matters to which a person must have regard in determining whether to suspend or expel a student from a non-Government school will be able to be prescribed in regulations. The *Education and Children's Services Regulations 2020* already include a range of matters that must be considered when determining whether to suspend, exclude or expel a student from a government school. Draft amendment regulations have been developed in consultation with the non-government sector which will extend the application of this regulation to non-government schools, and add a number of additional matters that will need to be considered by all schools, including the age of the student, whether the student has a disability, whether there is an individual learning plan in place for the student and whether it's being implemented, and whether there are any reasonable alternatives to suspending, excluding or expelling the student available in the circumstances.

In developing the amendments proposed by this Bill, the Government has worked closely with Catholic Education South Australia and the Association of Independent Schools of South Australia, disability advocacy groups, principals' associations, the Australian Education Union and other peak bodies, and I sincerely thank all of those bodies for their contributions to this important work.

The Bill and draft supporting Regulations were subject to public consultation through the YourSay website from 20 May to 13 June 2025. The measures in the Bill were well supported, with stakeholders particularly welcoming the increase in transparency and accountability that the new reporting provisions will bring.

All children deserve access to a safe, quality, and inclusive education system, but the Royal Commission shone a light on the barriers that still exist for many children with disability. This Bill will support the implementation of two of the Royal Commission's recommendations for overcoming these barriers and enabling children and students with disability to participate and realise their full potential.

I commend the Bill to the house and I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Education and Children's Services Act 2019*

3—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of *disability* which is based on the definition used in the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* of the Commonwealth.

4—Amendment of section 4—Application of Act to non-Government schools

This clause makes a consequential amendment to reflect that some of the proposed amendments to the Act by this measure will apply only to non-Government schools (see proposed new Part 7 Division 3A).

5—Amendment of section 7—Objects and principles

This amendment inserts as a new object of the Act to ensure that the provision of education and children's services in the State is inclusive by enabling the participation of children and students with a disability and supporting them to reach their fullest potential.

6—Amendment of section 62—Chief Executive may direct that child be enrolled in particular school

The amendment to section 62(1) to delete paragraph (a) removes the power of the Chief Executive of the Department to direct that a specified child be enrolled in a specified school if satisfied that, on the basis that the child has disabilities or learning difficulties, it is necessary or appropriate to do so.

7—Insertion of Part 7 Division 1 Subdivision 1A

This clause inserts a new Subdivision in Part 7 Division 1 of the Act as follows:

Subdivision 1A—Enrolment of children or students with a disability

63A—Enrolment of children with disability

Proposed section 63A provides that a child must not be refused enrolment at a school (whether a Government or non-Government school) on the basis that the child has a disability unless it would impose an unjustifiable hardship on the school. In determining whether a hardship would be an *unjustifiable hardship*, all relevant circumstances must be taken into account including those matters set out in section 11 of the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* of the Commonwealth and any relevant provisions of the *Disability Standards for Education 2005* made under that Act.

63B—Reporting in relation to refusal or cancellation of enrolment of children or students with disability

Proposed section 63B sets out the reporting requirements for Government and non-Government schools in relation to the refusal to enrol, or the cancellation of the enrolment of, children or students with a disability. This includes the number of children with a disability that were refused enrolment at a school on the ground that it would impose an unjustifiable hardship, the numbers of students with a disability whose enrolments were cancelled, the measures taken by the school to reduce the number of refusals or cancellations of enrolments and any other prescribed information. This information must be provided on an annual basis by 31 May in relation to the previous calendar year. The Minister must then publish a report on the information collected from the schools by 31 August in each year. Information provided for the purposes of this section must not directly or indirectly identify any individual and the information provided by the schools is not liable to disclosure under the *Freedom of Information Act 1991*.

8—Amendment of heading to Part 7 Division 3

This amendment makes a consequential amendment to the heading to Division 3 of Part 7 to take account of proposed new Part 7 Division 3A.

9—Insertion of section 80A

This clause inserts proposed section 80A as follows:

80A—Reporting in relation to suspension, exclusion and expulsion of students with disability

Proposed section 80A sets out the reporting requirements for Government schools in relation to the suspension, exclusion or expulsion of students with a disability. This includes the number of times students with a disability were suspended, excluded or expelled, the number of students with a disability that were suspended, excluded or expelled and, of those students, the number of instances each student was suspended, excluded or expelled, and for how long. Information is also required regarding the grounds on which those students were suspended, excluded or expelled and, of the total number of students with a disability enrolled at the school, the proportion of those that were suspended, excluded or expelled. This information must be provided on an annual basis by 31 May in relation to the previous calendar year. The Minister must then publish a report on the information collected from the schools by 31 August in each year. Information provided for the purposes of this section must not directly or indirectly identify any individual and the information provided by the schools is not liable to disclosure under the *Freedom of Information Act 1991*.

10—Insertion of Part 7 Division 3A

This clause inserts a new Division 3A in Part 7 of the Act as follows:

Division 3A—Suspension and expulsion of students—non-Government schools

81A—Non-Government school to have policy in relation to suspension and expulsion of students

Proposed section 81A sets out the requirement for a non-Government school to have a policy regarding the use of exclusionary discipline (suspension and expulsion) in relation to students of the school. The policy must set out the general approach of the school to managing student behaviour and the purpose for which exclusionary discipline may be used, the types of exclusionary discipline that may be used and the grounds on which they can be imposed. It must also set out who is authorised to use exclusionary discipline and the maximum length of time for which a student may be suspended, in ordinary circumstances, and in exceptional circumstances. The policy must also set out the process for a student who has been suspended to return to the school and any other matters prescribed by the regulations. The policy must, as far as is reasonably practicable, be commensurate with any policy relating to exclusionary discipline that applies to Government schools. The policy is required to be published on the school's website.

81B—Reporting in relation to suspension and expulsion of students with disability

Proposed section 81B sets out the reporting requirements for non-Government schools in relation to the suspension or expulsion of students with a disability. This information is consistent with the information to be provided by non-Government schools under proposed section 80A. This includes the number of times students with a disability were suspended or expelled, the number of students with a disability that were suspended or expelled and, of those students, the number of instances each student was suspended or expelled, and for how long. Information is also required regarding the grounds on which those students were suspended or expelled and, of the total number of students with a disability enrolled at the school, the proportion of those that were suspended or expelled. This information must be provided on an annual basis by 31 May in relation to the previous calendar year. The Minister must then publish a report on the information collected from the schools by 31 August in each year. Information provided for the purposes of this section must not directly or indirectly identify any individual and the information provided by the schools is not liable to disclosure under the *Freedom of Information Act 1991*.

81C—Regulations in relation to decision to suspend or expel a student from non-Government school

Proposed section 81C provides that the regulations may specify matters to which a person must have regard when deciding whether to suspend a student from a non-Government school.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

TAFE SA BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism)

(15:58): 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 TAFE SA Bill 2025 responds to the recommendation of Associate Professor Jeannie Rea in the report for the 2023 Roadmap for the Future of TAFE SA, that the *TAFE SA Act 2012* be reformed to articulate repositioning of TAFE SA, with reforms reflected in functions, governance and the management structure.

The Government commissioned the Roadmap Report to engage with industry, unions, government, TAFE SA staff and students on long term changes required to support TAFE SA to deliver skills needs for the State.

Out of this work, I announced a first action, to review the *TAFE SA Act 2012*.

This was to ensure TAFE SA's legislation is more focussed on delivering in the public interest and on government priorities; and places TAFE SA at the centre of the Government's goals for skills development for the State.

Since its incorporation in 2012, TAFE SA has operated as a statutory corporation under the direction of an independent Board of directors.

I have publicly stated that the 2012 Bill doesn't support TAFE SA to be the public training provider the public expects. I don't reflect on those members in this House who passed the Bill then, as here in SA and Nationally VET and TAFE was operating in a very different market to where we are today.

TAFE SA is the public provider. It should be focused on delivering quality vocational educational outcomes for all South Australians – with acting in the public interest as its core requirement.

Our government has high expectations of TAFE SA, to play its role in regional and remote delivery, teaching in thin markets and being at the forefront of new and growing areas of curriculum development.

I'm proud that this Bill sets out clear objectives that realign TAFE SA's purpose.

Development of the Bill was facilitated by a Project Reference Group, tasked with leading a review to establish a fit-for-purpose governance framework for TAFE SA, and consequential changes to the Act. Guiding principles for this work were that TAFE SA:

- develops and delivers industry-relevant training aligned to government priorities, supporting a strong economy through a skilled and agile workforce
- ensures eligible South Australians have the training they need to participate fully in their local communities and economy, including through removing barriers to access
- is an effective and efficient organisation with clear governance arrangements.

Out of this work a draft Bill was developed, which transitions TAFE SA from a public corporation to a statutory authority. The Government consulted with key stakeholders on a draft version of this Bill, and respondents to the review provided valuable feedback, which has resulted in a number of improvements and refinements, included in the Bill.

The Bill enshrines the legislative means to transition TAFE SA from a public corporation to a statutory authority, without eroding corporate governance performance and accountability standards currently applied to TAFE SA through the general provisions of the *Public Corporations Act 1993*.

Similar to legislation for other statutory authorities, the Bill ensures TAFE SA obtains its authority and operating context from its enabling Act, and its functions, level of independence, and the respective roles of the Board, Chief Executive and the Minister are derived from its enabling legislation.

To highlight TAFE SA's role and importance at the centre of the vocational education and training sector, the Bill introduces Objects which are informed by the aspirational and contemporary values for the State's vocational education and training system, similarly expressed in the *Adelaide University Act 2023* and *South Australian Skills Act 2008*.

Under the Bill, TAFE SA is responsible for:

- delivery of high-quality, responsive and industry-relevant education and training that responds to the needs of employers, and aligns with the strategic priorities of the South Australian Government;
- equitable access to education and training for all eligible South Australians that assists them to build the skills needed to contribute to the economic, social and cultural life of their communities; and
- performing as an efficient, transparent, innovative and accountable public institution underpinned by strong governance, effective leadership, and a commitment to public interest and educational excellence.

Functions under the Bill are also updated to reflect contemporary values for TAFE SA and VET, so that TAFE SA is to:

- Focus on excellence and demonstrate integrity
- Demonstrate quality and innovation in teaching including through the application of leading and contemporary industry practices
- Enable pathways to further learning or training in VET or at university; and promote lifelong learning
- Engage with the broader VET sector
- Provide appropriate student support services and be responsive to the diverse needs of students
- Focus on the impact and success of its services on students, staff and the communities that TAFE SA serves; and
- Engage with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to provide education and training appropriate to meet their needs and those of their communities
- Provide inclusive and culturally safe services on all TAFE SA campuses.

Importantly, the Bill also ensures our continued focus on delivering training in regional and remote areas. Ensuring equitable access to education and training for eligible South Australians is a core object of the Bill. TAFE SA is often the only provider in regional and remote regions as it is not viable for non-government providers. It's one of the unique reasons why the public provider is so important, and this Bill reflects that.

TAFE SA will, of course, continue to perform its commercial functions, and in so doing, the Bill ensures it must apply prudent commercial practices. But unlike the current Act's broad application of the Public Corporation Act's commercial principles to TAFE SA, the Bill ensures that TAFE SA perform its functions in the public interest first and foremost, having regard to its objects and its business plan.

It is critical that the board of TAFE SA can tap into the expertise of member directors with direct industry experience and experience in the education, training and employment sectors. The Bill does this by changing the attributes for TAFE SA Board membership to include members who collectively have expertise, abilities and experience required for the effective performance of TAFE SA's functions including:

- direct industry experience or
- direct experience in the education, training or employment sectors; and
- knowledge or expertise in the education and training of persons who have experienced disadvantage in accessing education, training and work or from non-metropolitan, regional and remote areas.

These attributes are in addition to directors possessing skills, experience or expertise in commerce, corporate governance, economics, finance, law and management.

The Bill formalises the authority of the TAFE SA Board to appoint an acting Chief Executive, for any period for which the Chief executive is absent or unavailable to carry out official duties; and requires the Board to meet a minimum four times a year.

The Bill also formalises the authority of the TAFE SA Board to establish committees, or subcommittees to advise or assist TAFE SA in relation to its functions.

The Bill requires TAFE SA to prepare a Business plan and authorises the Minister to provide a Statement of priority to TAFE SA. This replaces the current Ministerial Charter and Performance statement requirements under the *Public Corporations Act 1993*.

The Minister must consult with the Treasurer and TAFE SA in the development of a Statement of Priority and TAFE SA must have regard to and address the requirements of the Statement of priority in preparing its Business plan.

In other words, the Ministerial Statement of priority is key to indicating to TAFE SA the Government's expectations and aspirations for TAFE SA's forward outlook, and how planning and delivery of its activities and operations for the pending financial year support those deliverables; and TAFE SA must address this in its Business plan.

A new power is added to authorise TAFE SA to issue a barring notice in a manner specified in regulation in relation to specified conduct. Breach of a barring notice will result in a penalty and is enforceable. This will extend protection to staff and students of TAFE SA on all its campuses from unwanted conduct by others.

The Bill increases the maximum fine for a breach of a by-law to \$2,500, up from \$1,250.

TAFE SA's rule making powers are expanded to include setting standards in relation to student admission and selection; staff behaviour or conduct; and staff or student academic standards. This adds clarity to the scope of matters that a TAFE SA rule may cover.

In the interests of administrative efficiency, the requirement for Governor confirmation of a proposed TAFE SA rule or by-law is removed from the current Act by the Bill. However, proposed rules and by-laws will continue to require agreement of the TAFE SA Board and, in addition to Ministerial approval, by-laws will continue to be tabled in Parliament and be subject to disallowance.

In the development of the Bill, detailed consideration has been given to ensuring TAFE SA will continue to be subject to robust accountability and transparency standards across the breadth of its operations. This is partly achieved through the operation of other legislation in relation to statutory bodies and their governing boards; and partly through the selective inclusion in the Bill of provisions derived from the *Public Corporations Act 1993*. For example, there are provisions requiring TAFE SA to advise the Minister as soon as reasonably practicable of any matter that affects its financial or operating capacity; and to authorise requirements or recommendations by the Treasurer to pay income tax equivalents or dividends, to ensure compliance with competitive neutrality principles.

I commend the Bill to members. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Object

This clause sets out the objects of the measure.

4—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure.

Part 2—Administration

Division 1—TAFE SA

5—TAFE SA

This clause continues TAFE SA as established under the *TAFE SA Act 2012* and sets out its corporate characteristics.

6—Functions

This clause sets out the functions of TAFE SA.

7—Protection of proprietary interests

This clause provides that TAFE SA has a proprietary interest in all official insignia and sets out the manner in which the official insignia may be used by persons other than TAFE SA. An offence with a maximum penalty of \$20 000 applies for a person who uses the official insignia of TAFE SA without the relevant consents set out in the clause.

8—Ministerial direction

This clause sets out the manner in which the Minister may give directions to TAFE SA.

Division 2—TAFE SA Board

9—Board appointment and responsibilities

This clause establishes the Board of directors of TAFE SA, sets out their primary responsibilities and makes provisions regarding the appointment, number and required qualifications of directors.

10—Conditions of office of director

This clause provides for the appointment and conditions of office of a director of the Board.

11—Committees and subcommittees

This clause provides for the manner in which that the Board may establish committees or subcommittees and the procedures applying to the operation of such committees or subcommittees.

12—Board proceedings

This clause sets out the manner and form of meetings of the Board.

13—Conflict of interest under *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*

This clause sets out that a conflict of interest of a director will not arise under the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995* by reason only of the fact that the director has an interest in a matter that is shared in common with those engaged in or associated with the technical and further education sector generally.

14—Common seal

This clause provides for the manner and operation of the common seal of TAFE SA.

15—Minister's or Treasurer's representative may attend meetings

This clause provides for the manner and circumstances in which a representative of the Minister or the Treasurer may attend meetings of the Board.

Division 3—Chief Executive and other staff

16—Chief Executive appointment and responsibilities

This clause provides for the appointment terms and conditions of the Chief Executive of TAFE SA.

17—Other staff

This clause provides for the manner in which other staff of TAFE SA may be employed.

18—Use of staff etc of administrative unit of Public Service

This clause provides that the Chief Executive may, by agreement with a Minister responsible for an administrative unit of the Public Service, make use of the services of the staff, equipment or facilities of that unit.

Division 4—Rules and by-laws

19—Power to make rules

This clause sets out the manner in which TAFE SA may make rules for various purposes.

20—Power to make by-laws

This clause sets out the manner in which TAFE SA may make by-laws for various purposes.

21—Evidentiary provision

This clause sets out various evidentiary provisions applicable in relation to the by-laws.

22—Fines and expiation fees

This clause provides that fines and expiations in relation to the by-laws must be paid to TAFE SA.

Division 5—Barring notice

23—Barring notice

This clause provides for the manner and circumstances in which TAFE SA may bar a person from TAFE grounds.

Division 6—Reporting and information requirements

24—Business plan

This clause requires TAFE SA to prepare a business plan that complies with the requirements set out in the clause.

25—Minister to be advised of change in financial or operating capacity

This clause requires TAFE SA to advise the Minister as soon as reasonably practicable after becoming aware of any matter that materially affects the financial or operating capacity of TAFE SA or gives rise to an expectation that TAFE SA may not be able to operate within approved budgets or savings targets or meet its debts as and when the fall due.

26—Annual report

This clause requires TAFE SA to provide an annual report to the Minister on the performance of its functions in the previous financial year.

27—Provision of information to Minister

This clause requires TAFE SA to provide information or documents to the Minister in accordance with the provisions set out in the clause.

Division 7—Statement of priority

28—Minister to provide statement of priority

This clause requires the Minister to provide TAFE SA with a statement of priority outlining the government's priorities for TAFE SA in respect of a financial year or such other period as specified by the Minister. The clause sets out the obligations of the Minister and TAFE SA in relation to the statement of priority.

Division 8—Financial and other provisions

29—Guarantee of liability by Treasurer

This clause provides for the liabilities of TAFE SA to be guaranteed by the Treasurer.

30—Tax and other liabilities of TAFE SA

This clause provides for the manner in which the Treasurer may require TAFE SA to pay tax or council rates.

31—Dividends

This clause provides for the manner in which certain dividends may be paid to TAFE SA.

Division 9—Delegation

32—Delegation

This clause sets out the manner in which the Minister, the Board or the Chief Executive may delegate functions under the Act.

Part 3—Miscellaneous

33—Regulations

This clause provides for the manner in which regulations may be made under the Act.

Schedule 1—Repeal, amendments, saving and transitional provisions

Part 1—Repeal of Act

1—Repeal of TAFE SA Act 2012

This clause repeals the existing *TAFE SA Act 2012*.

Part 2—Amendment of *Education and Children's Services Act 2019*

2—Amendment of section 110—Interruption of service where officer leaves teaching service

These amendments make consequential amendments to substitute legislative references to the repealed Act with references to the current measure.

3—Amendment of section 113—Entitlement of persons transferred to the teaching service

These amendments make consequential amendments to substitute legislative references to the repealed Act with references to the current measure.

Part 3—Amendment of *South Australian Skills Act 2008*

4—Amendment of section 23—Staff

This amendment make consequential amendments to substitute legislative references to the repealed Act with references to the current measure.

Part 4—Saving and transitional provisions

This Part contains saving and transitional provisions consequent on the repeal of the *TAFE SA Act 2012* and the enactment of this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT (CUTTLEFISH—NORTHERN SPENCER GULF) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:59): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fisheries Management Act 2007. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (16:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am very pleased to introduce the Fisheries Management (Cuttlefish—Northern Spencer Gulf) Amendment Bill 2025. In South Australia we are lucky to have the iconic and unique population of giant Australian cuttlefish that aggregate each year near Point Lowly. Witnessing these majestic species during their spawning period is an incredible experience that draws in national and international visitors to the area.

This government seeks to continue the prohibition on the take of cuttlefish in northern Spencer Gulf through arrangements in the Fisheries Management Act 2007 to provide more certainty and permanency of the existing regulated closure. In 2023, this government regulated this spatial closure under the Fisheries Management (General) Regulations 2017, and we now seek to give this species the highest level of protection we can within the legislative framework.

The giant Australian cuttlefish is an iconic species in South Australia. Each winter, tens of thousands of giant Australian cuttlefish aggregate on a discrete area of rocky reef in northern Spencer Gulf to spawn. The aggregation of giant Australian cuttlefish in northern Spencer Gulf is the only known dense spawning aggregation of this species in the world.

The proposed amendment to the act seeks to ensure the long-term protection of the species is embedded into legislation to maintain this protection for the species now and for future generations. The bill I present today has been considered by key stakeholders, including our important fishing sectors and regional parties, as part of a consultation process undertaken by the Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

It is important to note that, while the bill seeks to move the current cuttlefish closure into the act, the location and size of the closure area remains constant. As such, the amendment is not expected to impose any new or additional restrictions on commercial, recreational or traditional

fishers. The fishing prohibition relates only to the take of cuttlefish species and will not therefore restrict the take of southern calamari or octopus within this closure area.

The Fisheries Management (Cuttlefish—Northern Spencer Gulf) Amendment Bill institutes a permanent spatial closure for the ongoing protection of the cuttlefish, as well as providing certainty for investments and tourism opportunities around northern Spencer Gulf. I commend the Fisheries Management (Cuttlefish—Northern Spencer Gulf) Amendment Bill 2025 to the council and look forward to further debate. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Fisheries Management Act 2007*

3—Insertion of section 75A

This clause inserts new section 75A as follows:

75A—Taking of cuttlefish in certain waters of Spencer Gulf

Proposed section 75A provides that, unless a person is authorised by a permit issued by the Minister, it is an offence for the person to take cuttlefish (*Sepia* spp) in the northern waters of Spencer Gulf.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. B.R. Hood.

Motions

ALGAL BLOOM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. B.R. Hood:

That there be laid upon the table of this council by the Leader of the Government within seven sitting days of the passing of this resolution the following documents:

1. All budget proposals or funding requests submitted by the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) to the Treasurer from 1 November 2024 to present;
2. All internal proposals developed by DEW regarding responses to the current harmful algal bloom that were not submitted to the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) from 1 November 2024 to present;
3. All internal memoranda or briefing notes produced by DEW relating to the current harmful algal bloom from 1 November 2024 to present;
4. All documents prepared by, for, or received by the Chief Public Health Officer or their staff that relate to public health advice concerning the current harmful algal bloom, including but not limited to risk assessments, health alerts, interagency communications, or advice to ministers from 1 November 2024 to present.

(Continued from 3 September 2025.)

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:04): I rise very briefly to indicate my support for the request for these documents to be made publicly available. As members will know, I am Chair of the joint parliamentary inquiry. The inquiry is looking into a number of these issues, and I recognise the support of the government and the opposition in setting up this inquiry. That said, I do think there is a public interest in this information being made more broadly available and so I am happy to support the honourable member's motion in that regard.

I understand there is an amendment being advanced by the government. No-one from the government has spoken to me about that, so I am not sure what the rationale is. I can assume that the inclusion of 'as soon as is practicable' is designed to give the government more time to comply with the request. I understand that, but I worry, given the dwindling number of sitting days that we have before us, that in real terms that may mean that the document is not made available. In those

circumstances, I am not inclined to support the government's amendment unless a very compelling reason is presented to do so.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:05): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out 'within seven sitting days of the passing of this resolution' and insert 'as soon as is practicable'.

I rise to speak as the lead government speaker on this motion. I am informed that the motion is of unprecedented breadth in South Australia. Advice from DEW and Health is that the timeline provided of seven sitting days is unreasonable, given it likely includes well over 1,000 documents. This would represent a substantial and, indeed, unreasonable diversion of the agency resources at a pretty critical time in response to the bloom, with the implementation of the summer plan. This would also put significant pressure on parliamentary staff in managing the physical documents and subsequent viewings. I am not sure if the mover is aware of the gravity of the work that would actually be involved in proceeding with the motion. Subsequently, we are proposing to amend the motion.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:07): Today, I rise in support of this motion, which seeks the tabling of key documents relating to the harmful algal bloom which has devastated our gulf waters and impacted communities, fishers and our marine environment for months on end. This motion is not about politics: it is about transparency, it is about accountability and it is about timeliness.

I just want to make the point that seven sitting days gives this government well over a month—close to six weeks—to be able to produce these documents, so I think there is plenty of time there. The motion requests three categories of documents:

- internal budget requests by the Department for Environment and Water;
- internal proposals that were never submitted to Treasury; and
- memoranda of briefing notes, alongside any public health advice provided by the Chief Public Health Officer regarding the risks to human health.

The reason the Hon. Ben Hood has brought this motion forward in his role as shadow minister for government accountability is simple, although it is disappointing that it has had to be brought. For three months, we have heard little more than vague assurances from this government. We have been told that assessments are underway, that conditions are challenging and that solutions are being explored, but what we have not seen is a clear plan, transparent advice or timely action.

South Australians were promised openness. They were promised that the government would govern differently, yet when it comes to the most serious marine environmental event in memory, critical information has been withheld. We know businesses are suffering. We know fishers are suffering. We know coastal communities are living with uncertainty, and they should not have to wait months for the truth to be dragged into the light. Accountability demands transparency and transparency demands timeliness.

If action has been taken, then the government should have no hesitation in demonstrating it. If funding has been sought, then the government should be willing to show it, and if warnings were given then the public deserves to know. This parliament cannot perform its duty, it cannot scrutinise and it cannot legislate in the public interest without access to the basic facts.

I note the government has sought an amendment to this motion, although I do note the error in the Hon. Justin Hanson's printed amendment, in that it says 'within seven days of the passing of this resolution'. Of course, no-one expects people to produce documents within seven days of the passing of this resolution, but, as the Hon. Ben Hood's motion states, it is 'within seven sitting days' and what seven sitting days means is that this government has a number of weeks, in fact, more than a month, some would say six weeks, to produce these documents.

So it will not be any surprise that we will not be supporting this amendment because it goes against the motion's main purpose of timely information sharing. We could FOI these documents and the government would have to produce them in 30 days. This is about being practical. This is about the timely sharing of information and if the government is true to its word and if it is throwing

everything it has at this algal bloom then the timely sharing of information I would have thought would have been easy enough to do. That is what the public expects.

Therefore, as I have stated previously, we will not be supporting the Hon. Justin Hanson's amendment and I hope that the other members in this chamber will also not support the Hon. Justin Hanson's amendment. I urge the government to respect the communities that are affected and to table these documents without significant delay. Sunshine is the best disinfectant and the people of South Australia deserve nothing less. I commend the motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:11): I rise to support this motion and to indicate that I do oppose the government amendment. I support this motion, having moved one similar myself seeking documents related to the algal bloom, which the government then duly provided after the winter break after a significant period of time. I note that, when those documents were tabled for the ecologists who had lobbied me to put that motion before this chamber, the information was still substandard. It did not include all of the requested phytoplankton counts, even though the government had argued commercial in confidence to already restrict what that particular motion asked for.

Also of incredible concern is that the documents were incorrect. The documents detail that at Boatswain Point in the South-East in March there had been identified brevetoxins and the algal bloom had been seen to be in that location. That certainly added up, with a local shark fisherman already raising it in the media on the ABC. This is really important. The government actually got the last lot of documents wrong and then they had to come into this place and very quietly slip in a correction. That correction was around the data collected at Boatswain Point, which the government now claims was all a clerical error, yet at Boatswain Point and around the South-East a local fisherman had been raising the alarm about the impact on his catch, which was non-existent in that March period, and the fact that he had identified foam and the fact that he had identified dead fish in the sea at an unusual rate.

So I do question: what happened to create that clerical error that in that first tranche of documents seemed to back up what the local fisherman had been telling not just the department but of course the ABC and is well documented by the ABC in that timeframe? These documents, I think, are incredibly important and I do commend the Liberal Party for seeking to use parliamentary processes to gain the information that South Australians are seeking with regard to this harmful algal bloom. The government at the moment cannot have it both ways. They cannot claim that there is misinformation out there when they refuse to release full information that, in fact, feeds into further misinformation.

I draw members' attention to the submission made to the Senate algal bloom inquiry by ecologist Faith Coleman, who has been variously quoted in recent weeks in this place. Her contribution to the Senate inquiry goes to commend, and quite rightly so, the way citizen scientists have stepped into the breach where there has been a dearth of information to inform our understanding of what is going on with this harmful algal bloom.

In fact, it has been heartbreaking, as she has watched particularly those in the fishing industry, but others as well, go to the wall literally and lose their income, including that shark fisher in the South-East. He, of course, is not able to apply for any of the government compensation packages because the government says that he has not been affected by the harmful algal bloom, despite, as I say, his loss of catch and observation of in that area in that March period the discoloured water and the foam and the dead fish and the fact that he was not getting any catch. He has been told that he does not qualify because the data that the government has released and put forward does not see him as affected. Yet, what has happened there? You have to ask that question.

Ecologist Faith Coleman, in her submission to the Senate inquiry, has commended the actions of the public. Indeed, she has worked and trained up many citizen scientists through platforms such as iNaturalist, a whole range of them. Our local community has really stepped up here. They have understood that, watching this devastating impact, they are perfectly capable of collecting their own data, forming their own networks of knowledge with independent scientists and collectively deciding the most appropriate ways forward for themselves. Why? Because there was a dearth of data being released by the government. Ms Coleman stated:

Once they have felt held or supported from others within their community, individual and community concern regarding the impacts on socioeconomic factors and marine ecosystems, the sky seems to be the limit to what can be done outside of government and academia.

Ms Coleman commends the community's willingness to learn and change in an attempt to protect this key aspect of South Australia's identity and sense of self, and it gives hope. What does not give hope, as Faith Coleman outlines in her Senate submission, is the opposite, the coordination of state government responses, including agency responsibility, industry engagement, scientific advice and public communications. She writes to that committee:

The South Australian government was slow to respond. I think that one is accepted even among agencies, but it is easy to have 20/20 vision when looking backwards in time. It was clearly a case of being caught off-guard and unprepared. This situation was not a matter of not being warned, but in some ways a matter of our decision-makers having been warned too much. As an elderly academic mentor said, who rang me when he heard of this bloom in the interstate media, 'It is funny, Faith—it is that we [as scientists] have so long been saying that these events will happen, that decision-makers completely missed it, when we started saying 'it's here.'

Ms Coleman goes on to also reflect on the adequacy or indeed the inadequacy of long-term monitoring forecasting and prevention strategies, noting that:

The seafood safety program undertakes a wide range of phytoplankton counts and related monitoring, however the industry sponsorship of this program means that the data is presented in a way that is of very little use to an ecologist and generally not available for wider access and analysis. Taking this program out of industry hands, sharing the data fully and making it a government run program that looks at the broader phytoplankton ecology in these areas would be beneficial for all. Not only is it likely that the aquaculture industry would benefit from a better understanding of what their animals are eating, but as a state, we would have a better appreciation of what drives healthier aquaculture, the loading capacity that is appropriate in each area, suitable complementary uses of our aquatic estate and the number of troublesome bloom events we are currently dealing with.

Ms Coleman reflects that it has been deeply disappointing and deeply disturbing that we have had to push so hard to get the little information we currently have, and in her recommendations to that Senate committee she states at recommendation 4:

We need to collectively monitor and publicise the impacts of marine heatwaves on phytoplankton health enabling us to provide rapid responses to community concerns regarding our marine zones separate from aquaculture and aquacultural specialists.

I could not agree more. What we do need here is more transparency, not less, in a house that is certainly meant to be a house of review that is not obsequious to claims that apparently the department cannot handle the provision of information, when this is the department that we expect to handle the harmful algal bloom. If they cannot actually provide the information about it, how on earth are they even going to tackle the problems that are besetting us?

We are not here as members of parliament to simply wave things through for the government of the day; we are here to hold them to account, and this motion is quite a reasonable way of doing so. Indeed, it gives seven sitting days for the government to provide this information—not just to the council in this chamber but for the public, for the scientists, for the community and for those whose industries are affected—in a way that, perhaps like the last release of data, when it is viewed by those with expertise, issues such as those that happened with the last release of algal bloom data can be identified by the experts in the field and perhaps corrected by the government again. Perhaps we will see more documents tabled as errata, addenda or corrections when these observations are able to be made by those outside of government.

Seven sitting days is not seven calendar days; it is not even seven business days. It is in fact the end of November this year, the final official sitting week of this year and indeed possibly of this parliament. It is the last possible week that we could reasonably expect this data to be provided in a way that is actually respectful of democracy and actually going to inform proper democratic debate. We have an optional sitting week the following week, but that is not guaranteed.

We know that what is guaranteed, however, are the numbers in this place. That is, the government has not held the numbers in this place for many decades, and indeed we do control our own destiny. I would say that if the government cannot comply with this motion in a timely way then perhaps the parliament needs to sit next year. Perhaps this chamber needs to come back in late January or early February to ensure that this is able to be complied with in terms of the very simple,

very practical and very reasonable request that this harmful algal bloom data be provided—as I say, not just for this institution of the parliament but for the people of South Australia.

This situation comes about through distrust in the current government's handling of this matter; that is, they have been slow to act and then they have obfuscated. I am still waiting for the Minister for Primary Industries to respond to a question, many months ago now, about when brevetoxins were first detected in this state. When I raised it as a supplementary follow-up question, many months later, she said that we had not hit the official time for that question to have been responded to yet. The government is playing games with the data on the algal bloom. The government is playing games with the data on brevetoxins, which had never been detected in our state before. They are willing to use sophistry and every trick in the political book that it takes to try to keep this out of an election agenda.

The reality is that there will be an election in March 2026. The government should actually be demonstrating the leadership that the people of South Australia want right now in providing this sort of information, so that the public can have restored trust in this government—because, my goodness, it has taken a hit in the last few months. Certainly in this chamber I would hope that we will be taking our responsibility to hold this government to account seriously and ensuring that we have the full information that should be provided—in a way that, should there be errors in it, they can be addressed, questioned and called out, and in a way that, if there are areas of concern in it, they can be debated in this place. But for the government to claim that they cannot even provide the information about the harmful algal bloom within a timely way and that we need to give them a deadline into the never-never, really, at this point, is a bit rich. It really, really is.

If you want the public not to believe in misinformation you actually need to provide the information and do so in a timely manner. Otherwise, how on earth can we trust this government?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (16:25): I will speak very, very briefly in support of the amendment put forward by the Hon. Justin Hanson. The government's position is that if this motion is passed unamended it is highly unlikely to be able to be complied with. There will be many, many people who are involved in doing work for the government in relation to the algal bloom—providing that industry support, providing that business support, doing the work to understand how the algal bloom works, where it is going, what might happen and what might happen in the future—who will be diverted to what may be many, many documents.

As the motion reads, it is, for example, 'all budget proposals'. Many of those documents will be proposals that are created for cabinet purposes that will be cabinet-in-confidence. It will not just be the volume of documents that will need to be searched for; it will be going through those to see what is able to be provided that does not breach cabinet-in-confidence. So if the amendment fails I do not want this chamber to be under any illusion. I expect it will be extraordinarily difficult for the government to comply with what the council has set down.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:26): I was not listed to speak, but given all the discussions around the chamber I am speaking. On the face of it the discussions I have had with the government in relation to this motion are: is this an achievable end in the sitting days? The answer we have just heard from the Attorney and I have heard from the minister responsible is that it is simply not achievable within the timeframe. I know we are talking about sitting days and four to six weeks. The government's response to that is, obviously, 'We have to go through cabinet processes and the rest of it in terms of sifting through those papers.'

I am reiterating the advice that has been given, and the advice given just now by the Deputy Premier on the record is that they are unlikely to meet that timeframe. So we are stuck between a rock and a hard place, in terms of trying to find a compromise that ensures this place gets the documents and meets the objectives of the motion. The advice to me from the minister responsible is that they do not have an issue with the requests that are being made; they have an issue with the timeframe that has been made. That is one position. The other is providing that within a reasonable timeframe or something else. This is only critical now given the number of sitting days left.

Obviously, there have been lots of discussions around the chamber, and I take the point that was just made by the Hon. Tammy Franks in relation to previous documents that have been requested and have not been provided to this place in good faith in those timeframes that were negotiated much earlier on in the piece around the algal bloom.

We are now at the tail end of that and at the tail end of the sitting year. So I could flip a coin and say, 'Well, say, within seven sitting days' and the government will say, 'We can't get it to you'; make it 'as soon as reasonably practicable' and the government does not deliver those documents in any event. So I really do not think it matters what we do, because we are all going to be in the same position.

I am not going to put myself in that position, and I do not think any member of the crossbench is going to put themselves in that position given where we are today. The discussions I had with the minister responsible were not unreasonable; they were very reasonable and they were fulsome. She provided lots of advice to me about what sort of timeframe they would need to get these documents.

I understand, of course, from the transparency perspective, the concerns that we all share around those timeframes and the ability to meet them, but none of us are going to put ourselves in that position, given where we are in the calendar year. Whether or not we receive the documents is yet to be seen, but I strongly urge all of us in this place between now and the next sitting week, should this amendment pass in its original form, to perhaps revisit this issue and see what would be a relevant timeframe.

From my perspective, and I think from the crossbenchers' perspective, generally speaking, we do not get another bite of the cherry. We do not get another crack at this. The calendar year is going to be over and, if they are not produced, they are not produced. That may very well be, in fact is likely to be, the outcome anyway. We are really stuck between a rock and a hard place, so it is on that basis that I strongly urge the government between now and the next sitting week to try to find a solution to this problem and provide some sort of timeframe that would ensure that documents are released.

I do take on board the feedback of the Attorney in terms of diverting resources away from algal bloom and the processes, the vetting and the cabinet processes they have to go through, but we are in a position where, regardless of whether or not we have the amendment, we do not know whether we are going to get the documents. It is on that basis that it is impossible, in effect, to support the amendment that has been proposed, because we simply do not know where we will stand. I strongly urge the government, if they are listening, to do something between now and the next sitting week to perhaps address this issue and come back with a more appropriate solution.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (16:31): I rise to close the debate on this motion and I thank the Hon. Robert Simms, the Hon. Justin Hanson, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Deputy Premier for their contributions. At the end of the day, transparency from the government really should not be too much to ask. Even our South Australian Auditor-General reported previously that this government is not transparent enough with even his department.

I just make clear that this is not seven days. This is seven sitting days for these documents to be provided, so that takes us to 25 November. As the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and the Hon. Tammy Franks pointed out, that is seven sitting days in which to get this done, which ultimately takes us to five weeks and with only two days remaining in the sitting calendar, because I doubt that we will get to the optional sitting week.

I would also make the point to the honourable members, most especially the crossbench, as the Hon. Tammy Franks has said, that this is a unique aspect of the Legislative Council in that we can compel the government to produce documents. I would hate to see that this will be set as some kind of precedent in which, when we do ask for things in a timely manner, the government comes back and says, 'Well, you can get them as soon as we determine to be practicable.' No, seven sitting days is contained within the motion. We believe it is right that the people of South Australia have this information. We believe it is right that this chamber has the information that is contained within this motion and I urge this council to support it.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
 Noes.....10
 Majority3

AYES

Hanson, J.E. (teller)
 Martin, R.B.
 Wortley, R.P.

Hunter, I.K.
 Ngo, T.T.

Maher, K.J.
 Scriven, C.M.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
 Girolamo, H.M.
 Lee, J.S.
 Simms, R.A.

Centofanti, N.J.
 Hood, B.R. (teller)
 Lensink, J.M.A.

Franks, T.A.
 Hood, D.G.E.
 Pangallo, F.

PAIRS

Bourke, E.S.
 El Dannawi, M.

Game, S.L.
 Henderson, L.A.

Amendment thus negated; motion carried.

RONALD MCDONALD HOUSE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

1. Recognises the outstanding role Ronald McDonald House in Melbourne St, North Adelaide, has played in South Australia for the past 25 years by providing a 'home away from home' for families with seriously ill or injured children who are receiving treatment at nearby hospitals;
2. Acknowledges the supportive, caring environment it offers where families dealing with significant trauma can stay together, close to the care their child needs;
3. Notes that each year Ronald McDonald House supports about 300 regional families with free, safe and friendly accommodation and support services, without any form of government funding;
4. Recognises the exceptional role volunteers play at Ronald McDonald House where they help create a warm, welcoming environment by cooking meals, maintaining the house, offering emotional support, and helping with daily operations, noting in the early years of the house, it was mostly run by volunteers, who generously gave their time and care to make it possible for families to focus on what matters most;
5. Acknowledges two very special volunteers who have been at Ronald McDonald House from the start, Mrs Jill Rowe and Mrs Colleen 'Nanna Cole' Billows; and
6. Calls on the state government to provide financial support to the wonderful charity as it prepares to relocate to a brand-new site closer to the new Women's and Children's Hospital at Thebarton.

(Continued from 4 June 2025.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:37): I rise today in support of this motion moved by the Hon. Frank Pangallo, recognising the outstanding contribution of Ronald McDonald House in North Adelaide to South Australian families over the past 25 years. Since its establishment, Ronald McDonald House has provided a vital sanctuary for families with seriously ill or injured children receiving treatment at the nearby Women's and Children's Hospital.

Each year, around 300 regional families are welcomed into a warm, safe and supportive environment free of charge and without any form of government funding. This is not just a place to stay; it is a home away from home where families can remain close to the care their child needs while

surrounded by compassion and community. The house offers more than accommodation; it provides mental health support, nutritious meals seven days and seven nights a week, education continuity for siblings and culturally responsive care.

The heart of Ronald McDonald House is its volunteers. From cooking meals and maintaining the house to offering emotional support and helping with daily operations, volunteers have always been central to its mission. In its early years, the house was run almost entirely by volunteers, and today their dedication continues to shape the experience of every family who has walked through the door.

I particularly want to acknowledge two remarkable individuals, Mrs Jill Rowe and Mrs Colleen Billows OAM, who have each served as volunteers for 25 years. Colleen, affectionately known as 'Nanna Cole', is widely recognised for her warmth, resilience and tireless fundraising efforts. In 2019, she abseiled down a 33-storey building to raise funds for the house, saying, 'Everyone said you're crazy, but I had decided it was nothing compared with the turmoil some of our families face.' In June this year, Colleen was awarded the Medal of the Order of Australia for her service to the community through charitable organisations.

Under the leadership of CEO Melissa Monkhouse, Ronald McDonald House Charities South Australia continues to evolve and respond to the changing needs of families. Melissa's vision and passion for purpose-driven work have helped expand the charity's services to include case management, Aboriginal family support and outreach education programs across the state. I also wish to recognise the board, particularly Chairperson Rebecca Wessels, whose strategic guidance has been instrumental in the charity's growth.

Their leadership is now steering the organisation through an exciting expansion, building a new 80-room Ronald McDonald House near the future Women's and Children's Hospital at Thebarton, while continuing to operate the beloved Melbourne Street facility. This expansion reflects a growing demand for family-centred support and the charity's commitment to meeting that need with compassion and care. As planning progresses, it is timely for the state government to consider how it might assist in bringing this important project to fruition. With those remarks, I acknowledge the enduring impact of Ronald McDonald House and thank everyone involved for their generosity. I wholeheartedly support the motion.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:41): It is such an honour to speak to this motion and celebrate a truly remarkable milestone of 25 years of Ronald McDonald House supporting families right here in South Australia. Thank you to the Hon. Frank Pangallo for bringing this important motion to the chamber. For a quarter of a century, Ronald McDonald House has stood as a beacon of compassion, generosity and hope. It has been a home away from home for thousands of families, a place of warmth and comfort during times that are often filled with worry and uncertainty.

When a child becomes seriously ill or injured, families, both regional and interstate, face enormous emotional, financial and logistical challenges. For parents, their world suddenly revolves around hospital corridors, medical appointments and long nights of uncertainty. Ronald McDonald House steps in at that moment, offering not just accommodation, but a community of support; a place where families can rest, recharge and find strength knowing they are not alone.

I know the heart of this incredible organisation better than most because my mum, Julie Black, was previously chief executive. My mum had an incredible career in the not-for-profit space for over 30 years, and her role at Ronald McDonald House was a real highlight, and her final role before she retired three years ago. Mum loved her job at Ronald McDonald House. It was so much more than a job for her. I can tell you it was definitely not a nine-to-five job.

She was always on call, always ready to drop everything and head into Ronald McDonald House if a family needed help or if something went wrong. Whether it was late at night or over the weekend or during the holidays, she would answer the call without hesitation. My mum cared so deeply about the families at Ronald McDonald House and the mission of this organisation. The families also had such strength in such challenging circumstances.

I want to take a moment to recognise the incredible volunteers because they are truly the heart and soul of Ronald McDonald House—people like Colleen Billows OAM, who has volunteered for decades and is in every sense the grandmother of the house. Colleen cooked countless meals, offered countless hugs and gives comfort to so many families who just need a friendly face and a listening ear. She embodies the very best of what Ronald McDonald House stands for: care, compassion and connection. My mum and Colleen both abseiled down the InterContinental and it was quite a sight. It was an amazing achievement for both of them, and raised incredible funds for such a great organisation.

I would also like to acknowledge Chris Baker AM, who served on the board of Ronald McDonald House for an incredible 23 years. His dedication and commitment to supporting families during some of their most challenging times is truly inspiring. Chris's leadership and compassion played a huge role in shaping Ronald McDonald House into the welcoming, supportive place it is today. Thank you, Chris, for your extraordinary service.

I always admired the volunteers who worked alongside my mum. They gave their time so freely, sometimes day after day, week after week, to make sure families felt supported and cared for. What always struck me was that everyone, from the staff to the volunteers, treated families not as guests but as part of their community. Over the years, I had the opportunity to help cook meals for families at Ronald McDonald House, and I can tell you it is a truly humbling experience, sitting down with the parents, siblings and carers, hearing their stories, laughing with them and sharing a meal. Those moments were very powerful and something that I will always remember.

A warm meal, a clean bed and someone to talk to: these might sound like small things, but when your child is in hospital and you are away from home they mean absolutely everything. They are the lifelines. That is why Ronald McDonald House is so special. It offers more than a place to stay. It offers comfort, dignity and hope. It offers families the chance to focus on what matters the most: being together as a family and being there for their child.

As we celebrate 25 years, we are celebrating every person who has played a part in this story: the staff, the volunteers, the donors, and of course the families who have called this place home. To everyone who has contributed, whether it be through volunteering, fundraising, cooking, cleaning or simply offering a kind word—thank you. You have made an extraordinary difference.

To Ronald McDonald House, congratulations on 25 years of supporting South Australian families. You have created something truly special, a legacy of love, community and hope that will continue for generations to come. I wish Melissa and the team at Ronald McDonald House all the best, and here's to the next 25 years of helping families find strength, comfort and joy during the most challenging times.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:46): I rise to speak in support of this motion, and I thank the honourable member for providing the opportunity to recognise and celebrate 25 years of Ronald McDonald House in South Australia. Over the last 25 years, Ronald McDonald House has been a shelter of hope and healing for countless families whose children are receiving medical care in Adelaide. Ronald McDonald is spread across two buildings. The main house sleeps up to 10 families and the second apartment accommodation contains 10 two-bedroom self-contained apartments. These are located directly opposite each other on Melbourne Street, North Adelaide.

The support offered to families from South Australia extends far beyond the accommodation it has provided. Ronald McDonald House has not only provided a bed and a meal to more than 7,000 families over 25 years but also comfort, stability and hope during some of life's most challenging moments. When a child becomes seriously ill, families are often forced to travel long distances for treatment. At Ronald McDonald House, families can find a place where the lights are always on, where they are welcomed with kindness and where they can focus on what truly matters, and that is being together.

Ronald McDonald House is now part of the fabric of our health and community care, thanks to the continual work, support and donations of South Australians. It stands alongside the Women's and Children's Hospital, the Hospital Research Foundation and countless volunteers, nurses and doctors who embody the best of who we are as a community. This generosity of spirit reminds us that every child deserves the comfort of family, and every parent deserves the strength of community.

This 25-year milestone reflects the compassion, generosity and community spirit that defines our state. We owe deep gratitude to the staff, volunteers, donors and partners who make this possible, from McDonald's franchisees and local businesses to school charities and every South Australian who gives what they can. A special call-out to longstanding volunteers, Mrs Jill Rowe and Mrs Colleen Billows. Congratulations and thank you to Ronald McDonald House for 25 years of care and compassion, and may the next 25 years be just as exceptional.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:49): I rise to speak in strong support of the Hon. Pangallo's motion, which urges this council to recognise the outstanding role that Ronald McDonald House on Melbourne Street in North Adelaide has played in South Australia for the past 25 years and to acknowledge the supportive, caring environment it offers, where families dealing with significant trauma can stay together close to the care that their child needs. It also notes that each year Ronald McDonald House supports about 300 regional families without any form of regular government funding, I understand, and recognises the exceptional role that volunteers play at Ronald McDonald House and calls on the state government to provide financial support to the charity as it prepares to relocate to a brand-new site closer to the new Women's and Children's Hospital.

It has been 25 years now that Ronald McDonald House on Melbourne Street has offered a sanctuary in Adelaide for regional families with children facing significant medical challenges. Situated just some 200 metres from the current Women's and Children's Hospital, the facility provides a warm and supportive homelike environment for families. It is equipped with some 10 ensuite facility bedrooms, 10 two-bedroom apartments and convenient onsite amenities. Facilities include a recreation room, family lounges, a fully equipped kitchen, a children's playroom, outdoor play areas, a gym, a laundry and a peace garden, which I am sure would be most welcome given the challenges many of these families face.

Breakfast is provided each morning, in addition to a fully stocked pantry, so families can rightfully focus on the needs of their sick or injured children. Twice a week, the house offers a family dinner program, where multiple families have the opportunity to come together to connect and bond over their shared experiences, which I am sure in the end would make it somewhat more easy, although the circumstances are obviously very challenging.

Families staying at Ronald McDonald House have access to a range of support services designed to address the whole family's needs. The trained staff and volunteers work with the hospital school in the Women's and Children's Hospital so that children are able to continue with their studies, with teachers arriving each weekday in the morning to collect outpatients or siblings to take them to school and then back again in the afternoon. This incredible service greatly assists children undertaking treatment and their siblings in maintaining a sense of normalcy, whilst offering respite for parents and carers alike. They face very difficult circumstances and this great support that Ronald McDonald House provides, I am sure, is most welcome and highly valued.

At Ronald McDonald House, priority is given to families whose children have been recently diagnosed, seriously injured or require emergency treatment, in addition to families who are required to travel long distances from their home to the hospital. The charity appreciates that being away from home for medical treatment can put families under immense financial pressure, which is why its accommodation is completely free of charge for eligible families.

As the Hon. Mr Pangallo detailed in his speech when he introduced this motion, Ronald McDonald House is outgrowing its current premises, and with the new Women's and Children's Hospital being constructed near the new Royal Adelaide Hospital the organisation is seeking to relocate to a nearby location, which of course makes sense. Like the Hon. Mr Pangallo I, too, am hopeful that the state government supports Ronald McDonald House in this endeavour so it can continue its important work in assisting families in future who need to be in close proximity to the new hospital.

I wish to commend Ms Jill Rowe and Ms Colleen Billows for their 25 years of service with this outstanding charity, as highlighted by the Hon. Mr Pangallo. I am also indeed familiar with the commitment and passion of the volunteers who give their time and energy for the many beneficiaries of Ronald McDonald House. One of my good friends over the years, a gentleman by the name of Chris Baker, was on the organisation's board for decades. I take this opportunity to commend Chris

for his efforts and dedication in serving Ronald McDonald House over this extended time. I know he put in not only his own sweat but also substantial resources of his own, such was his heart for the place.

Of course, I have to mention my good friend, the Hon. Ms Girolamo's mother, who was an outstanding servant of Ronald McDonald House and is, I think, regarded very highly by patients and staff who have had the benefit of experiencing the services offered at Ronald McDonald House. I strongly support the motion and commend the Hon. Mr Pangallo for bringing it to us.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:54): I wish to thank the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, the Hon. Tung Ngo and the Hon. Dennis Hood for their warm expressions of thanks to this great organisation, and to all the people who have been involved in the 25 years of Ronald McDonald House. We look forward to Ronald McDonald House being supported in its move to a new home close to the new Women's and Children's Hospital so that it can continue the wonderful caring service it provides to families and also, of course, continue its operation. I am sure that one day in this place they will be celebrating their 50th anniversary. With that, I commend the motion to the chamber.

Motion carried.

RADIO ITALIA UNO

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:55): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates Radio Italia Uno Adelaide 87.6FM for reaching the special milestone of its 10th anniversary in 2024;
2. Acknowledges the founding members, current and past presidents, board members, committee members, sponsors and volunteers of Radio Italia Uno for their dedication and contribution to serving the Italian-Australian community in South Australia;
3. Recognises that Radio Italia Uno supports the social and cultural welfare of the Italo-Australian community by providing valuable communication services through broadcasting current affairs, essential information, services and diverse programs in the Italian language; and
4. Commends Radio Italia Uno for sharing the rich culture, language, and success stories among the vibrant Italian community, fostering community engagement and enriching multicultural South Australia.

I rise today to acknowledge the 10th anniversary of Radio Italia Uno Adelaide 87.6FM, a station that has become a vital voice for the Italian-Australian community in South Australia.

The station was established in 2015 by the founding board which included respected community leaders across the Italian community and they are: Angela Cutri, Antonino Plateroti, Antonio Simeone, Benedict Battiste, Dr Carmine De Pasquale, Cosimo Cutri, Dino Musolino, Frank Salandra, John D'Aloia, John Di Malta, Orso Osti, Patrizia Restaldi, Theodore Luliano and Vincenzo Papandrea. Their commitment to preserving Italian heritage laid the foundation for what Radio Italia Uno is today.

From its early days, broadcasting on 1629AM from a modest studio in Adelaide, the station has grown into a vibrant and far-reaching platform, now broadcasting on 87.6FM and streaming online to listeners across the globe. Radio Italia Uno is a cultural cornerstone of South Australia's multicultural community. It connects generations, supports community events, promotes local businesses, and provides essential information, especially during times of crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

During this period, Radio Italia Uno played a vital role in keeping the community informed and staying connected. With many older Italian-Australians facing isolation, the station became a lifeline broadcasting health updates, support services and messages of hope in both Italian and English. It was a trusted voice during uncertain times, offering not only information but comfort and solidarity.

The station's programming has evolved to include English language shows such as *The Breakfast Club* and *Jeff's Sport Show* which has broadened its appeal and fostered greater inclusion across Adelaide's diverse communities. These programs complement the station's Italian language

content creating a bilingual platform that reflects the lived experience of many Italian-Australians. Radio Italia Uno is deeply embedded in the South Australian community, through not only its daily broadcast but also its active support of local events.

The station proudly hosts an annual gala ball and the radiothon A Night in Italy, both of which I have had the honour of attending on numerous occasions and most recently for their 10th and 11th anniversary celebrations. These events are more than festive celebrations, they are vibrant expressions of community pride, cultural heritage and collective generosity. Their annual gala ball is a spectacular evening of food, live entertainment, dancing and community connection, and is often attended by many members of parliament from this place, from all sides and persuasions. While this event is the major fundraising event for the station, it is also a night that brings generations together in support of local radio and shared heritage.

The radiothon, A Night in Italy, hosted annually at the Marche Club, is a vibrant, family-friendly event featuring four-course Italian meals, live music, dancing and games for all ages. I recall that Cathy Papandrea, the Marche Club's manager, often would do a live recording, so if you do not want something to be published please say something non-offensive, because Cathy is always on her phone, recording everything! The event is always a joyful expression of Italian culture and generosity.

Proceeds of both these fundraising events go directly to support the station's operations and community initiatives. The station also brings its voice directly into the heart of the community through outside broadcasts from local businesses and festivals. These live segments capture the energy and diversity of Adelaide's Italian-Australian community, making listeners feel part of something larger than themselves. I always love listening to all the favourite Italian songs as well. Today the station continues to thrive under the stewardship of its dedicated board, including returning members and new faces who bring fresh energy and ideas to the community radio station. This continuity of leadership reflects the station's strong community roots and its ability to evolve while staying true to its mission.

I especially would like to acknowledge president Dino Musolino, a really lovely gentleman. I also acknowledge him as a very successful businessman who has operated a family horticultural business for many generations. His leadership has certainly guided the station with integrity and vision. I also want to congratulate the new general manager, Deanna Carbone, whose creative energy and commitment have also helped shape the station's modern identity and outreach programs. I also thank the wonderful Angela Cutri, the head of the events committee, whose dedication ensures that every celebration is meaningful. On this note, I also want to pay tribute to Mark Aiston, the former general manager of Radio Italia Uno, for his contribution during his term of employment.

Radio Italia Uno's contribution goes beyond the Italian community and reaches the broader multicultural fabric of South Australia. In this place today it is a great honour to recognise that Radio Italia Uno supports the social and cultural welfare of the Italian-Australian community by providing valuable communication services in broadcasting, current affairs, essential information services and diverse programs in the Italian language and also in English.

By sharing stories, music and cultural insights, the station fosters cross-cultural understanding and appreciation. It exemplifies the spirit of multicultural South Australia, reminding us that multiculturalism is not just about diversity; it is about connection, contribution and fostering a sense of belonging in this place we call home.

In recognition of this milestone, I commend Radio Italia Uno for over a decade of service. I certainly look forward to many more celebrations with the radio station. I want to thank them for their friendship and for always welcoming me and the community members to attend all the fantastic events. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

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

*Bills***FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (GREYHOUND RACING TRANSPARENCY) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 September 2025.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:03): I rise to speak on behalf of the government on the Freedom of Information (Greyhound Racing Transparency) Amendment Bill. While the government acknowledges the significant efforts of the honourable member and the intent of this bill, unfortunately we will not be supporting it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ngo will be heard in silence.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: The bill seeks to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991 by including Greyhound Racing South Australia within the definition of 'agency'. This would effectively subject Greyhound Racing SA to the same freedom of information obligations as government bodies. It was outlined in response to a similar proposal last year that the Freedom of Information Act is designed to promote transparency and accountability within government agencies. Its jurisdiction does not generally extend to non-government entities such as Greyhound Racing SA.

This bill stems from a recommendation made by the Animal Justice Party which was included in the 'Independent inquiry into the governance of the greyhound racing industry in South Australia' conducted by Mr Graham Ashton AM APM. The government has accepted this recommendation in principle; however, the inquiry itself noted that some of these recommendations overlap with those already contained in the broader review.

There are numerous other recommendations from the inquiry aimed at strengthening transparency and accountability within the greyhound racing sector—among them are recommendations 24, 27, 33, 37, 48 and 54. These cover:

- strengthening traceability and reporting, examples being mandatory tracking of greyhounds from birth and better welfare data collection;
- reforming of drug testing and integrity practices, an example being more frequent hair testing;
- improving track safety, examples being more straight-track racing and better track design, and improving welfare standards on and off track;
- enhancing the Greyhounds as Pets program to ensure better outcomes for retired or unraced dogs;
- requiring stronger governance standards—board roles, declarations of interests, external audits and enforcing compliance; and
- establishing an independent Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector with oversight powers.

I note that this parliament passed the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector Act 2024, which established the office of Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector. The inspector, Mr Sal Perna AM, commenced on 8 July 2024 and has published several progress reports, which are available on the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing website.

Given the inspector's ongoing work, the comprehensive set of transparency measures already being implemented and the fact that this bill falls outside the intended scope of the FOI Act, the government will not be supporting the proposed amendment. However, we acknowledge the Hon. Tammy Franks' advocacy in this area and thank her for her ongoing efforts over many years.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:08): I rise very briefly to place on the record my support for this bill and to thank the Hon. Tung Ngo for a very timely reminder about how we treat

recommendations from reviews and reports. I am pretty sure that this week, a couple of days ago, I had a briefing from the education minister's office about a bill that we will be debating that picks up on one of the recommendations of the royal commission. There is a standalone bill dealing with one recommendation out of a number of recommendations, similar to what we have just talked about—the fact that we have about six recommendations the Hon. Tung Ngo referred to.

When the government briefed me on the education bill, they said, 'Well, this is not contentious at all and we support it in principle', just like they do this issue, 'so let's get this out of the way before the end of the year so we can get cracking and get on with the work of getting it implemented, getting this part of it done'. It seems that when it suits the government's agenda and flexibility in terms of getting something that is non-contentious, that they support in principle like they did with the education bill, they are quite happy to deal with one recommendation on its own and then deal with all those other recommendations that might be a little bit more prickly in another piece of legislation.

It is a shame that we have a bill here which meets the brief of what the government has supported in principle and, rather than wasting this parliament's time and valuable resources that go into drafting, we do not adopt the same approach as we are doing on the education bill and say, 'Let's get this one done now and we'll get back to the drawing board in relation to those other six recommendations that we have to put a bit more work into.'

The contribution given on the part of the government is completely at odds with the justification for dealing with that education bill that was put to me only two days ago. Notwithstanding, that is not the reason I am supporting this bill: I support this bill in principle and in full. I am happy to support this bill and see its passage through this place, rather than having to wait for this component of it to be dealt with in another bill, which, let us be frank, Ms Franks, we are not going to see this side of an election. That is the reality of it, but we can waste the resources of this place during the next term when the government picks up the bill by the Hon. Tammy Franks, puts it in its own bill and presents it to this place. I thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for bringing this issue again to this place, and I thank the Hon. Tung Ngo for his very timely reminder of our priorities.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:11): I rise to indicate the opposition's position on this bill presented by the Hon. Ms Franks. In truth, our position largely mirrors that of the government. The bill seeks to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991 to include the greyhound racing controlling authority, currently Greyhound Racing SA, as an agency for the purposes of the act. On 30 November 2023 an independent inquiry report was handed down, and it reported into the governance of the greyhound racing industry and was released on that day. The inquiry made a total of some 86 recommendations—a large number of recommendations, all of which were to be implemented by Greyhound Racing SA within two years if the industry is to continue operating in South Australia.

That is quite a significant carrot and stick, I guess, for the industry. But, getting to the nub of it, it is recommendation 13 that I understand was proposed by the Animal Justice Party, namely, to:

Amend freedom of information legislation to ensure that there are no exemptions applicable to the racing industry.

That was adopted by the inquiry and accepted in principle, as I understand it, by the state government as part of one of those 86 recommendations. Despite this, I note that the government has opposed past attempts to define the racing controlling authority for greyhound racing as an agency under the act, so that is a change. It is noteworthy that the Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector was appointed on 8 May last year in order to review and implement the remaining recommendations handed down in that review, to work through them, if you like. In light of that situation as it stands, the opposition considers that it is in the best interests of the industry to allow the inspector to methodically work through these recommendations on a one by one, or case by case, basis, rather than bills being brought to individually do so. As such, our position is that we will not support the bill at this time.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:13): I rise to thank those speakers who have made a contribution: the Hon. Tung Ngo, the Hon. Dennis Hood and the Hon. Connie Bonaros. This is the third time since the Ashton Review recommendations were accepted by the government in principle

that we have tested their resolve to implement a freedom of information application to greyhound racing in this state in practise.

'In principle' does not help the dogs. 'In principle' does not really mean anything, and I would perhaps suggest voters who might vote for the Labor Party next time in the election in principle perhaps put their vote somewhere else if they actually want action on animal welfare in this state. I seek leave at this point, noting that the time is short, to table a document entitled 'Further reported concerns at the Angle Park Veterinary Clinic'.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I will not belabour the point, but this is the sort of document that would be revealed through freedom of information requests to GRSA and particularly impacting not just the practices—the unethical, the bullying, the unhygienic, the cruel practices—of this industry but also the bullying of staff at the Greyhounds as Pets program, which is lauded by the government and by GRSA as somehow the good part of this industry. These documents will prove that that tale is a fantasy and that freedom of information restrictions on this industry have no place in this parliament.

I hope the government will take on board, again and again, that they have been lied to by this industry that everything has been cleaned up—it has not. Previously, Premier Malinauskas was quite incensed that he had been lied to by this industry and that is in fact what sparked, in the end, the Ashton review. That Ashton review confirmed what many have said in the animal welfare sector for many decades, that this is an industry that does not deserve a social licence. It has been given two years to clean up its act by the Ashton review. That was accepted in principle by the Malinauskas government.

The GIRI (Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector) was indeed appointed in May, as the Hon. Dennis Hood reflected, but did not start until July, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros noted, and in fact that gets us beyond the next election period. Just tidily, that two-year clock did not start ticking in December 2023, it did not start ticking in Easter 2024, it only started ticking in July 2024, which of course gets us well beyond the next state election. So, as I say, I hope voters support the Labor Party's position on greyhound racing in principle at the ballot booth and actually vote for politicians who will do something about the animal welfare needs of this state and actually make Labor keep their promises for a change.

I will be dividing on this because I think the people of South Australia need to see that Minister Hildyard then—because we are now three ministers into this particular portfolio under the regime of the GIRI—and Premier Malinauskas in December 2023 did a massive press conference and pledged that they would accept all of the recommendations and ensure that they were implemented.

This is the third chance that the Malinauskas government has had to vote on implementing what is the AJP recommendation No. 13, which was accepted by Mr Ashton; that is: amend freedom of information legislation to ensure that there are no exemptions applicable to the racing industry. This will be the third time the Malinauskas government will have breached that promise to the people of South Australia and we want to see the numbers in the *Hansard* recorded to reflect that.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes3
Noes.....14
Majority11

AYES

Bonaros, C.

Franks, T.A. (teller)

Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.

Girolamo, H.M.
Hood, D.G.E.

Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.
Pangallo, F.

Lee, J.S.
Martin, R.B.
Wortley, R.P.

Lensink, J.M.A.
Ngo, T.T. (teller)

Second reading thus negatived.

Parliamentary Procedure

MONEY CLAUSES IN BILLS

The PRESIDENT (17:22): Honourable members, I draw your attention to money clauses in bills. Earlier today, the council considered in committee the Unclaimed Goods (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill and the Legal Practitioners (Disciplinary Matters and Fidelity Fund) Amendment Bill. Each of these bills contained a money clause: clause 8 of the Unclaimed Goods (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill and clause 10 of the Legal Practitioners (Disciplinary Matters and Fidelity Fund) Amendment Bill.

Both of these clauses were inadvertently included in the grouping of clauses of the bill in the question 'that the clauses stand as printed'. The two money clauses were printed in erased type. Each of these respective clauses should not have been included in the grouping of clauses but rather, as Chair—I'm bad—I would normally advise the committee that the clause is a money clause and is printed in erased type and no question should be put on such a clause and that the message transmitting the bill to the House of Assembly is required to indicate that this clause is deemed necessary to the bill.

The bills passed this house today and the messages sent to the House of Assembly containing the bills have, as required, drawn to the attention of the House of Assembly the money clauses printed in erased type in each of the bills, which are deemed necessary to the bills.

At 17:23 the council adjourned until Tuesday 28 October 2025 at 14:15.