

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 27 November 2025

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 11:02 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) (11:03): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers, 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

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of message No. 307 from the House of Assembly.

(Continued from 26 November 2025.)

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

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

Motion carried.

CARERS RECOGNITION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 November 2025.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (11:05): I speak in favour of the Carers Recognition (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. Carers, as we know, are the quiet backbone in South Australia who—probably until more recent years, 20 or 30 years or so—have just gone about assisting loved ones often completely unrecognised and without any additional financial support. This has been and is being rectified over the years in terms of both formal financial support through Centrelink and Services Australia and through various state and federal governments recognising them and initiating charters and funding support services.

I would particularly like to commend the carers' organisations, whose boards are often substantially run by carers who, in addition to their own caring role, are doing that in a volunteer capacity. It is quite an extraordinary job to look out for people who would otherwise need to go into government-funded or government-supported services, either residential or the like. They really have been the unsung heroes in our society and should always be commended at every opportunity for the compassion and stoicism that they provide to the people whom they love.

This bill takes some steps towards modernising the South Australian Carers Recognition Act to better reflect the diversity and reality of caring. It expands the definition of a carer, updates and

expands the Carers Charter, strengthens obligations on public sector agencies and departments, and requires regular statutory reviews.

Caring roles have evolved and, over time, our understanding of them has also evolved, and therefore our legislation needs to evolve with them. The updated charter explicitly acknowledges informal carers, including grandparents, siblings, kinship carers and others whose relationships have not previously been reflected in the act. This validates what people do day in and day out, often getting to the end of the day and being completely exhausted because they are doing two jobs. This bill will help.

There are unfortunately concerns that there may be some gaps that remain. Informal kinship carers who look after children continue to fall outside the definition of a care relationship if the child does not meet the criteria in the act. We do know that thousands of children in South Australia are being raised through informal kinship carers who prevent those young people from entering state care, and that is an absolutely critical role. It is much better than if the state was looking after them, quite frankly. Their contribution needs to be recognised as well.

The bill also implements stronger reporting requirements and brings public sector agencies into its scope. I understand that there are recommendations from the recent review that the government has chosen not to adopt, but we need to ensure that the act is strengthened, carers are recognised and that reviews are undertaken regularly so that people can be included because, yes, if they fall apart then there are lots of other consequences outside the trauma that they and the person they care for will experience. With those few words, I indicate support for the bill.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:10): I rise to speak briefly in support of the Carers Recognition (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, which we know follows the 2024 review of the Carers Recognition Act 2005 undertaken by the Department of Human Services, as well as the commonwealth's 2024 inquiry into carer recognition, which culminated in the release of the National Carer Strategy 2024-2034.

The bill seeks, as we have heard, to implement 21 of the 24 recommendations from the state review and to align South Australia's framework with the National Carer Strategy, promoting national consistency in the recognition and support of carers. Under the act a person is considered to be in a care relationship where they provide personal care, support or assistance to another person who meets at least one of the criteria outlined in the act. I will come back to that point in a moment in relation to one of the issues that has been raised with respect to this bill.

The bill also clarifies what is not considered a care relationship. It makes explicit that a paid contract-for-service arrangement, volunteer or community organisation work or care provided as part of an education or training program does not fall within the scope of the act. It also expands the reporting requirements and updates the Carers Charter to reflect the nationally consistent approach. It establishes a requirement for the act and the charter to be reviewed every five years. At present, the act applies only to seven public sector agencies. The bill will expand its coverage to all public sector agencies, thereby strengthening the whole-of-government responsibility to recognise and support carers.

It has been noted that about 13 per cent of Australians—more than 230,000 people—are carers. Their contribution is immense and can never be overstated. We are very fortunate in those cases to have people doing what they do in caring capacities. The number of carers is expected to continue to rise in the future as our population ages and the demand for informal care grows, and that is, I guess, what makes this framework so important. We have heard that there has been consultation on the bill involving around 30 non-government executive stakeholders. Many more public sector agencies and policy teams in other jurisdictions have also undertaken similar reforms.

I want to touch on the issue of grandcarers and kinship carers. I note that there was concern that this bill did not cover grandcarers specifically. I have thought about this in great detail, in terms of those concerns. The first and foremost point I would make is that this is about a nationally consistent approach, and in order to have a nationally consistent approach we follow the lead of what we have federally, so that inclusion would put us out of step with the definitions that apply federally, but I think there is a little bit more to it.

At the outset I thank Julia Overton, CEO of Carers SA, because I spent some time talking to her about this, and I think that was actually very useful in the context of what was considered. Of

course we all have a great deal of sympathy, given that we have all worked over the years with these groups.

My starting point is that I am concerned that including grandcarers in this actually does not assist them; firstly, because the inclusion is not consistent with the commonwealth. There are the recommendations of the review of this, and the commonwealth inquiry into the recognition of unpaid carers was consistent with definitions between states and commonwealth, but it is, I think, quite fair to say that it could lead to confusion. Certainly one of the issues I discussed was what benefit would be served for grandcarers if they had that formal recognition under this act, how that would interact with their recognition under other and what I would call much more relevant pieces of legislation that exist in Human Services and DCP.

One of the things I am worried about is undermining their role by giving them recognition, because the reality is that all you would get in this bill is recognition. Nothing else attaches to that, it is just recognition, whereas there are other very important pieces of legislation which apply to those groups that should and can provide much more than just the formal recognition. That formal recognition under this act does not give rise to access to anything at a commonwealth level or a state level. That is the first point, and one that cannot be understressed.

In addition to that, having spoken again to Ms Overton, even on the face of it the concern is that the meaning of care relationship and carer will not include grandcarers or kinship carers. I think it is fair to say that Ms Overton just does not agree with that proposition because, by virtue of the fact that you are in the position where you are, for instance, raising your grandchildren, there is scope to fit within these provisions that relate to the meaning of care relationship and carer. I accept the points Ms Overton has made in relation to that.

We were talking about having discussed this with her, and said, 'Well, how would you consider that they fit into this?' Yes, there may not be a person with a disability or somebody who is experiencing mental ill health, or a medical position. The fact that there is a provision in here that says the other person is frail due to age, it is also not limited to old age. Then there are references to the issue of alcohol or other drug dependency, and of course any other reason prescribed by regulation.

I take on board the feedback I have had from Ms Overton in relation to that. She does not see that as an exclusion of those groups, she certainly does not see it as an exclusion of grandcarers. Indeed, I think she sees it as quite the opposite; that, again, by virtue of the fact that you are in this situation where you are the grandcarer of a grandchild, that in and of itself may give rise to falling within the meaning of care relationship and carer.

As I said at the outset, I maintain that there are other pieces of legislation that are much more critical to those carers than this one is. This one is—I am not going to call it symbolic; I do not mean that disrespectfully—but it is a recognition. It does not follow from that that you necessarily have any entitlements. Certainly, you do not have the entitlements at the commonwealth level, because the commonwealth definition does not include those groups.

Again, this piece of legislation will be subject to further review, but right now the importance of reaching that nationally consistent approach—which is what this is aimed at—and ensuring there is recognition is vitally important. We can hand over to the scheme coming into effect, coming into play, and see how that pans out in line with the advice I have been provided about whether somebody would or would not fit within the scope of this. As I said, there are other pieces of legislation that I think are much more critical in terms of providing not just recognition but something that attaches to that recognition.

All the discussion we have around these arrangements when it comes to kinship carers and grandcarers is that they ought to have something attached to their relationship with a person they care for. That simply does not exist under this bill. It is on that basis that I am satisfied with the information and response that I have received to date.

We know these are unique and complex caring relationships, which can include grandparents, siblings, family friends, kinship care, particularly amongst our diverse ethnic groups and our Aboriginal collective kinship care groups, and other family and kinship relationships. We

accept that they should be supported, as the government has said, irrespective of any ambiguity around guardianship or legal status.

However, when it comes to some of these groups, firstly, I think the intent is that they would be covered in any event, and secondly, the important thing is that you do not just have recognition but that something follows from that recognition. This bill does not deliver that, not at this point in time anyway. It may very well in the future, but it does not right now, so there is room to revisit this and consider this further after its implementation. But I hasten to say that I would hate to see something done that actually undermines a person's ability to have a formal recognition and entitlements under a different piece of legislation.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (11:21): I rise to offer my support for the Carers Recognition (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2025. The bill acknowledges the vital role of unpaid carers in our community and is intended to ensure that government agencies provide appropriate assistance and support for carers as well as effective consultation about programs and policies. The bill also includes a Carers Charter, which highlights the importance of maintaining the health and wellbeing of carers, as well as recognising informal carers such as grandparents, siblings, family friends and other kinship relationships.

While I fully support the acknowledgement of informal carers, in particular the vital contribution that grandcarers continue to make to our communities, I am concerned that the bulk of this bill will not achieve what many carers so desperately need. Carers need more than recognition. They need direct and concrete support from government agencies such as the Department for Child Protection, rather than statements about how much carers are valued.

Unfortunately, some of the praise offered by this chamber today will appear as empty words to carers such as Leah Terry, who has tirelessly and continuously called for support and assistance from the DCP and the government to provide her with the medical and disability equipment she so desperately needs to provide appropriate palliative care for her foster daughter Grace. Leah has also informed my office that not only has DCP provided less than adequate support for Grace; the department has actually withdrawn some of Grace's services and funding. According to Leah this case is not the only one where a carer of a disabled child has not received appropriate levels of assistance and support.

Consequently, while it is definitely worthwhile and warranted to acknowledge the great work that thousands of carers do in our community, and it is also important to highlight the impact that the job of caring has on the wellbeing of carers, we should not let this provide any cover for the ongoing concerns and serious issues in this space that have still not been addressed. Until we can truly and legitimately back up these statements and intentions about how much we value carers with some tangible actions, it will be difficult for carers to accept these measures before us today.

That being said, I do offer my full support for this bill and acknowledge the need to recognise the contribution of all carers as a significant initial step towards improving the lives of carers. However, it must not end with this. It must be accompanied by a genuine commitment to enact further measures that will empower and support our carers to continue their invaluable and challenging work.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (11:23): I rise today to speak in support of the amendments in the Carers Recognition (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. At the outset I want to acknowledge the enormous contribution that carers make to our communities. They are the quiet backbone of our state. For many carers the load is carried in private, often with little recognition and limited support. It is therefore essential that our legislation keeps pace with their lived experience and properly reflects their role.

This bill introduces important updates. It will broaden and clarify the definition of 'carer', so it better reflects the diverse types of caring relationships; expand the act's coverage and reporting requirements and modernise the Carers Charter; and require a review every five years, ensuring the legislation remains relevant.

Carers are parents, partners, children and siblings, extended family, friends and neighbours who step in to help someone who is living with disability, illness, frailty, mental ill health or other complex challenges. Their work holds families together, strengthens communities, and saves governments.

In 2024, the Department of Human Services undertook a thorough review of the act, while the commonwealth government completed its own inquiry and released the National Carer Strategy 2024-2034. More than 2,000 carers participated in these processes. Their lived experiences, insights, and voices are at the heart of the reforms we bring forward today.

A central purpose of this bill is to align South Australia's legislation with the National Carer Strategy, ensuring that carers are defined, recognised and supported consistently across the country. If passed, this will make South Australia the first jurisdiction in the nation to achieve this alignment.

There are an estimated 236,600 carers in South Australia, making up 13 per cent of our population. Across Australia, the demand for unpaid care is expected to increase by 23 per cent between 2020 and 2030, while the number of people stepping into caring roles is projected to rise by only 16 per cent. The urgency of making sure our legislation is responsive and meaningful is highlighted by this growing gap.

The bill applies to all public sector agencies, not just the seven currently covered. The definition of 'carer' will focus on when a care relationship exists and removes the requirement that the care provided must be ongoing. The bill clearly acknowledges caring for people with medical conditions, terminal illnesses, dementia, and alcohol or other drug dependence. It replaces 'mental illness' with 'mental ill health', a term that is a more respectful way of describing people's experiences and fits better with contemporary mental health practice.

The bill removes section 5(3), which has long caused confusion, and clarifies that 'relevant services' refers to services designed for carers and the person they care for, not generic services that carers may incidentally access. Obligations on applicable organisations will be expressed more clearly, including a requirement that internal HR policies have due regard to the Carers Charter.

For the first time, a new, contemporary Carers Charter will be adopted. It will reflect the national strategy and explicitly acknowledge informal kinship carers, sibling carers, Aboriginal collective kinship care arrangements, and others who have felt unseen in the past.

Finally, the bill makes consequential amendments to three acts within the Attorney-General's portfolio, so that removing the 'ongoing care' requirement does not have unintended effects elsewhere in the law. Carers give so much time, energy, and compassion so that others can live with dignity and support. I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism)
(11:29): I thank the honourable members who have spoken on this bill before us today: the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Sarah Game and the Hon. Tung Ngo.

As we all know in this place, the best bills that come before us are those that have been highly consulted on, and this is one such bill, with over 2,000 carers, 30 non-government stakeholders and 95 public sector leaders who shared their insights into crafting and bringing this bill before us today. As everyone has rightfully highlighted, in the chamber today we all know volunteers play a significant role in our lives but particularly our carers. We understand there are about 245,000 carers in South Australia and to each and every one of them we say thank you, and we say thank you through this bill in recognising your service.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

The CHAIR: Are there any contributions on clauses 2 to 9?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I have a question, but I am not sure which clause it is at. I refer to my second reading contribution and, indeed, the discussions I have had with government and Carers SA to confirm that in the case of grandcarers there is not an explicit exclusion from the scope of this bill and those categories may very well include grandcarers and other informal carers within them, regardless of whether it may not be apparent on the face of it through the definition that is in the bill.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The honourable member is correct. They are not excluded if the person they are caring for meets the criteria that is set out.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: And that is not necessarily limited by age, so if somebody is frail, for instance, that is not limited to somebody who is frail because they are old, it may be because they are frail because they are young and, by virtue of the fact that—as Ms Overton said—a grandcarer, for instance, is caring for a grandchild, the circumstances around that may very well be enough to bring them within those existing definitions that have been put in the bill.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: You have put that perfectly, and that is correct, as I am advised.

Remaining clauses (2 to 9), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (11:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

BYNER, MR L.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (11:35): I move:

That this council—

1. Expresses its sorrow at the passing of Adelaide radio presenter, Leon Byner OAM;
2. Extends its sincere condolences to his family, friends and colleagues; and
3. Acknowledges the significant contribution he made to Adelaide media for over two decades, raising awareness of issues of interest to the South Australian community, advocating for the people of our state and giving them a voice.

I will speak very briefly today. We have a lot on the *Notice Paper* that we need to get through, and members would be aware that we had originally intended to do this motion last night. I do want to take a moment to pause and reflect on the really significant—and I would go so far as to say magnificent—contribution that Leon Byner has made to the state of South Australia. He was truly one of a kind and a person I grew quite close to over the years.

He was, of course, a broadcaster, who commenced radio presenting way back in 1966, before I was born. Some people might be shocked to hear that, but yes, even before I was born. He worked in radio in every Australian capital city during his decades-long media career: Sydney, Brisbane, Canberra, Melbourne, Perth, Hobart and, of course, right here in Adelaide. He most recently hosted his top-rating morning talkback show for over two decades on Adelaide's FIVEaa radio station and all the affiliate stations throughout regional South Australia. He was truly a household name in Adelaide and throughout the regions.

He retired from broadcasting somewhat reluctantly, I understand, but nonetheless retired on 2 December 2022. By that time, as I have indicated, he had spent some 60 years on the airwaves. This is the sort of longevity that I think will be almost never equalled, given the extraordinary length of time that he was able to speak to all of us. He was nominated for an ACRA Award 13 times. That is the industry award for one of the most outstanding presenters. He was actually nominated 13 times.

I remember speaking with him when I think he had been nominated for the eleventh time and he said, 'I have no chance.' I said, 'Why would that be, Leon? Your ratings are through the roof. You should win.' He said, 'It always goes to someone in Sydney or Melbourne. It always goes to someone in Sydney or Melbourne,' and the truth is that it does. When you look at the data, he is quite right. I think he was well and truly up against it, but in my view he was very deserving of winning at least one, if not more than one.

I do not think this is widely known, but he was also nominated for Australian of the Year some three times. Again, he was not actually declared the winner, but to be nominated is a great honour,

and I think he was truly a worthy nomination. He was awarded a Medal of the Order of Australia for service to radio broadcast media in 2023 in the King's Birthday Honours. Leon was a man who took a great deal of pride in civil society and in the recognition that goes with those highly regarded awards. I know that he was personally thrilled to receive his OAM, as he saw it as not so much recognition of himself but of the impact that he had had on our community.

He, sadly, passed away from acute leukaemia on 11 November this year. He was 77 and other than the disease was a very vibrant, energetic 77 year old. I saw him just a couple of months ago. What did he want to talk about? He wanted to talk about what the government was up to, what the opposition was up to, what the individual players on the crossbench were up to. He was still very astute, very interested in the day-to-day ins and outs of politics. He was indefatigable, which is a word I do not use very often. I do not use it very often because I stumble on it when I say it.

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Okay, there is a pronunciation issue there, but he was. He really was. His energy knew no bounds. Of course, his show brought issues to the attention of South Australians on a daily basis. He would argue with passion, with venom. I remember, before I joined the Liberal Party, I was on the crossbench, and he would often ring me after his show and say, 'What have you got for tomorrow?' I would say, 'Okay. Just give me a minute, Leon, and I will come back to you.' He demanded of you a certain level of activity and vigilance, if you like. That was something that he expected of himself and expected of others as well.

He regularly engaged, of course, with members of parliament. I am sure all of us have been on his show at one stage or another. He was quite exacting in his standards and could be really quite brutal on the air. I remember when I was on the crossbench. He was a little bit kinder to the crossbench, I think, by and large, but used to get stuck into the major parties quite a bit. I remember that was great when we were in opposition but not so good when we were in government. He would get the minister on there and tear them apart on various issues. If you were going on Leon's show, you had to know your material and know it well, because he did not suffer fools lightly at all.

He was passionate about keeping the government of the day to account and advocating for individual groups. When he saw injustice, he would pounce on it, and he would not stop until that situation was fixed. People would ring up his show after having been thrown around the various avenues of government—they might have gone to the Ombudsman or done something, whatever—and he would find a way. Leon would ring that minister personally and say, 'Look, I have had this call today.'

Usually the minister would know about it because one of the staff was listening to it. The minister would try to get a head start so that Leon did not ring them afterwards and say, 'Why are you not doing something about this?' They could say, 'Actually, we are doing something about it, Leon.' He was the last resort advocate, if you like, when people had nowhere else to go. He used to wear that as a badge of honour, and he would fight passionately to get a result for people.

I think it is fitting that I bring this motion to the chamber today. He was a unique man. He was quite different. When I first met him, it is fair to say we did not get along very well. We were just different types, if you like. His pace and energy were a little bit different to mine; I am more of a slightly reserved type, and he just went guns and all. But after a while, I really became quite friendly with him. We became quite close and were good friends right until the end. He will certainly be missed. He has contributed a lot to our state, and I think it is appropriate that we acknowledge him today.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:42): I rise to speak on this motion and thank the Hon. Dennis Hood for putting this forward. I also got to know Leon Byner over the years. I think it is fair to say that he was a remarkable contributor to South Australian public life and the political discourse of our state, and in fact I would describe Leon as really being the voice of Adelaide for several decades. He had one of those voices that was so recognisable and really iconic in terms of being the voice of our state. He gave voice often to the concerns of people in our community who were being marginalised or excluded.

One of the things that I really valued about Leon and his advocacy was the fact that, if somebody was not able to get through with government departments or was finding that their issue was being caught up in government bureaucracy, he would provide a platform to cut to the chase and try to get an outcome for that person. There are lots and lots of examples of Leon Byner doing that over the years. I will say that I first went on his program as an Adelaide city councillor. He had me on on multiple occasions over the years in my different roles over the last decade.

I will say there was always a level of trepidation when you got a call from the producer of the Leon Byner program asking you to go on, because you knew you had to be well prepared. You knew that he was going to sometimes give you a hard time. I think he treated all political parties in that way, but he was somebody who cared genuinely about people and cared genuinely about our state. He was a tough interviewer, and we need that from our journalists and people who operate in journalism. I salute him for that. He also was very generous to me over the years in terms of giving me opportunities to appear on his program, and I really appreciate that.

I might also make a remark about his good friend Sean Dinning, whom I know, who was Leon's carer in recent times. I see Sean regularly at the Arab Steed Hotel—he works there, and I live around the corner—and I know that the loss of Leon is being deeply felt by him and, of course, other friends and family too, so my thoughts are with them at this time.

I think it is fair to say we unfortunately are not going to see another person like Leon Byner in terms of someone who really commanded the medium of radio in that way in our state over such a long period of time, so it is certainly appropriate that we recognise his contribution in the parliament today. Vale Leon Byner.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (11:45): I stand today to pay my regards at the loss of Leon Byner, and I thank the Hon. Dennis Hood for putting this on the agenda. We lost a legend of Adelaide and Australian radio earlier this month. Leon Byner was the consummate broadcaster. In an increasingly formulaic radio media too easily filled with morning zoos and shock jocks, Leon stood out, from spinning the discs in the 1970s to dealing with irate talkback callers and helping out even more callers who needed to be heard.

Leon worked for 50 years and in every state in Australia. He was one of Australia's all-time great broadcasters, and South Australia has been lucky enough to have him on our airwaves for most of his career. Leon's career started at just 14, working as an announcer at a hospital fete in Melbourne's St Kilda. There he met a giant of Australian theatre, John Bell, who encouraged him to pursue a career in broadcasting. Three years later, his already smooth radio voice was filling the airwaves at Shepparton in Northern Victoria. In rural media you really learn your stripes as a jack-of-all-trades. It was a great training ground, and it set Leon up to for a brilliant career.

When he arrived in Adelaide, he worked the graveyard shift on radio station 5AD before moving to 5KA, where he became one of its renowned music DJs. Leon Byner was only getting started. The fact that he could be an expert on the songs of the Rolling Stones and the Easybeats and transition quickly to someone filling in on local matters, including politics for the legendary John Laws in Sydney, speaks volumes for his ability.

The move to Sydney would change his career forever and showed he was one of Australia's best broadcasters from a young age. Leon went on to work in every city in Australia during the eighties and nineties. He even worked on Adelaide morning TV and pushed the boundaries further by heading to the US and taking on several roles in Los Angeles. But he had come to love his adopted home of Adelaide and returned in 2000. Very quickly, he became the voice of Adelaide morning radio, working on FIVEaa. Leon went from respected commentator to a legend in South Australian broadcasting.

I first met Leon in around 2011 when I was Minister for Industrial Relations and Local Government, when I introduced quite significant reforms to the work health and safety legislation. Leon was the voice for many of those people who opposed that legislation, and there were quite a few from the HIA and some social commentators. When Tammy used to ring up and ask me to go on the radio, I was very grateful for the fact that I could go and put my point of view, but I always knew that he had three or four other characters who were ready to attack me at every end.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: To hammer you.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Yes, to hammer me. I did not mind that, because that is what Leon was there for. I was a great admirer of Leon's. As long as I got my opportunity of speaking and putting my position, I had no problem with having four or five people basically attacking me.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: How could anyone attack you, Russell?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: No, not Leon; it was all the people there. Leon lived in the seat of Torrens. I know my partner, Dana Wortley, had a lot to do with Leon. We went out to his favourite restaurant, which was the House of Chow in Wakefield Street. We would go out for meals with him and his friend Sean, and we spoke about many, many issues.

It was very funny with Leon in that he very rarely knew what position he was going to take. He actually acted as a mouthpiece for those people who had issues. He loaned his voice to many causes and he gave a voice to callers who needed to be heard. He helped his growing army of callers deal with everything from medical emergencies to banking issues, Centrelink payments and energy bills. He was their way of cutting through the bureaucratic red tape.

When people got sick of dealing with the system, they knew Leon was there to help. There is no doubt he got many people through one crisis after another. He may have even saved the lives of some of the more desperate listeners who had all but given up before he came to their aid. He investigated wrongdoing, gave airplay to stories that others ignored, and was very supportive of local businesses.

For his ongoing service to the community, he was nominated for Australian of the Year three times. He was the mainstay of morning radio for more than 20 years before his retirement in 2022. One year later, Leon was awarded the Medal of the Order of Australia for his service to radio broadcasting. Leon persevered through illness in his later years and succumbed to acute leukaemia on 11 November. My sympathies go out to Leon, his friends, Sean and the rest of his family. Vale Leon.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Before I go to the Hon. Ms Bonaros, can I acknowledge in the gallery some students from Mercedes College, who are visiting in the capable hands of the Treasurer. Welcome.

Motions

BYNER, MR L.

Debate resumed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:51): I rise to thank the Hon. Dennis Hood for bringing this motion to this chamber. I echo the sentiments that have been expressed by my colleagues in here today, and I think everyone has nailed it when it comes to Leon. I marvel at how much time Leon must have spent on the phone. You felt like you were kind of unique with Leon, in that he would call you all those times a day—we have heard that he really was a persistent man and like a dog with a bone when it came to pursuing an issue—and it was not just one of us, it was many of us.

I had the opportunity, on radio with Graeme Goodings, to reflect on Leon and his time in here. During that conversation I reflected on some of the things that Leon did, and the thing that always stands out to me the most is the drug-driving campaign. I attribute the changes made to our laws in this place to Leon Byner and Leon Byner only. He was on a one-man mission to change our drug-driving and hoon-driving laws in this state for the safety of our community. You knew he was not going to let up, and he brought people on that journey with him. I think that is one of the exceptional things about Leon.

I do not know that he often appreciated the level of influence that he had over politics in this state, but I think other speakers are quite right: he took what was happening in here on a daily basis and engaged with the public about that. He let them know what decisions were being made about the issues that impact each and every one of our community members. The level of influence that I think he had over those sorts of decisions is, as I said, immeasurable.

The sort of impact that Leon had and the role that he played on radio, as I think everyone agrees, cannot be overstated. There is a lot to be said for trust and information and some truth, and people looked to him for that—and not just that; it went beyond just the big campaigns. People would call Leon with an individual problem, and he would see those people, those individuals, through with phone calls to many of us in here until something was done.

He would be on the phone after somebody called in and said that they had a problem with this issue or that issue. He would call one of us in here and ensure that it was dealt with, whether it was a speeding fine, a housing issue, an electricity issue or whatever the case may be. There was always one of us who was going to get that call, or a minister who was going to get that call. He would be on it until it was resolved. That goes way above and beyond the role our radio presenters play.

I also had cause to reflect on—and this is a question that Graeme put to me—the truth and trust we have in people like him and in Leon. I said at the time when I spoke that we have social media today and you do not know what is true and what is not. People still do turn to their radio presenters and people like Leon for a trusted source of news, and he delivered that in spades over decades in South Australia and we are all better off for it.

He brought decision-making from this place each and every day to the fore of the South Australian public. His service was much greater than just as a radio host. It was a civic duty and a responsibility for Leon, and certainly he brought to the fore many things in SA public life, as the Hon. Rob Simms has said, that people genuinely care about. At this point I, too, would like to extend my condolences to his family, friends and loved ones, and thank him for his invaluable service to the community above and beyond everything else that he provided to us for so many years.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (11:56): I also wish to send my condolences to the family of Leon Byner and his friends. I know that Leon had been in bad health in recent months. I had coffee with him only a few months ago, and we shared a lot of stories and a lot of what he had done in his radio career. Considering my age, I have probably known Leon longer than many people in this place.

I first came across Leon in the 1970s when he worked as a DJ on radio stations in Adelaide after coming here from interstate, on 5KA particularly. His nickname was Binky at the time. He had not only a talented knowledge of music when he was spinning discs but also was a bit of a comedian of sorts and would often do skits mimicking cartoonish voices and writing rather humorous scripts.

Leon progressed from there to the more serious side of radio, which is talk, and of course I got to know him very well during his period on FIVEaa, I was one of his regulars, and what struck me about Leon was his constant ability and interest in setting the agenda on radio each day. He was always looking for something different, rather than just pulling something out of the paper and covering what was already in the paper. Leon was always on the phone early in the morning, wanting to know if there was an issue of importance that needed to be raised on radio or if a particular politician needed to have their cage rattled or appear on the program to make a particular comment.

Leon like to set the agenda on radio, and he did that quite a few times, as has been mentioned here. What he was really strong at was being a watchdog for the community, for his radio community, particularly on consumer issues and also on the lack of fairness that had been given to people, particularly those on Centrelink benefits. He would often have the chief executive of Centrelink on his program and the program would be flooded with people who had issues about the way they had been treated. Leon was probably one of the first to highlight and expose the Centrelink Robodebt scandal. He stayed on that all the way through. He had many listeners who gave him information, and consequently we know what happened in that regard.

That gives you an indication of the type of talkback presenter he was: you gave him a bone and he would not let go until he achieved an outcome. People would ring on his program—and we have experienced it all in our line of work here, and I experienced it in my previous line of work—and sometimes an individual would try to get assistance for some problem that beset them with a government department. You usually find that the government departments or the ministers do not really take much notice of them, because it is only one complaint—'We'll send them a letter.' That is it, nothing happens. They give Leon a call, Leon airs it publicly, and within 24 hours the matter is fixed.

He did that not only with Centrelink issues, he did it with Housing Trust issues. I think the Hon. Michelle Lensink would attest that when she was minister Leon would often be on her tail about these issues. He had other strong issues; he had the consumer ones, of course, and then there were electricity prices. He was really strong on what was going on with the electricity market and how it was impacting on cost-of-living pressures on South Australians.

Leon was also a very competent interviewer. In the mid-nineties, when I worked as the features editor at Channel 10, I produced segments that Leon would shoot in Hollywood and we would air on Channel 10. It was incredible the amount of celebrities in Hollywood who gave Leon time and sat down with him to do interviews; Jackie Collins and Arnold Schwarzenegger, for example, are two who come to mind. He would go there and do a whole bag full of interviews, come back, and then they would be edited and would go to air. Leon certainly was able to show his prowess in being able to do those types of celebrity interviews for television. He was a multifaceted man, not only on radio but also on television.

Last year, Leon was awarded an Order of Australia for his services to broadcasting—much deserved. It did not really get much fanfare, or the fanfare it deserved, in my opinion. Having been involved in the media for something like 50-odd years, I would rate Leon Byner in the same league of radio talkback commentators as the late John Laws, who died recently, as Neil Mitchell in Melbourne, Ray Hadley and, of course, Jeremy Cordeaux, who was a legendary figure on radio here and who also worked with Leon.

As I said, I think Leon will be best remembered for his strong campaigns on issues and the fact that he went in for the underdog. He will always be remembered for that work and what he did on radio. Radio is poorer for not having Leon there. I know he was quite disappointed when he had to leave FIVEaa—again, on health grounds. He would have loved to have gone on. In the discussions I had with him after he had left FIVEaa he was still razor sharp, still interested in what was happening, he still had an opinion on particular issues. He never lost that interest in his craft; it almost became obsessive, in a way, for him. That is the type of person he was; he worked hard, he researched hard.

I still recall my days in 2017 when I was working with Nick Xenophon as Nick's media adviser. A day would not pass without me getting a call from Leon wanting to know what issues he could tackle that morning, or who we needed to tackle or what issues were going to come up before parliament. He certainly had a really good rapport with Nick and would often speak with Nick about politics and issues of the day and have him regularly on his program.

There were many people that Leon helped along the way in their careers, whether it was in politics or in other fields. We will all be thankful for the time he gave us and for his friendship. With that, I thank the mover of the motion.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (12:05): I would like to thank the speakers: the Hon. Mr Wortley, the Hon. Ms Bonaros, the Hon. Mr Simms and the Hon. Mr Pangallo. I think all of us had an affection for Leon. He was a unique and remarkable individual, and he will be sadly missed.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:05): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON DAMAGE, HARM OR ADVERSE OUTCOMES RESULTING FROM ICAC INVESTIGATIONS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (12:05): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL AND LIVE CREATIVE VENUES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (12:06): With great pleasure, I bring up the report of the committee, together with the minutes of proceedings and evidence. While I am on my feet, I want to say a few words of thanks to those members of the committee who participated in this particular select committee: the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. Ben Hood. I must say it has been the most pleasurable committee to have ever been a member of in my time in this parliament, and that time has been quite an extensive one so far.

We have agreed on recommendations to ensure the protection of grassroots music venues under our liquor licensing legislation and that other protections be afforded. We know, of course, that the Crown and Anchor and the saving the Crown and Anchor campaign led to what was a really interesting debate in this state about the importance of live music, the importance of iconic venues and the importance of grassroots venues.

This report comes together to try to ensure that we do not get to a situation where we are about to lose more iconic venues. We know that we have lost far too many live music venues in this state. This report recommends that there be an investigation of community right-to-buy legislation, should we ever face another situation such as that of losing a grassroots venue where the community might be able to pull together to ensure that we keep live music local and live in this state.

The state government also has been encouraged to support a model that has been very successful in the UK and to support the newly established Australian Music Venue Foundation. That is based on a voluntary ticketing donation to be made at point of sale or by the artists encouraging it themselves that goes back into local grassroots live venues. Both of those schemes work in the UK, and they could very much work here in South Australia.

Another recommendation we have made is that the state government investigate what they are now looking at in Tasmania—after the last Tasmanian election—where the Rockcliff government promised to establish something called TasInsure and to look at the chokehold that the monopolies in insurance currently have on industries like the live music industry. Venues are unable to get insurance, and they are priced out of the market because the market is rigged against them. We encourage the Malinauskas government to look at the benefits for live music and other vulnerable sectors of having that state-led insurance option to break the monopoly.

We also recommend increasing what was first established by then minister Diana Laidlaw back in the day of taking the pokies money and quarantining it for live music. When that was first done, under Liberal minister Di Laidlaw, it was an amount of \$500,000. In 2013, I was proud to have played a role in lifting that amount up to \$850,000, which is what it should have been in 2013 had the CPI index been followed each year.

We have again seen that fund sit dormant and static, so this report recommends that the CPI increases be respected and that we have an immediate injection of live music money from pokies money of \$1.3 million each year, and then it continues to be indexed annually, so that we are not having to come back here and reinvent the wheel.

The report also recommends that we look at the mental health benefits of creative venues and live music in our state. We know that we have had the COVID crisis that is creating not only a mental health crisis—indeed, it is the tsunami of a mental health crisis after the earthquake of COVID—but we have loneliness in our society. Ways to tackle that can indeed not just see music as therapy but live music as a remedy, and we recommend that there be mental health grants for the promotion of live music and that they be based on a mental health criteria, not an artistic criteria. Such fantastic projects such as The Jam, The Mix, The Gig have been lost over time because of a lack of focus on the importance of things like music to mental health and strengthening our community.

We also recommend that a regular Premier's gig guide be published online and in print and that that be promoted to tourists and locals alike. It is an opportunity for venues to promote themselves, as well as new performers and established performers, to let people know when they are playing and where and to be a source of wisdom. We note that literally *The Note* magazine currently does run a gig guide. I know there is a lot of interest in the live music community of how this gig guide could work, but given we are a UNESCO City of Music we think a Premier's gig guide would actually be a really appropriate role for the Premier to take.

We also recognise that the lack of late-night public transport limits people's abilities to get out to a gig. They can probably get there, but they cannot easily get home. We want to see that addressed as well. Victoria runs a fantastic program called FReeZA and has done for decades. It is now called Amplify. That is youth-led committees right across that state who get active and involved and do everything from on the stage through to the tech, through to the front of house, point of sale, and run these gigs, promote these gigs and get their community together and rally around. Something like FReeZA in South Australia, or Amplify as it now is, could go a long way to ensuring we have audience development, ensuring we have excellent youth opportunity and ensuring live music continues to live beyond the current generations.

There are other measures here that I think are incredibly important. Controversially, we have recommended that the late-night trading code of practice be replaced with a new safety strategy. I note the dissenting remarks in the report from the Hon. Reggie Martin on that; however, I think we would all agree that an independent review of the late-night trading code of practice be undertaken with a particular view for the harmful impact it has had on live music in this state, particularly unnecessary imposts and costs on the operations to comply with that code of practice that do not necessarily make anyone safer. They simply make it more expensive for those venues to operate when they are often quite small venues and are unable to—particularly with the costs of things like insurance—sustain these costs.

Today is AusMusic T-Shirt Day and I literally recognised that when I saw a few T-shirts online this morning. I had this Paul Kelly T-shirt in my cupboard from last year's AusMusic T-Shirt Day. I love this day. It is a day to celebrate live music in all its forms, but it is also a fundraiser for Support Act, which is a wonderful charity which supports musicians and those who have worked in the music industry when they fall on hard times and when they have mental health challenges. I think there could be no better day on which to table this report and I commend it to the council.

Report received and ordered to be published.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT OF THE COVID-19 RESPONSE

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (12:14): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until the next Wednesday of sitting.

Motion carried.

Motions

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.T. Ngo:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges and celebrates the 175th anniversary of the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) in South Australia, one of the oldest community organisations in the state;
2. Recognises the YMCA's enduring commitment to empowering young people, promoting healthy living, and building stronger, more connected communities across metropolitan and regional South Australia;
3. Commends the YMCA for its extensive contributions over nearly two centuries, including youth development programs, community recreation facilities, health and fitness services, and support for vulnerable populations;
4. Acknowledges the work of staff, volunteers, board members, and supporters past and present who have contributed to the YMCA's mission and impact; and
5. Congratulates the YMCA on this historic milestone and extends best wishes for continued service to the people of South Australia for generations to come.

(Continued from 12 November 2025.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (12:15): I rise to support the motion of the Hon. Tung Ngo, and thank him for bringing it to the chamber. I am not being glib when I say that for the YMCA to be operating in South Australia for 175 years is a very long and significant period of time, because when

we consider how old South Australia is as a colony, the YMCA came hot on the heels of Adelaide's colonisation and settlement by the British people.

There was recently an event at Government House which I was privileged to attend. I think that really brought home, through the speeches of the Governor, the Hon. Frances Adamson, and through the YMCA itself, how significant it was that Adelaide became the first YMCA to be formed outside of Europe. It is interesting to look at the history and the heritage of these organisations because we often do not appreciate where they have come from.

The YMCA was initially established in London in 1844 and its purpose was to assist a lot of the young men who had been drawn to London through the Industrial Revolution. Obviously, times were very different for young men in those days. I think it has euphemistically been said that it provided a safe space for young men. It would have been challenging for them if they were from rural areas and went to London, which I do not think was probably the greatest place in the world at that stage. It was there to prevent some of the other temptations that may have abounded in a large city where young men found themselves at that time.

In 1850, which was just six years after its establishment, Adelaide became the first place outside of Europe to have a YMCA. It has probably modified its function of learning, recreation and moral support into a range of other services. Presumably, in those days they would have had lots of different meetings and sporting activities and a whole range of things, but the YMCA provided a huge amount of support to soldiers during both world wars, as well as in communities back home, and it is well known these days particularly for a lot of its children's programs.

I certainly was not aware of the work the Y does in out-of-school hours programs, which is significant. They bid for some of the school programs whether they are located in the government sector or in independent schools. People would be familiar with the sporting activities that they have in terms of swimming pools, but they also do gymnastics. These days they provide allied health, youth empowerment, early learning and care.

They have a significant number of employees in South Australia, including in regional areas. There are some 68 locations in South Australia where they operate as a charity across different services. Indeed, it was good to recognise them through that particular event. I think it is important to very much thank their volunteers and their board members, who I think have demonstrated incredible leadership in ensuring that the Y continues its mission in a sustainable way and is very much about providing services that fund other operations, cross-subsidising the charities, if you like. They look like they are in an extremely good position in 2025, and long may they continue.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (12:20): I would like to thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for her contribution to this motion and for that little bit of history.

Motion carried.

HAHNDORF BYPASS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms:

That the Environment, Resources and Development Committee inquire into and report on the diversion of heavy vehicles along River Road and Strathalbyn Road, with particular reference to:

1. The consultation and decision-making processes that led to the decision to divert traffic along River Road and Strathalbyn Road;
2. The impacts of the diversion on local amenity, community safety and the environment;
3. The impacts of the diversion on traffic in Hahndorf, Mount Barker and other Adelaide Hills communities;
4. Alternative solutions for freight transport through the Adelaide Hills;
5. Any other relevant matters.

(Continued from 12 November 2025.)

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (12:20): The decision taken by the Labor government to restrict trucks over 15 metres in length from the Hahndorf main street was announced in August 2023. Residents and businesses have consistently said over many years that they wanted fewer heavy

vehicles on the Hahndorf main street. It is important to them for amenity, for safety and to protect the town's unique heritage, and it took a Labor government to step in and get it done.

Significant investment is already being delivered to support infrastructure and freight transport throughout the Adelaide Hills, including upgrades to the Adelaide Road roundabout, the Mount Barker interchange and the Verdun interchange; other South Eastern Freeway upgrades; and a broader Adelaide Hills productivity and road safety package.

In 2024, the federal and South Australian governments jointly committed \$150 million towards Mount Barker and Verdun interchange upgrades in the 2024-25 respective budgets. Modelling previously undertaken for the Verdun and Mount Barker interchange solutions suggests that these interchange upgrades would remove a further 990 cars and trucks each day from the main street.

The state government is spending about \$40 million to upgrade the Mount Barker roundabout at the intersection of Adelaide Road, Alexandrina Road, Wellington Road and Flaxley Road. The upgrade includes dual-lane approaches on all roads and a new dedicated right-turn access into Mount Barker High.

We have also committed \$19 million on upgrades to public transport in the Adelaide Hills, providing 590 more trips each week in total, a 42 per cent increase in trips between the city and the Hills. This commitment also includes a new Go Zone from Mount Barker, express buses running via the freeway at least every 15 minutes from 7am to 7pm on weekdays, buses every six minutes in peak periods and half hourly at night and on weekends, and 15 new hybrid diesel buses.

The government has continued to listen to residents in this area. Minister Bourke met with councillor Anne Fordham on River Road on Monday 17 November, and a further meeting with a wider representation is locked in for early December. I would like to thank the member for bringing this motion to the chamber. However, in regard to the amendment that has been proposed, I do need to inform the chamber that the government will not support the amendment.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (12:23): I rise today to speak in support of this motion moved by the Hon. Robert Simms. The Liberal opposition have been long-time supporters of the need for well-thought-out and well-planned traffic management solutions throughout the Adelaide Hills. A full bypass project was planned for Hahndorf under the former Liberal Marshall government, which committed funds to the project and secured funds also from the federal government. This plan was later scrapped under the Malinauskas government.

What is worse is that the former Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, then determined by regulation that from 30 October 2023 non-local semitrailers and pig and dog trailers over 15 metres in length would be banned from the Hahndorf main street and redirected down River and Strathalbyn roads. Residents of River and Strathalbyn roads have borne the brunt of the diversion, with large trucks using the rural but residential road as what locals would determine a rat race.

The petition that has prompted this motion before us today was organised by local River Road residents, with the assistance of the member for Heyzen, Josh Teague MP, and has now received over 10,000 signatures calling for action to resolve the dangers created by diversions of heavy trucks onto River Road and Strathalbyn Road.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport says that the \$250 million upgrades to the Mount Barker and Verdun interchanges, funded 80:20 by the Australian and state governments, will complement the current truck diversions in helping to ease traffic congestion through Hahndorf and other towns, although this seems not to be the case. The Adelaide Hills need further road investment. The residents who live on River and Strathalbyn roads deserve to feel and be safe, hence why they have been able to collect a significant number of signatures: 10,000.

An elected Liberal government will commit to delivering two significant transport infrastructure investments for the Adelaide Hills, easing congestion, improving safety and providing a much-needed public transport boost. These projects include a fully funded park-and-ride and transport hub at Verdun as well as delivering a stage of the South Eastern Freeway upgrades, adding a third lane on the city-bound track between Hahndorf and Bridgewater, some 2.4 kilometres, which

at a kilometre per lane cost would be about \$15 million—not that I am going to ask questions of the Hon. Emily Bourke right now, but I would be interested to see what her advice is on the per lane kilometre for adding additional lanes to freeways.

I also move an amendment to this motion, which I understand the Hon. Rob Simms does support. I move:

Insert 'be tabled' and 'by 30 June 2026' as indicated below:

That the Environment, Resources and Development Committee inquire into and report be tabled by 30 June 2026, on the diversion of heavy vehicles along River Road and Strathalbyn Road, with particular reference to:

Then the motion will continue. With that, we commend the motion.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (12:26): I thank members for their support of this motion. As I indicated previously, this is a significant issue for the community in the Adelaide Hills and in particular the community in Heysen. I want to acknowledge the work of community campaigner Anne Fordham in particular, who has been working very hard. She gathered 10,000 signatures in relation to this.

I also want to acknowledge the work of the Greens candidate for Heysen, Genevieve Dawson-Scott, who has really been championing this issue. She raised it with me on multiple occasions and pushed to make this a focus for the parliament. Should the upper house back this referral to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, I think that will really be testament to the advocacy skills of Genevieve, because she has been pushing this hard. I thank her for that.

This is an opportunity to really examine what has gone on here and to look at what alternatives there are, because it is clear that this approach is causing some really terrible outcomes for people who live along that road and also some terrible outcomes for our environment as well and impact on the local habitat. I thank members for their support for this referral.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (ADDITIONAL HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 November 2025.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12:28): I want to begin by acknowledging Andrea and Peter, who have shown extraordinary dignity in the face of an unbearable loss. No parent, no family, should ever endure what they have endured. Michelle Foster's death was a tragedy, and the Coroner's findings laid bare serious failures across multiple systems. It is because the subject matter is so serious that we must be precise about the laws we make.

The bill before us proposes a significant expansion to the definition of a high-risk offender under the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act. It would allow extended supervision orders to be sought for any prisoner whom a court considers to be at significant risk of committing a serious, violent or sexual offence upon release. The intent is absolutely understandable. The question is whether this mechanism is the right legislative tool. Our view is that it is not. The threshold proposed here is broad and risks shifting the high risk offenders act away from its targeted response.

The act was designed for a narrow class of offenders whose past convictions and profile clearly justify exceptional post-sentence restrictions. This bill would substantially lower that threshold. The Coroner's inquest highlighted longstanding systemic issues of failures in discharge planning and communications between agencies across the treatment and follow-up care. Those issues sit squarely with the Mental Health Act and the framework for mental health orders both in custodial and community settings.

I know the government has already indicated that it is reviewing that act. The high risk offenders act is the appropriate vehicle for managing complex mental illness. The act is not designed to substitute for proper clinical pathways, nor can it repair the failures identified in this case. Using a

high-risk offender regime to respond to shortcomings in mental health law risks expanding coercive powers far beyond what parliament originally intended.

In summary, the high-risk offender scheme, we believe, is not the appropriate place to deal with mental health issues: the Mental Health Act is. For that reason, the opposition will not be supporting this bill.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (12:31): In place of the Hon. Mr Hanson, I want to give an indication to the chamber that for a number of the reasons the Hon. Nicola Centofanti just outlined the government will not be supporting this bill either.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:31): I appreciate the day and the time in bringing this to a vote. I did want to bring this issue to a vote today. I wish that we had had that contribution. I have obviously had discussions with the Deputy Premier about this issue and the sorts of commitments and at least undertakings that I was expecting to be placed on the record by the government in relation to this bill and what will happen with this issue going into the future. So, yes, I am disappointed that we have not got that on the record. The Deputy Premier can step in at any point—

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: They could support clause 1. We do not introduce these bills lightly into this place. It is a serious issue. I apologise to the Hon. Mr Hunter, but I am sure you can appreciate my frustration at having this issue here.

Can I just say for the record—and I appreciate what the honourable Leader of the Opposition has just said—this is not my idea: this is the Coroner's recommendation. I did not wake up and think it is a good idea to introduce this bill and expand the scope of high-risk offenders: the Coroner did. The Coroner conducted an inquest into Ms Foster's death and killing, which took into account similar other incidents.

It is off the back of that inquest that the Coroner made the recommendation that, where somebody has a mental illness that makes them prone to this sort of violent behaviour—and it is not one isolated case; there are others—the 'high-risk offender' category ought to be expanded so that it captures people who pose an unacceptable risk to the safety of the public, rather than just the categories that we capture now.

I take the government at their word that Minister Picton is looking at it. I have seen the response that was tabled in this place and understand that there is a difference of opinion with the Coroner in relation to this particular issue being dealt with under the high risk offenders act. But if it is the government's position, based on discussions I have had, that the government will consider this into the new year and that Minister Picton and the Deputy Premier and Attorney-General will continue to consider this issue and it will form part of a review into mental health that we know is being undertaken at the moment, then that is something that I would like placed on the record. It is important. It is important not just to me; it is important to the foster family. It is important to Michelle's mum and to her brother, and it is recognising not what I have said but what the Coroner has said.

We do not dream these ideas up. A Coroner does a lot of work, and I always say that that jurisdiction is the single most important jurisdiction in this state because they are the ones who forensically look at these issues and make determinations on the efficacy of our laws. In this instance, we have a Deputy Coroner who has said that the law does not stack up in this case, and there are other cases that fall into the exact same category. So if indeed that is the government's position, then I would like that placed on the record. I would like to know what the government's commitments are to addressing this issue going forward.

I am bitterly disappointed that that is not going to be placed on the record. I am happy, if we are going to clause 1, for that to occur and for this to be placed on the record, because I do not think the response we have had to date—and I mean no disrespect to the Hon. Ian Hunter—is enough. We can adjourn and go to clause 1 or have a position put on the record about how this will be handled in the new year. If the government's response is simply that they do not support this then that is fine, but that is not the response and that is not the discussions I have had with government. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge in the gallery Ms Tammy Nguyen, who is the CEO of the Vietnamese Museum Australia in Melbourne. The museum will be unveiled in late 2026. Welcome.

Motions

VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That this council—

1. Notes the Victims of Crime Fund had a balance of \$251.2 million reported as at 30 June 2025, representing an increase of \$27.3 million on the previous financial year;
2. Recognises the current compensation scheme applies a reduction of 25 per cent for financial loss payments, including medical expenses, exceeding \$2,000; and
3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to commission an independent actuarial review of the Victims of Crime Fund to assess the impact of abolishing the 25 per cent reduction in compensation on the position of the fund.

(Continued from 12 November 2025.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12:38): We on this side of the chamber know what we are doing.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: That is a first.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The Victims of Crime Fund continues to hold a very substantial balance, reported at more than \$251 million as of 30 June 2025. I will ignore that interjection, the Hon. Robert Simms.

The PRESIDENT: Interjections are out of order, the Hon. Mr Simms. Calm down.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Thank you, Mr President, for your protection. At the same time, the current compensation scheme still applies a 25 per cent reduction to financial loss payments above \$2,000, including medical expenses. That reduction sits within a broader statutory framework that already limits the compensation many victims can receive. These settings have been the subject of concern for some time. They were highlighted during a debate on the Victims of Crime (Compensation) Amendment Bill 2023, where the Law Society pointed to clear shortcomings in the existing model, particularly around financial loss and legal costs.

An independent actuarial review is a sensible way forward. It would allow government and the parliament to understand, in a clear and informed way, what impact the removal of the 25 per cent reduction would have on the fund's long-term position. With that information, any future decisions can be made responsibly and with confidence. This motion does not predetermine an outcome, it simply seeks transparency and evidence to guide possible reform. That is in the interest of victims and in the interest of maintaining a sustainable compensation scheme. For these reasons, I indicate that we wholeheartedly support the motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (12:39): I rise briefly to indicate that I will be supporting this motion, given the opposition has put on the record its support, for your ability to count the numbers.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (12:40): I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter before us. The honourable member has been very passionate in her advocacy in relation to victims generally and making sure that victim welfare is well looked after.

This issue has been raised this week in discussion in parliament in question time. This issue has been ventilated during the Auditor-General's question time and although we have significant sympathy with what the honourable member is putting forward, as I have said a number of times in relation to the call from the National Redress Scheme, we want to make sure that we are in a position, when that National Redress Scheme comes to the close (which it has been indicated will be in the

middle of 2027), that there are sufficient funds within the Victims of Crime account to make sure our South Australian contribution to that National Redress Scheme can be met.

We have already committed, since the National Redress Scheme was established, hundreds of millions of dollars, including many tens of millions of dollars recently. Although we do not disagree with the sentiments the honourable member is putting forward, we need to ensure there are sufficient funds with the anticipated call—and I would be shocked if there were not very significant further calls—of many tens of millions of dollars from the Victims of Crime Fund for the National Redress Scheme.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:41): I thank the speakers on this motion: the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Ms Franks and the Deputy Premier. Just to the point, there are two issues before this parliament that deal with victims of crime: one is asking for a bill to be passed to allow the discount that currently applies in the bill to be removed from the bill and, noting all the concerns that have been raised by this government, there is this motion. This motion seeks to do exactly what the Deputy Premier just said. The Deputy Premier wants to ensure that we have enough funds in there to deal with the Redress Scheme. We want to know that there are enough funds in there to deal with the Redress Scheme, too.

This is not about removing the discount; this is about providing an actuarial review of that fund so that we all know what the viability of that fund looks like. I can understand that I have a difference of opinion with the Deputy Premier when it comes to the bill, but I cannot understand how it is not in this parliament's interest, or in the public's interest, to undertake a review of that fund, which currently has \$251.2 million in it, and take into account the calls that have been made, not just by me but by the Law Society, which has done an extraordinary job at leading the charge on this campaign for the last two years and which takes on board the issues that have been raised by the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Leader of the Opposition and looks at whether the fund is healthy enough or viable enough to ensure that it can make these changes and meet the needs of the Redress Scheme—that is all this is intended to do.

There is nothing else; there is nothing magical in here. We are just saying, 'Let's have an actuarial review of that fund so we all know—this parliament knows, the public knows, the Law Society knows, stakeholders know—what the scope and viability of that scheme will look like, with or without the expenditure of the Redress Scheme or otherwise, and what dent removing those provisions would look like in this bill. I cannot wrap my head around this position. I understand and take on board what has been said about the bill, but on this issue, where we are just asking for an actuarial review, a review of the fund so we all know where it sits, it is quite staggering. For the record, I will be dividing on this motion.

Motion carried.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (ADDITIONAL HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:45): I appreciate the work of everybody to get to this point, and look forward to having the Deputy Premier provide those comments on the record.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (12:45): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to make a comment on the record.

Motion carried.

*Bills***CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (ADDITIONAL HIGH RISK OFFENDERS)
AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (12:46): I am just going to put a very brief comment on the record. I know the government's view has been put on the record already, but I can confirm that it is the government's view that the High Risk Offenders Scheme, which is a criminal justice response, is not the appropriate mechanism in relation to oversight of patients who were the subject of the coronial report into the death of Mrs Foster. What I am informed of is that how the Mental Health Act works and oversights people is being reviewed rather than the criminal justice system.

Second reading negated.

*Motions***SHELLFISH REEF RESTORATION**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the urgent and ongoing threats to South Australia's marine environment and economy;
2. Recognises the critical role of large-scale shellfish reef restoration in improving water quality and system resilience;
3. Commits the state government to the development of a five-year 'South Australian shellfish reef acceleration plan', focused on expanding reef restoration to priority geographies—particularly the Gulf St Vincent region, Spencer Gulf and metropolitan coastal waters—and linked with localised monitoring, nutrient-reduction strategies and stakeholder partnerships;
4. Tasks the relevant minister to report back to the council within six months on the progress of reef restoration efforts, including area restored, intended to be restored, partners engaged, budget profile and measurable ecosystem outcomes; and
5. Actively encourages collaborative investment from the commonwealth, philanthropic and private sectors to scale reef restoration in South Australia, leveraging the national Reef Builder model and local partnerships.

(Continued from 29 October 2025.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12:47): I rise to speak in support of the motion from the Hon. Tammy Franks. It is a timely and constructive contribution to the parliament's work on restoring the health of South Australia's marine ecosystems, a work that is essential not only for our environment but for the long term prosperity of coastal communities and the sustainability of our state's fisheries.

This motion is consistent with the opposition's long-term environmental and economic priorities. It reflects the principles contained in our evidence-based Save Our Seas policy platform, with marine restoration recovery that is grounded in science, supported with transparent reporting, and delivered through partnerships that combine public and private investment. South Australian waters are among our state's greatest natural assets, and we believe that future generations deserve a marine environment healthier than the one we inherited.

When shellfish reefs are re-established in biologically suitable locations the ecological benefits are extraordinary. These restored reefs filter and clean vast volumes of water, remove excess nitrogen, build richer and more complex food webs, and support recovery of fish stocks that our recreational and commercial fishers depend on. They are nature's own water treatment systems and fisheries recovery mechanism rolled into one.

However, as this motion notes, success requires ecological care. We must avoid monocultures and instead ensure, quite simply, that the right shellfish are placed in the right

locations. This means species-appropriate and site-appropriate restorations that rebuild functioning biodiverse ecosystems, not just structures on the seabed. This approach reflects the national Reef Builder principles and is fully aligned with the scientific recommendations of the federal Algal Blooms in South Australia report.

Importantly, the intent of this motion aligns closely with existing Liberal commitments. A future Liberal government has already outlined a \$30 million Save Our Seas initiative to accelerate reef restoration and deliver a further 50 hectares of limestone shellfish reefs across the state. Our long-term vision is ambitious but achievable: to restore South Australia's shellfish reef systems to something approaching their pre-20th century extent. To scale this work we have called for an 80:20 co-investment partnership with the commonwealth government to enable an additional 200 hectares of reef restoration.

With the state and federal governments' withdrawal from hosting COP, we reiterate our call for the redirection of that funding towards an immediate and substantial commonwealth investment in the order of \$500 million to accelerate reef restoration nationally and particularly in South Australia. This would deliver enduring environmental outcomes, genuine economic stimulus and a legacy of national significance.

I also want to acknowledge the many citizen scientists, coastal groups, local volunteers and community organisations who have been central to marine monitoring and habitat recovery for decades. Their contribution is a cornerstone of this state's environmental stewardship. Strengthening their role through localised monitoring, transparent reporting and nutrient reduction strategies is not only appropriate; it is essential. The opposition has been consistent in its belief that rebuilding marine health requires ongoing, independently verified science and long-term investment, not piecemeal or politically reactive measures.

Finally, the motion's requirement for the minister to report on progress, area restored, partnerships established, measurable ecosystem outcomes and budget trajectory is both sensible and strongly supported. Accountability is essential for the parliament, good for communities and good for the environment. Clear, regular performance reporting is entirely consistent with the opposition's longstanding calls for improved transparency in marine management and the operation of government in general.

For all those reasons—the environmental necessity, the economic opportunity, the community support, the scientific foundation and the demand for accountability—the opposition is pleased to support this motion. By doing so we help ensure that South Australia leads the nation in the restoration of shellfish reefs and the recovery of our precious marine ecosystem. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (12:51): I rise to support the motion, and I thank the honourable member for putting it forward. This is certainly timely, particularly when one considers the toxic algal bloom that has devastated our marine ecosystems, causing over 90,000 recorded marine deaths across more than 700 species since February 2025. There can be no question that we are facing the biggest ecological catastrophe in our state's modern history. The government needs to do more to restore biodiversity and the ecosystems that have been devastated by the toxic algal bloom.

The impacts have rippled through the fishing, aquaculture and tourism industries and have impacted on our coastal communities, and the effects have been absolutely devastating. The government must commit to a longer term plan to restore shellfish reefs across our coastal waters. In terms of its establishment, an artificial shellfish reef can take three to five years to reach maturity. Oysters can filter up to 100 litres of water each per day, helping keep our oceans' waters cleaner. This is a practical and tangible project that could improve the health of our oceans.

I therefore call on the government to urgently expand the artificial reef restoration projects to increase the resilience of our oceans and coastal waters. This is needed now more than ever, as the effects of climate change will increase the severity and frequency of these events. I commend the motion.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (12:53): I rise today to speak on behalf of the government in support of this motion and thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for providing this opportunity. The honourable

member is right when she says that the ongoing threat to our marine environment is an issue that goes to the heart of one of the most pressing environmental challenges facing South Australia.

As this motion states, these challenges are urgent. The threats they pose to our marine ecosystems must be resolved. South Australia's oceans are among our most valuable natural assets. They sustain our fisheries, aquaculture, tourism and recreation industries in metropolitan communities as well as our regional and remote coastal towns. They also underpin the health of the Gulf St Vincent, Spencer Gulf, the Coorong and our entire marine environment.

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) along with the Department for Environment and Water have already delivered low-profile reef modules at Glenelg. Kangaroo Island and O'Sullivan Beach are part of this Reef Builder project. We know that these waters have faced many accelerating pressures. These threats are visible in the diminished resilience of our gulfs and other key coastal zones. It is within this context that shellfish reef restoration becomes essential.

The Malinauskas government knows that coordinated, targeted and ambitious action is essential. Central to the honourable member's motion is a clear commitment to the development of a five-year shellfish reef acceleration plan for South Australia, a plan that this government supports and is committed to.

The state and federal governments have invested \$2.6 million in total for community-based shellfish restoration. This includes an initial \$800,000, followed by a further \$1.8 million of funding from the state and federal government's Algal Bloom Summer Plan, which includes the building of 25 community shellfish reefs. Such coordinated planning ensures we scale up restoration to the level required to make a long-term difference.

This government wants to ensure progress is measurable, transparent and accountable. We have committed to real action and are working toward solutions. By accelerating shellfish reef restoration, we are investing in cleaner water, more resilient gulfs, stronger fisheries, improved biodiversity, and a healthier future for generations of South Australians. The government supports this motion because it charts a clear and responsible path forward.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (12:55): I rise to thank those speakers who have made a contribution to this motion: the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Reggie Martin. Indeed, shellfish reefs—hard to say, good to do. I am glad it is not just me who decided not only that The Nature Conservancy (TNC) needs to be congratulated, but perhaps it is better to use the acronym.

The concept of shellfish reefs is hardly a new concept. In fact, Aboriginal people had successfully looked after and lived from native shellfish reefs for 80,000 years before white colonisation. Within decades, however, the reefs were declining after colonisation, and by the 1890s, here in South Australia, they were collapsing. Globally, there remain now less than 1 per cent of the oyster reefs that this globe once had. That is extraordinary: just less than 1 per cent.

The Murray Basin was once a shallow inland sea or estuary, which reached well over 100 kilometres inland, and here, too, oysters and other shellfish thrived. Indeed, fossilised reefs survive in the Murray Basin to this day. Some of them are 75 to 100 metres long and six to eight metres thick. By destroying our native oyster reefs through a combination of overharvesting, damaging them through mechanical dredging, and removing shells to be burned for lime in the production of mortar and cement—and it has been pontificated that perhaps some of that mortar and cement might hold this building together—we have destroyed the incredibly complex ecosystems that depended upon them as the foundation species.

No doubt some of the oyster shells removed from along our own coastline have indeed ended up in this building, and while they hold Parliament House together, oysters cannot spawn on the seafloor without them. Indeed, it might not sound like much, but the damage from the removal of those shells plays a key part in the collapse of our naturally occurring reef. Oysters, in particular, need to colonise, and need the shells of their ancestors. They cannot simply settle on the floor, but build it and they will come. We have seen it at Glenelg and on the Windara Reef where local restoration projects are doing really well.

Globally, reef restoration projects have been successful right across the world: here in Australia of course, New Zealand, Chesapeake Bay in the US, and the North Sea. Indeed, we have also seen really successful projects off the German and Dutch coasts. This is having an impact. They

are cleaning the water, they are increasing biodiversity, they are capturing carbon and protecting our coastlines from the impact of climate change.

The combination of critically important services that they provide includes baffling. I have a note here 'or absorbing' if the use of the term 'baffled' has you feeling slightly baffled. They are baffling wave energy, protecting shorelines from sea level rise and erosion, cleaning the water, removing nutrients that can contribute to toxic algal blooms, and reducing the impacts of sea level rise and increasingly frequent storms.

They provide both habitat and food, they increase fish production, they grow vertically and densely, and cram a huge amount into a small footprint. Stable coastlines, of course, are better able to support coastal wetlands and mangroves which are 50 times more effective than sequestering CO₂ than forests are. Of course, this is of increasing importance as our land-based carbon stores are vulnerable to being wiped out, and are releasing more carbon into the atmosphere via bushfires. Without taking into account carbon sequestration services, a 2012 study valued the ecosystem services provided by oyster reefs—if money is your thing—at \$US99,000 per hectare per year. Finally, a recent Insurance Council of Australia report found that resilience spending returns \$9.60 for every dollar spent.

If we are serious about supporting our coastal communities, tackling climate change and valuing the waters that, in addition, contribute so much to our mental and physical health, we must continue to be the strongest possible advocates we can be for critically important work such as this. I welcome the approach that has been taken here today. There has truly been cross-party support, and that is the support we need if we are to have a future. With that, I commend the motion.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:16.

Condolence

APPLEBY, MRS J.E.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:16):
By leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of Mrs June Appleby, former member of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of her public service and that, as a mark of respect to her memory, the sitting of the council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I rise today on behalf of the government to commemorate the life of Mrs June Appleby, former member of the House of Assembly. Born on 2 June 1941, June Appleby dedicated her life to service, compassion and the pursuit of fairness for all members of the community. June's political career began with her election to the House of Assembly in 1982 as the member for Brighton, proudly representing the Australian Labor Party.

From her earliest days in parliament, she stood out for her deep empathy. In her first speech to parliament, June spoke with passion about the urgent need to address mature age unemployment, a cause she championed with genuine care and vigour to ensure the voices of older members of the South Australian workforce were heard.

June's achievements in politics were driven by a strong sense of justice and a heartfelt belief that members of government should serve as both an ear and a voice to the community. She worked tirelessly for her constituents and remained firmly grounded in community values throughout her career. She championed accessibility, striving to be available to every person, regardless of age, gender, background, position, environment, religion or political belief.

In December 1985, June made history when she was appointed Government Whip in the House of Assembly for the Bannon government, the first woman in South Australia to hold this significant role. She served with distinction until late 1989, earning respect for her integrity, discipline and leadership.

Those who knew June personally remember her steadfast dedication to the people and principles she cared about. She opened the doors for women in public life and made a lasting impact on the community she served. On behalf of the government, I extend my sympathies and best wishes to June's family. With the passing of someone who made their mark on this state, I commend the motion to members.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I rise on behalf of the opposition to support the motion of condolence for the late June Elizabeth Appleby and to acknowledge her service to our state. June Appleby entered this parliament at the 1982 state election as the member for Brighton, and following a redistribution continued her service as the member for Hayward from 1985 until 1989. Her time here spanned a significant period in South Australia's political history, and she embraced the responsibilities of public life with commitment and with purpose.

In 1985, June became the first woman to be appointed Government Whip in the House of Assembly, a milestone achievement and a meaningful moment for women in South Australian politics. I understand that colleagues of June's era described her as a formidable and highly capable whip, respected for her discipline, her fairness and her understanding of parliamentary process.

June's contribution extended beyond procedure and party responsibilities. She worked on matters that touched the daily lives of South Australians, highlighted by her strong advocacy for disability rights and access. She was known as someone who engaged earnestly with her work and who represented her communities in Brighton and Hayward with sincerity. While her parliamentary career concluded in 1989, June remained connected to her community and continued to be respected within her party for many years thereafter.

Her passing offers us an opportunity to acknowledge not only a former member of this parliament but a woman who helped shape the path for others who would follow her into public life. On behalf of the opposition, I extend our deepest sympathies to her husband, Maurice, to her family and loved ones and to all who knew her well. We thank June for her service, and we honour her contribution to this parliament and to South Australia.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:20): I would also like to acknowledge the passing of Mrs June Elizabeth Appleby, former member for Brighton and then Hayward following a redistribution. June was born on 2 June 1941 to her parents, Colleen and Albert Bennetts. Colleen Bennetts was a lifelong party member and was actually very instrumental in helping Jay Weatherill in his campaign in his first election.

She instilled in June the values of solidarity in the working class movement, which June took on herself when she went on to enter parliament. She won first in 1982 and again in 1985 when there were only, I think, about six women elected to parliament. She was the epitome of Labor values: fairness, equality and social justice. She was a very strict disciplinarian, as I came to find out, but that is an ideal quality for a Labor government whip in the lower house, and one that I have tried to emulate in my position here.

One of her interesting trademark traits was this long, cylindrical, black cigarette that she used to have in her mouth at all times, even during sub-branch meetings, which caused not a few asthma bouts in some of our elderly members of the branch. She had to be told very strictly that she needed to go outside if she wanted to smoke those things in the future. She did not take it well, but as always, she went with the majority vote.

Throughout her career, June was a very strong advocate for many causes, but mostly she had a natural feeling for the vulnerable in society. She stood up for them at every opportunity and took on the federal government, calling on them to take action to support unemployed people and those over 35 years of age who needed training to get back into the workforce.

My condolences go to her husband, Maurie. June and Maurie were an inseparable unit in the Labor Party. They were always hand in hand together at sub-branch meetings. Maurie would be the treasurer and June would be the president or the vice-president of the branch, always having meetings at their place or turning up at every branch meeting. I think Maurie must have been treasurer of about 15 different branches over his 30 years of membership, and he pulled double duties by running the household and the family while June was doing her duty as member for Brighton and then Hayward. I know Maurie will miss her very, very deeply. Vale June Appleby.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:23 to 14:32.

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOMS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:32): I bring up the interim report of the committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:33): I bring up the interim report of the committee, entitled Kangaroo and Wallaby Populations in South Australia.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Reports, 2024-25—

Audit Office of South Australia
Australian Energy Market Commission
Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator
Cross Border Commissioner
Defence SA
Department for Energy and Mining
Department of the Premier and Cabinet
Department of Treasury and Finance
Distribution Lessor Corporation
Essential Services Commission
Generation Lessor Corporation
HomeStart Finance
Infrastructure SA
Lifetime Support Authority
Local Government Finance Authority
Lotteries Commission of South Australia
Motor Accident Commission
Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia
Office of Northern Water Delivery
Office of the Industry Advocate
Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission
Powerline Environment Committee
Premier's Delivery Unit
South Australian Government Financing Authority
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme
South Australian Motor Sport Board
South Australian Superannuation Board
South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board
Southern Select Super Corporation
State Owned Generators Leasing Co Pty Ltd
Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia
Technical Regulator South Australia
Transmission Lessor Corporation

Australia's National Science Agency review of progress to achieving targets under Section 7 of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction

Act 2007 prepared for the SA Department for Environment and Water
dated October 2025
Department of Treasury and Finance Report on the review of the operation of the Public
Finance and Audit Act 1987 dated October 2025
Letter to the Deputy Premier—SA Government Response to the Unmet Needs Report

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

Reports, 2024-25—
Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal
Legal Practitioners Education and Admission Council
Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner
Legal Services Commission
Professional Standards Councils Combined
Public Advocate
South Australian Employment Tribunal
The Law Society of South Australia
Training Centre Review Board
Inquest into the Death-in-Custody of Michelle Stephanie Foster, pursuant to the Coroners
Act 2003

By the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Reports, 2024-25—
Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment
State of the Sector

By the Special Minister of State (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Electoral Commission South Australia Election report 2024 Dunstan and Black By-elections

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

Reports, 2024-25—
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust
Adelaide Festival Corporation
Adelaide Film Festival
Art Gallery of South Australia
Carrick Hill Trust
Club One (SA) Ltd
JamFactory Contemporary Craft and Design Incorporated
Libraries Board of South Australia
Small Business Commissioner SA
South Australian Film Corporation
South Australian Museum
State Opera of South Australia
State Theatre Company of South Australia
TANDANYA
Minister Michaels' Travel Report from 4 September to 5 September 2025 prepared
pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Minister Michaels' Travel Report from 26 September 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public
Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for the Minister for Trade and Investment from 5 October to 6 October 2025
prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Travel Report for the Minister for Trade and Investment from 20 September to
29 September 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009

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

Reports, 2024-25

Aaron Cooke—Official Visitor
Adelaide Cemeteries Authority
Department for Correctional Services
Department for Housing and Urban Development
Education Standards Board (Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Board)
Joanne Battersby—Official Visitor
La Nina Clayton—Official Visitor
Lauren Messmer—Official Visitor
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing.
South Australia Police
South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission
South Australian Water Corporation
Surveyors Board of South Australia
Teachers Registration Board of South Australia
Timothy Fitzgerald—Official Visitor
Urban Renewal Authority
Coroners Court of South Australia—Inquest into the Death of Edward John Raines—
Inquest Findings of her Honour Coroner Giles dated 20 May 2025
Coroners Court of South Australia—Inquest into the Death of Robert Lloyd Hall—Inquest
Findings of his Honour State Coroner Whittle dated
17 October 2025
Travel Report for the Minister for Education, Training and Skills from 16 October to
17 October 2025 prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009
Report of actions taken by the Department for Correctional Services following the coronial
inquest into the death of Michael Lionel Richard Weetra
Department for Correctional Services' response to the Deputy State Coroner's findings into
the death of Michelle Stephanie Foster

Motions

ALGAL BLOOM

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):
By way of brief explanation, I am tabling more than 1,000 pages of documents requested by this council. The documents that I table today are the result of significant efforts within the Department for Environment and Water and the Department for Health and Wellbeing, supported by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. None of these agencies with whom these documents are held report to me. I have tabled the documents in the form that they were provided earlier today.

I am advised that, since the passage of the resolution on 16 October, there have been significant efforts underway at relevant agencies to identify, collate and review documents within the scope of the resolution. I am advised that the documents have been reviewed and that many of them have been identified as containing information that would breach cabinet-in-confidence requirements, are subject to parliamentary privilege or contains matters which may breach commercial confidentiality, personal privacy or other requirements. Where documents in full contain information that falls within these categories they have not been provided. However, where possible, documents have been provided in part, with those relevant sections redacted.

As I said in the debate on 16 October, the motion captures a significant range of documents. I am advised that searches and review remain underway. If further documents are identified that are capable of being tabled, I have requested that they be provided to the parliament's Joint Committee on Harmful Algal Blooms in South Australia, which I am advised intends to continue to meet following the conclusion of the sitting year. Lastly, I would like to thank the many public servants who have contributed to this body of work.

*Parliamentary Committees***JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:41): I seek leave to move a motion without notice concerning the appointment of a member to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee.

Leave granted.

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

That, pursuant to section 5 of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985, the Hon. L.A. Henderson be appointed as a member of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned) and that the Hon. D.G.E. Hood be appointed as the alternate member for the Hon. L.A. Henderson and that a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the aforementioned resolution.

Motion carried.

*Question Time***ALGAL BLOOM**

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of the harmful algal bloom.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: It is the opposition's understanding that, despite the state government establishing 76 monitoring sites, brevetoxin itself is not routinely tested in beach water or foam, meaning beach users have no clear information on toxin presence, only algal presence. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries are:

1. How often is the government monitoring brevetoxin levels across metropolitan beaches?
2. Are these levels made public?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am happy to take that question on notice and bring back a response.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Leader of the Opposition, your second question, please.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are you going to stand up and ask your second question or you are going to forfeit? What are you doing today?

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Standing, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: There we go.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries regarding oysters.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Different oyster growing areas of our state continue to have the sale or movement of oysters prohibited from their waters with the ongoing presence of both *Karenia* algae and associated brevetoxin. The opposition continues to hear concerns from algal growers in unaffected waters that there may be consideration from PIRSA of applications for the translocation of oysters from waters affected by *Karenia* algae to their unaffected areas. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries are:

1. What is the safe level of *Karenia* algae within water where oysters are moving from to ensure there is no risk to the waters where oysters are being moved to?
2. What peer reviewed scientific data about *Karenia* algae within oysters has been taken into consideration on the basis of any decision about whether to approve a translocation?
3. Are there any restrictions on oyster movements beyond the levels of brevetoxin, which are solely based on food standards only rather than any risk associated with *Karenia* algal movement?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question. She did refer to algal growers. I think she meant oyster growers, so I will take it as though the question was about oyster growers.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: How about you sit quietly, in that corner?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The issue, obviously, for our oyster growers is significant. A number of areas have been closed for some months. Of course, there are a number of other areas that have been able to continue to trade uninhibited, because, of course, they have not had the algal bloom, nor have they had brevetoxins recorded within the oyster meat.

It is particularly important that the reputation of our oyster industry is protected. Obviously, food safety standards always come first, but it is incumbent on all of us, I would suggest, to ensure that international markets in particular but other markets also are aware that the issues for the oyster industry are limited to a small number, notwithstanding, of course, that for those who are directly affected it is incredibly significant. That was one of the reasons I had a meeting with oyster growers in Cowell just last week to discuss, first of all, the impact that they are experiencing from all of these matters but also to get feedback on the support that has been provided through the state and federal governments.

Brevetoxins were first detected in May of this year through routine South Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (SASQAP) testing at a concentration that was below the Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) regulatory limit of 0.8 milligrams per kilogram. Notably, brevetoxins had not been detected in Australia previously. Since May 2025, weekly brevetoxin testing and monitoring has triggered the closing and reopening of some harvesting areas for oysters, pippies and mussels in line with the Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes) (Seafood) Regulations 2017.

This is to maintain food safety standards and ensure the Food Standards Australia New Zealand regulatory limit of 0.8 milligrams per kilogram for brevetoxin is not breached. The opening and closing of harvest areas is not dependent on the amount of *Karenia* species detected but the level of brevetoxin contained in shellfish meat.

Closures of harvest areas prohibit the sale and movement of bivalve mollusc from those areas, and consistent with the biotoxin management plan a harvest area is closed until two consecutive weeks of results indicate that brevetoxin levels are below the FSANZ level of 0.8 milligrams per kilogram and declining or static. When a harvest area is open, producers are free to move oysters to other harvest areas.

The movement of oyster stock between harvest areas is critical to many oyster farming operations to maximise oyster growth, maintain stock quality, manage farm logistics and respond to market pressure, with specific harvest areas having environmental characteristics that support particular life stages of oyster development. Some producers have become specialised in growing a particular life stage of oysters and may sell or move oysters when they grow beyond that life stage.

The movement of oysters from a closed harvest area to another harvest area requires authorisation under the regulations. These relays have previously occurred for closures due to the presence of some harmful algae species above trigger levels or high rainfall and E.coli, with a relay request process in place to facilitate these movements.

Predetermined criteria have been developed nationally to inform relay authorisation, and SASQAP relay protocols ensure compliance with the Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (ASQAP) operations manual, the ASQAP export standards 2004 and relevant state legislation.

In the anticipation of a need to facilitate the relay of shellfish from areas closed because of biotoxins, a review of national and state relay requirements was recently led by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) in consultation with state governments. That review was undertaken during 2023, and South Australia updated its relay guidelines in 2024 in response to the review.

In response to the current algal bloom, and to better understand the risk that oyster relays may play in spreading *Karenia* species to unaffected areas, the South Australian Oyster Growers Association (SAOGA) commissioned an independent risk assessment. PIRSA facilitated a workshop of algal bloom experts and oyster aquaculture regulators from the US, New Zealand, Tasmania and New South Wales to help inform the SAOGA risk assessment.

On 10 September, SAOGA advised PIRSA that, although they had finalised their risk assessment and had undertaken extensive consultation to form a position on oyster relays, there was not a unanimous view within the industry. To inform the management of oyster relay risk, PIRSA animal biosecurity completed a risk review drawing on the risk assessment already completed by SAOGA and concluded that both the absolute risk of spread of the algal bloom via oyster relays, as well as the relative risk these relays may play in spreading the algal bloom compared to other means of spread of the bloom, are low.

PIRSA informed oyster producers who were in attendance at the annual SAOGA seminar on 17 October that PIRSA would assess oyster relay applications on a case-by-case basis, and that the relay applications needed to meet national criteria to ensure food safety standards were met. Following the SAOGA seminar, PIRSA received applications to relay Pacific oysters from Franklin Harbour, which is currently closed due to brevetoxins, to Haslam on the West Coast. There is only one oyster producer in Haslam.

PIRSA was advised by oyster producers that similar movements of large amounts of oysters were made from Franklin Harbour to Haslam in the three weeks leading up to the closure of Franklin Harbour on 30 July 2025, when at the time *Karenia* species counts were above 150,000 cells per litre, higher than the *Karenia* detection levels at Franklin Harbour at the time of the relay request. Importantly, weekly routine testing of Haslam has not detected an increase in *Karenia* species as a result of these movements.

PIRSA assessed the relay applications against the criteria and risk assessment, and the request to relay stock was authorised. The approved authorisations were time-bound and took over a two-day period in October, which has now lapsed. I am advised that PIRSA currently has no active applications.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Supplementary: has the minister received the third independent risk assessment commissioned by PIRSA for oyster translocation or relay, and, if so, what level of risk was identified?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:52): All of the information that has been provided has indicated that the risks are low, particularly, as I mentioned, when compared to other potential ways of the algal bloom spreading.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary: to protect the reputation of the oyster industry, as you mentioned, is there any restriction on oyster movement or relay due to risk associated with *Karenia* algae movement? Not brevetoxin, but algae.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): My advice is that any restrictions will be in relation to brevetoxin levels. As I mentioned, SASQAP is monitoring those levels, and they are the levels that could result in a closure.

ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Final supplementary: is the minister concerned that there are no restrictions on oyster movement due to risks associated with *Karenia* algal movement between waters, given the minister's comments in regard to protecting the reputation of the oyster industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. I think what needs to be taken into account is the assessment that was done in terms of other ways that *Karenia* could be moved. For example, we have not banned the movement of boats from an area that has *Karenia* to an area that does not have *Karenia*. There are many ways in the natural environment that *Karenia* can be spread. *Karenia* is present in many locations at any time, well before the algal bloom. It is a type of algae which is not unknown, in general terms, well before the algal bloom in South Australia eventuated.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of food security in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: This morning, we have heard deeply concerning warnings from the beekeepers industry. The Beekeepers Society of South Australia's Simon Gerblisch told ABC Radio Adelaide that the deadly varroa mite detections across our state now at Sellicks Hill, Taratap, Salt Creek and previously in the Riverland pose serious and immediate risk to South Australia's pollination-dependent industries. He stated, and I quote:

South Australia isn't prepared for it. The horticulture industry, pollination industries—if we have a lot of the feral bees wiped out in the next year, it's going to have massive consequences for food security in South Australia.

He goes on to say further:

People have had a false sense of confidence...because I actually thought there were none here...it appears that it's been here, and people just aren't testing.

Given these alarming statements from industry leaders themselves, my questions to the minister are:

1. Why are so many South Australian beekeepers still unaware that varroa mite has entered our state and is now apparently spreading within our state?
2. How many full-time equivalent staff has the department allocated each year for the past three years to communicating the risk of varroa mite, educating beekeepers on surveillance and testing, and managing the state's ongoing varroa response strategy?
3. Does the minister accept that she has failed in her responsibility to minimise the impacts of varroa mite in South Australia by not ensuring adequate communication preparedness and surveillance across industry?
4. Finally, is the minister concerned, as industry clearly is, about the serious risk to South Australia's food security if this state cannot effectively manage varroa mite in both managed and feral bee populations in the months and years ahead?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her question. As I have outlined in this place on numerous occasions, there has been a great deal of work that has gone into preparing South Australia for the potential incursion of varroa mite. It's unfortunate, but of course not unexpected, that a second detection of varroa mite was confirmed. This was on 20 November this year in hives in the vicinity of Salt Creek in the Limestone Coast region.

On 19 November, a beekeeper undertaking routine surveillance suspected he had detected varroa mite. He subsequently notified PIRSA of the suspect detection. The sample was collected and submitted to SARDI and confirmation was received. Further DNA analysis will confirm the

species level of the mite to varroa destructor. This detection has links to additional sites in the region as well as sites in the Southern Fleurieu and Adelaide Hills. I am advised that three of these sites have also now been confirmed as being positive for the presence of varroa mite.

As of today, 27 November, varroa mite has been confirmed at Salt Creek and Taratap in the Limestone Coast area, Sellicks Hill in the Southern Fleurieu and Woodside in the Adelaide Hills. PIRSA biosecurity staff continue to investigate linked properties, apiaries and beekeepers while supporting beekeepers with surveillance and management treatments where required.

There has been a 25-kilometre surveillance buffer instigated to assist PIRSA in contacting and supporting beekeepers who may have an apiary registration within the buffer or who are working in the area. Beekeepers can view the buffers and search as to whether they are in the vicinity of detection through the PIRSA varroa surveillance map. There is currently no evidence, according to my advice, indicating that this detection is linked to the Pooginook detection in the Riverland in September, nor is there evidence the detection is linked to any known interstate movement. A source of the incursion is being investigated but is undetermined at this time.

A biosecurity notice was issued to all registered beekeepers by email on Friday 21 and Wednesday 26 November, with corresponding social media and internet updates to extend the notification reach to unregistered beekeepers. An additional notice is being prepared for issue for tomorrow.

Beekeepers within the vicinity of detection are being urged to undertake monitoring using one of the nationally approved methods, including alcohol wash, soapy water wash and to notify PIRSA via the pirsa.beebiosecurity email box or the Exotic Plant Pest Hotline if they suspect that they have detected varroa. The South Australian Varroa Industry Advisory Committee (SAVIAC) has met and is due to be briefed again today.

One of the things that I have spoken about on multiple occasions in this place is the work that has been done in terms of preparation for this. There was the National Varroa Mite Management Program and also the Transition to Management program. Once it was determined nationally that varroa mite could not be eradicated, it was incumbent on all of us to then develop plans for the management of varroa.

SAVIAC was established in South Australia and the management plan was developed by that group. That group includes both hobby beekeepers as well as industry representatives, as well as those who are in pollination-dependent industries.

My advice is that registered beekeepers have been receiving regular communications which cover key varroa information including both state and relevant interstate permit changes, summaries of the discussions at SAVIAC, notification of training and education events, and reminders regarding practices to support good biosecurity such as registration, sampling and surveillance. For example, I know well a hobby beekeeper who, whenever he gets a text message from PIRSA in regard to varroa, always lets me know. That is just an extra piece of information which shows that the information has been getting out to those who are registered.

Since November last year through to October this year, the varroa development officers team have disseminated varroa monitoring and management advice. There have been 837 engagement events incorporating over 1,500 beekeepers across all regions of South Australia.

VARROA MITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary: how many staff from PIRSA have been appointed for communication with and education of the apiary industry, given that so many South Australian beekeepers are still unaware that varroa mite has entered the state?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): I would have thought that the honourable member would be aware that there has been a large amount of information in the public domain, particularly through news reports. I, myself, have done multiple media interactions, as has the department. We have 4½ FTEs who are varroa development officers and three FTEs in the apiary unit.

AUTISM INCLUSION CHARTER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Autism. Will the minister provide an update to the council on autism inclusion initiatives implemented by the Malinauskas Labor government in 2025?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in autism inclusion. The Malinauskas Labor government is committed to making South Australia a leader when it comes to autism inclusion. National statistics show that approximately one in 70 Australians are autistic, and approximately one in four Australians have an autistic family member.

Since coming to government, we have been working with South Australian autistic and autism communities to design and implement inclusive initiatives, and 2025 has been no different. This year, we have hit a milestone when it comes to building knowledge and understanding of autism in South Australia. We have now trained more than 5,000 people through the Office for Autism, with free autism awareness training.

The Office for Autism was established by the Malinauskas Labor government in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet in 2023 to place autism inclusion at the heart and centre of government. As members here know, the training is delivered by autistic facilitators and covers: what is autism; myths and facts about autism; autistic strengths; and strategies for autism inclusion.

We all know that positive word of mouth is important in encouraging adoption, and the Office for Autism training has certainly benefited from that, with participants providing overwhelmingly positive feedback and many government and non-government workforces seeking to train more employees. I am advised that the latest number of training figures show that 5,872 have completed the training, so it won't be long before we celebrate yet another milestone of reaching 6,000 people who have been trained by the Office for Autism.

Upskilling our workforce is integral to building autism inclusion. Education workforces form a key role in working with autistic and autism communities, which is why many of our autism inclusion initiatives have focused on the education sector. Last week, I had the pleasure of meeting with the principals and school leaders who are participating in the Autism Inclusion in Secondary Schools pilot program. The program builds on the Malinauskas Labor government's nation leading autism inclusion teacher initiative in our public primary schools. The secondary school pilot has been focused on supporting autistic students as they transition to high school and has received positive feedback from students, teachers, principals and parents.

We have also continued to work to boost knowledge and understanding of autism before teachers enter the classroom. South Australian universities have continued to implement change to their courses as part of a two-year research project funded by the Malinauskas Labor government. We also know early childhood educators want increased knowledge and understanding of autism, so this month we launched a pilot for the Autism Professional Learning course within a Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care at TAFE SA. This latest course updates and builds on the nation-leading autism inclusion initiatives we have introduced in vocational education. We also introduced a unit on autism for all students undertaking Certificate III in School Based Education Support at TAFE SA, which is an Australian first.

Away from the classroom, we are working to make sure that South Australian autistic and autism communities can enjoy our famous events. In November 2023, I was approached by Nathan Hull at our Christmas carols with an idea of creating a sensory bus. Nathan's idea was designed to help reduce barriers to inclusion and create a supportive space for autistic children and young people and adults. Now it is a reality, and the sensory bus has been launched and is in operation. I had the pleasure of visiting SA's sensory bus at the Adelaide 500 event today, where members of the autistic and autism community were utilising the mobile sensory space, including a guard from the event who has an autistic grandson. He popped over just to say thank you for making sure that his family can be seen.

I also mention Henry, who is 15. His mum mentioned this person. He is a kid who loves cars. He is about to become an apprentice in mechanics. He wasn't too keen to wear his sensory hidden

disability lanyard to the race, but when he got to gate 9 and it was covered in the sunflower pattern and saying that this is a hidden disability gate, he proudly pulled it out and put it on himself without mum even asking.

Our government also supports a sensory space at schools, with Encounter Youth receiving a grant through the Autism Works in the Community Grants Program, providing and delivering on Autism Works projects. We have been able to deliver so much in this space. It is one of the proudest achievements that I have been able to work on, as an assistant secretary and now being a minister in this space. Stories like the one I have just heard from Henry and also the grandparent tell of finally feeling like they have been seen.

The largest disability cohort in our community feels that South Australia is leading the world, and that is being recognised by the fact that in 2027, for the very first time, we will host APAC, the Asia Pacific Autism Conference. This will be an incredible opportunity for hundreds, if not thousands, of people to come to South Australia to see what we have been able to achieve as a government.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Leesa Chesser, former member for Taylor and former minister.

Question Time

REGIONAL RAIL

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport on regional rail. This one is for you, Mr President, for your last day.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: On 16 May 2025, the former Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Tom Koutsantonis, announced two additional rail corridors to support peri-urban growth, one south towards Aldinga and Sellicks Beach and one north towards Roseworthy and Concordia. I quote from the minister:

As the world around us changes, our transport system will play a crucial role in driving economic growth, achieving net zero emissions, and preserving the liveability of our state.

My question to the minister responsible for infrastructure and transport, therefore, is: when will the Malinauskas government finally announce a meaningful transport policy that adequately services our regions by expanding passenger rail to connect our regional cities and townships? When will you finally fund regional rail?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. Regional public transport is very important to this government. As he has highlighted, new corridors have been secured. I think that a pretty important part of planning ahead is not to think in a few years' time, 'I wonder how we are going to build that infrastructure that is so needed for these new housing growth areas? We should maybe go and acquire all these homes that we allowed to be built where a corridor could have been secured if someone had just planned ahead.'

As a government, yes, we are planning ahead. We have made it very clear that we are extending those important rail and public transport corridors. That is something that the government have been proud to be able to achieve. We have also been pretty proud to be able to achieve bringing back our public transport into public hands. You might roll your eyes over there and feel like, 'Oh, I have heard this before,' but when you have good government in place, you want to make sure that you can continue to invest in public transport. We need to make sure that it is in public hands, and that is what we have done with our trams and trains.

The reason that is really important is that the honourable member is pretty keen on getting trains to Belair, extending the line. He is keen to use the ARTC line to be able to extend the train line. This becomes a little bit tricky. I do not know if the honourable member with his policy announcements over there has decided to talk with ARTC about if we are able to use their line to extend public

transport. We know that this is very complicated and not an easy one and not an efficient one at that, because if you have an ARTC line that is owned by a freight company, guess who has priority on that line? It would be the freight company.

So in the morning, when you are waiting for your passenger train to be able to use a freight line, I am not sure exactly which section they get to use and how they get to use it. Are they waiting on the sideline whilst waiting for the freight line to go past? As a government over here, we are doing our homework and we are investing heavily. We have made sure that we have not just gone out there with some ideas about 'Let's go put a train here' or 'Let's go do something over there'. What we have done is we have brought the trams and trains back, as we promised.

What we have done is spend \$19 million in Mount Barker so that we can have up to 590 extra services. That is a 42 per cent increase in services. We have seen \$2 billion spent on public transport. We have seen patronage grow by 1.9 million journeys. We have seen significant change, because we are not just investing in one part of this story, we are investing in bringing it back. We are investing in the infrastructure, and we are investing in the services that are available. That is the combination, and we are very proud that we have been able to achieve that.

REGIONAL RAIL

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:12): Supplementary: it was a good try, but does the minister have a plan for rail to the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:12): I don't know if the member was listening, but as much as I have the absolute most respect for the honourable member, the line that he has referred to, I believe, in his policy ideas is the ARTC line to Mount Barker. That line was built in 1883. It is a little bit outdated. I just want to run through this a bit more. When the Mount Barker Mass Transit Study was released, it suggested that the maximum speed that could be used on this particular line could be 25 to 40 km/h. That is rather slow. That is a slow journey into the city.

What is seen as a good investment, and what is seen as an efficient form of getting down from the Hills—weaving around, instead of going 20 to 40 km/h—is investments in buses. That is what we have seen. I just went through that before. There is \$19 million to go into new park-and-rides and to go into almost 600 new services. I have run through the rail component just for you just then, and the investment that we put in is buses, significant investment in buses. It is making a difference. We have seen an increase, we are seeing the popularity grow, and that has been the investment.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:14): Supplementary: does the minister acknowledge that South Australia's public transport network is running later than ever, with punctuality complaints up 87 per cent in the last financial year since it has come back into public hands?

The PRESIDENT: I never heard any mention of punctuality complaints, but if you are on your feet and you want to speak, go your hardest.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:15): This could have been a Dorothy, to be honest. I had such pleasure in going to Dry Creek on Monday or Tuesday, and I learned how to drive a train. I was talking to the people—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I could drive, the Hon. Robert Simms. It was an incredible experience to see the wealth of knowledge that is there.

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: Do you have a licence to drive a train?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: It was a computer—we don't have to panic too much. What was really interesting was the feedback from employees who had worked and transitioned back, from

being privatised to being in public hands. What they made really clear to me was the significance of how proud they feel to come to work now. It's not about the KPI—

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Just wait. It was not about the KPI of making sure that they arrived somewhere spot on time. What they are so proud of is that they make sure everyone gets picked up, because that wasn't happening before. People were not getting picked up. They were getting left so that they could meet the KPIs that you put on them. You didn't provide the services that people actually need to make sure that they can get on a train and go where they need to go. When the employees are saying that the service is better, when the people riding it are saying it's better, I think we have made the right choice by bringing it back into public hands.

PUBLIC SECTOR ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector a question on the topic of public sector wages.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Since 11 September this year, the government has been offering the state's 400,000 or so public servants a 10.5 per cent pay rise over three years in the enterprise bargaining agreement negotiations. The union demand is 20 per cent in 18 months. The members clearly support the unions, if the evidence yesterday of over 4,000 public servants who stopped work and were outside on our steps and undertook a half-day stoppage is anything to go by. Indeed, it's no surprise when essential workers simply can't afford their rent and other basics and those people we rely on to do jobs such as corrections, youth justice, courts administration and child protection are finding that they have fallen far behind their award safety net.

Indeed, Charlotte Watson, the new General Secretary of the PSA, was quoted yesterday saying, 'Our members have lost the equivalent of 20¢ in every dollar they were earning in 2015.' We know we have a cost-of-living crisis. So my question to the minister is: can he indicate what the Malinauskas government will be doing for the hardworking members of our public sector who stopped work yesterday because they cannot afford to live while our government funds things such as LIV Golf, which does not need our money?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I do acknowledge her very, very longstanding commitment to supporting working people and the rights of trade unions in South Australia. The honourable member has been at the forefront in this chamber over many, many years. She has brought before us time and again legislation such as to have a standalone criminal offence for industrial manslaughter. I am very proud that, heeding the honourable member's calls and following in her footsteps the number of times this legislation has come before us, we have passed that in this term of government.

In relation to negotiation with public sector unions, I have stood in this place a number of times in answer to questions to say that we will bargain in good faith. That was not something the former government did. The former government set arbitrary limits on what they would bargain on; for example, 'There will be no back pay. No ifs, whats and buts.' We haven't put those arbitrary limits on and we have been bargaining in good faith.

It is true that almost every public sector agreement has been up for negotiation during this calendar year. So far this year we have reached agreement with the unions representing public sector workers. That has been voted up by their membership in relation to allied health professionals and in relation to salaried medical officers in our public hospitals. Both those agreements have been voted up and they have been around 3 to 4 per cent per year as the headline wage increases, with other terms and conditions, of course.

We have seen more recently, in the last few weeks, the weekly paid agreement that covers people like disability support workers, childcare workers, and those who work in a hospital, such as hospital orderlies and sterilisation technicians. Those were agreements with similar headline wages

but which recognised the very low-paid nature of some of that work, where the membership—I think it was something like 90 per cent of members—are paid under \$65,000 a year.

There were significant other parts to that, such as federal parity for modern awards that have seen significant increases in aged care and disability care to make sure we match those as part of that agreement, amongst other conditions and wage outcomes. Just in the last week, we have seen an in-principle agreement with the United Fire Fighters Union for the South Australian firefighters. Again, that is a 3 to 4 per cent per year wage increase.

So we have been negotiating in very good faith. I know that myself and other ministers are meeting very regularly with public sector unions which are still negotiating agreements. In relation to the quantum being sought, 20 per cent over 18 months is almost 13½ per cent per year. That will be very difficult, given the quantum we have seen for other public sector unions.

I have been invited on a number of occasions, particularly by members of the crossbench, to engage in negotiations in the chamber, but I am going to resist doing that and we will continue negotiating with the public sector unions. We have said publicly that the equivalent of almost 13½ per cent per year, given the other EBs that we have settled, would be very difficult and, I would suggest, impossible to do given the parameters that other people have reached. But we will continue those negotiations. There are meetings scheduled, I think in the not-too-distant future, with the PSA and a couple of other public sector unions that we continue to negotiate with.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:22): I seek leave to give a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport on road maintenance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: In 2024, three Fleurieu councils undertook road safety works in preparation for the 2025 Tour Down Under. These councils were obligated to carry out these projects under state legislation. My question to the minister is: are there any road maintenance projects planned for the 2026 Tour Down Under?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for her question. I would have to look into this a bit more closely. I believe that there may be, but I am happy to look into that a bit further.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: This is going to be problematic, isn't it? The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: I may have to rule it out, sir.

The PRESIDENT: I am listening, and you are not ruling anything in or out.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Sorry, sir—trying to help.

The PRESIDENT: You are not very helpful. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I will listen to your supplementary.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: I would like to know when the minister intends to get back to me with a response, given it's the last day, or potentially the last day, of sitting. Would you like to come back to me? It's an important question. The Tour Down Under is in January. Maybe you should be—are you able to maybe get some information before the end of question time then?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:23): You literally just asked me the question. I don't know how much clearer I have to be. I said I would look into it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: How about we move on to the toecutter, the Hon. Mr Ngo.

MUNDA WINES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister tell the council about the success of Munda Wines in the inaugural First Nations Exporter Award?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:24): I thank the honourable member for his question and it would give me very great pleasure to inform the chamber. The Australian Export Awards are Australia's longest running business awards program and exists to celebrate the achievements of exporters and recognise their contribution to the country's economic prosperity. After joint advocacy from both the South Australian and Western Australian governments, this year has seen the introduction of a First Nations exporter category for the first time in the 63-year history of the awards—it is fantastic to see the recognition and the growing contribution of Aboriginal enterprise globally.

Six Indigenous finalists were named in this landmark category: Aldridge Rail Group from New South Wales; Elephant in the Room Consulting from Queensland; Ikuntji Artists from the Northern Territory; Jala Jala from Victoria; Kirikin from WA; and Munda Wines from South Australia. I am exceptionally proud to see that the inaugural winner of the First Nations export category was Munda Wines, an exceptional South Australian company. Munda Wines is led by Wirangu and Kokatha man, Pauly Vandenberg, and is an Aboriginal-owned premium wine company that celebrates and shares culture, connection and country through its unique blends named after the traditional lands on which they are produced.

Munda Wines has gone from strength to strength since releasing its first two wines: a shiraz from Kaurna country, followed by a grenache from Ngadjuri and Peramangk country. In just a few years Munda Wines have already broken into the Canadian and Malaysian markets and are on track to break into the United States.

I would like to congratulate all the finalists in their categories and acknowledge the success and recognition of their contribution to the Australian economy. But, of course, I would particularly pay tribute to Munda Wines and in particular congratulate its founder, Pauly Vandenberg. Pauly Vandenberg is an extraordinary South Australian. He was a top-level basketball player—played NBL in Australia—and you just have to ask him and he will tell you how good he was at basketball, without too much more reference. However, I haven't seen him play lately in his advancing years.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Twilight years.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: His twilight years. I got to know Pauly Vandenberg very well when he was working for the Port Adelaide Football Club in their Aboriginal and community programs division. I would be at some of the most remote places in South Australia—Oak Valley or on the APY lands—and regularly I would have comments from people, 'Pauly was just here a couple of weeks ago.' He crisscrossed the state, making sure Aboriginal kids in some of the most remote communities were having access to football programs and helping improve their lives, whether it was at an Ernabella dance or putting on carnivals. Pauly Vandenberg is one human being that I most admire for the contribution that he has made. If anyone deserves outrageous success, it is Pauly and Munda Wines.

ANNA CREEK STATION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Deputy Premier and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Attorney-General a question regarding charges against owners of Anna Creek Station, Williams Cattle Company.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Last month, an ABC News *Stateline* report confirmed the owners of the biggest cattle station in the world have been charged over allegedly building illegal dams on inland rivers and waterholes in outback South Australia. Anna Creek Station is a pastoral lease of just under 24,000 square kilometres, bordering at Kati Thanda (Lake Eyre) on country held under native title by the Arabana people since 2012. In a submission made in late 2022 to the South

Australian Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, the Arabana Aboriginal Corporation provided satellite imagery of 21 earthworks and 21 Indigenous sites.

At the same time, *The Advertiser* cited a report by Indigenous heritage experts stating that no consultation about the proposed earthworks had been conducted with the Arabana people, nor had any cultural heritage surveys been carried out. These seven business entities that jointly controlled and operated Anna Creek Station under the trading name Williams Cattle Company are defendants in the case and are charged under the Aboriginal Heritage Act, the Natural Resources Management Act and the Landscape South Australia Act. This represents the first time charges under the Aboriginal Heritage Act have been laid against a pastoralist or commercial entity.

Penalties under the act were recently increased up to \$2 million for companies, but due to the time of the offending the station is being charged under the previous act with penalties of up to \$50,000. The owners are also being pursued for environmental damage in the Environment, Resources and Development Court. My questions to the Deputy Premier are:

1. Can the Deputy Premier confirm if all of the offending in question occurred prior to the enactment of the new penalty provisions?
2. Was there any offending post the new laws coming into effect?
3. What further updates and information is the Deputy Premier able to provide this chamber with regarding this matter?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:30): I thank the honourable member for her questions. As the honourable member would appreciate, with an ongoing matter before the courts—as when I am occasionally asked about them—there is limited information that I can give or that I should give in relation to something that is before the courts.

I can confirm that there are prosecutions I think that were, as I remember, initiated in the Coober Pedy Magistrates Court in relation to breaches of the Aboriginal Heritage Act and, if I remember correctly, in the Environment, Resources and Development Court in relation to environmental laws. As I understand it, the prosecutions are in the very early stages of proceedings.

I am happy to go away and find out and report back directly to the honourable member in relation to her question about the timeframes—whether the acts occurred before we made changes during the term of this parliament to significantly increase the potential penalties or if the acts that are being particularised in the prosecution occurred before the passing of our legislation and the new penalties applied. I will go back and check that.

Certainly, it is something we remain committed to—the protection of Aboriginal heritage in South Australia. I think the honourable member is correct when she says that it may be the first prosecution against a corporation since the Aboriginal Heritage Act came into operation in, I think, 1988 in South Australia. I think it is the case that there has only been one other prosecution that has been lodged, and that was well before my time. I do not think that was against a corporation, and as I remember that prosecution failed, so I think that is correct as well.

REGIONAL ROADS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:32): I seek leave to make an explanation prior to addressing questions to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport on the state of our regional roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Liberal candidate for the seat of Stuart, Mr Leon Stephens, has been in contact with a gentleman by the name of Neil Watkins, who is responsible for the mail run from Yunta in the state's north. The run, from my understanding, goes as far north as the Beverley uranium mine along Tea Tree Road and south along the Sturt Vale Road toward Lilydale and Mutooroo.

Mr Watkins has serious concerns about the state of the roads he drives along regularly and the constant damage they cause his truck. He reports there are worn shoulders and big potholes, and he is convinced that although locals understand and use caution it is only a matter of time until

a tourist might have a serious accident, noting that help is hard to come by between Yunta and the Beverley Mine. Mr Watkins has said that in recent years he has seen a steep decrease in the number of work gangs or groups of people out fixing remote roads, and he believes not enough is being done when lives are at risk every day.

We have also been advised by a pastoralist from past Oodnadatta, first name Tony, who is a member of the outback roads group, and has been for decades, that under this government re-sheeting on outback roads has decreased from an average of 100 kilometres a year to as low as 20 kilometres per year. My questions for the minister are:

1. Is Tony from past Oodnadatta correct when he notes that re-sheeting on outback roads has decreased significantly under this government's watch?
2. Does the minister agree with Mr Watkins that there is a legitimate concern about serious injury and death on regional roads, especially for those who are not familiar with them?
3. How does the minister justify the current backlog of works on our regional roads, which has now blown out to over \$2 billion on Labor's watch?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:34): That blew out under you guys. When you privatised it and you decided to outsource our road maintenance and didn't build the contract appropriately, problems were created, and it left us with significant problems. What we have done as a government is decided to invest in road maintenance. As I have probably said a few times now in this chamber, yes, we are always concerned about regional roads and, as I am advised, the total road maintenance spend in regional areas over the last three years is 50 per cent.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Say that again.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Sorry, 57 per cent was spent in regional areas. I am further advised that the planned maintenance spend in 2025-26 in regional areas is 58 per cent. I am advised also, which I have said a few times in this chamber, excluding the north-south corridor—because it is such a significant project we need to just park that for a second—the major projects announced in regional areas since 2022-23 are approximately \$2.7 billion, which represents 70 per cent of the total statewide transport investments.

We are spending a significant amount in our regional communities. If we look at the \$15 billion Torrens to Darlington project, this is something that is going to be of great benefit to all South Australians. What is happening there is the supplies, particularly aggregate, which we have also spoken about before in this chamber, have to come from all corners of our state. Workforces are getting an opportunity to participate in increasing demand that is then going into our projects in South Australia. As I have highlighted, they are significant investments, and I have also highlighted that a significant amount is going back into our regions.

REGIONAL ROADS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:36): Supplementary: which part of that answer should I provide to Tony and Mr Watkins as relevant to their issue?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (15:36): All of it when I said we are prioritising.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:36): My question is to the Minister for Forest Industries. Will the minister update the council about the significant forestry election commitments that have been delivered over the last four years?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. The forest industry in South Australia is worth around \$3 billion and employs, both directly and indirectly, a total of roughly 18,000 to 21,000 people. Indeed, one in four people in the South-East of our state have employment directly connected to the forest industry.

While members opposite at the last election failed to articulate any significant forestry-related election policies at all, members on this side of the council took to the election a suite of election

policies that we have been busy implementing over the last almost four years. Forestry, in many ways, is the ultimate renewable. In South Australia alone, over 4.6 million tonnes of carbon is sequestered each year from the atmosphere. We know those opposite are not interested in things that might sequester carbon or anything to do with climate but, here on this side, as governments continue to seek to decarbonise their economies, forestry has a key role to play in achieving this aspiration.

It is for these reasons that the Malinauskas Labor government is rolling out a record level of investment within the industry. Some of the highlights that we have delivered include \$16 million over 10 years for the construction of the Forestry Centre of Excellence. The establishment of this centre will create a long-term research and development capability in Mount Gambier for the industry. I am pleased that the physical building will be opened in the coming months, and all key staff have now been appointed.

We provided \$2.346 million for the delivery of eight new AI-powered fire towers, providing landscape-level fire detection and safeguarding the Limestone Coast's 120,000-hectare forest plantation estate, as well as supporting fire protection for all of our local communities. Also, \$2 million has enabled the delivery of a South Australian Wood Fibre and Timber Master Plan. This critical funding has delivered a wide range of projects to the benefit of the forest industry, including:

- the Fennell Forestry electric log truck trial;
- the State of South Australia's Plantation Forests Report;
- the campaign This is Wood Work;
- the Workforce Development Program in partnership with the Green Triangle Hub. This allowed for the appointment of a workforce development officer for the forest industry;
- the Treated Timber Product Stewardship prospectus; and
- Decarbonising the Freight Task—Driving to Net Zero project in partnership with the South Australian Forest Products Association and Tabeel Trading.

The state government has invested \$450,000 with Tree Breeding Australia to assist with the construction of a purpose-built dedicated gene conservation and tree improvement facility in Mount Gambier. The government has committed \$5.5 million as part of a total \$28 million investment for the Limestone Coast Regional Connectivity Program, which will deliver 27 mobile sites around the Limestone Coast and assist the forest industry, other industries and our local communities.

While the shadow minister, like much of the opposition, continues to struggle to find Mount Gambier on the map despite it being our second largest city, let alone show any interest in announcing any forest-related policies, the Malinauskas Labor government will continue to work side by side with the forest industry in South Australia.

I would like to thank the Forest Industries Advisory Council, the South Australian Forest Products Association, the Green Triangle Forest Industries Hub and the Green Triangle Fire Alliance for their ongoing engagement and advocacy for the industry and the work that they have all provided over the last almost four years to achieve these election commitments.

SWIMMING POOL RENTALS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, representing the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, regarding the emerging trend of swimming pool rentals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Recent developments show a growing market for short-term private swimming pool hire through online platforms. While this offers economic opportunities for home owners, it raises significant safety concerns for the community.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Currently, South Australia's laws do not specifically regulate private pool rentals, leaving gaps in compliance, liability and public health standards. Without clear guidelines, there is a risk of drowning incidents, inadequate fencing and poor water quality that could cause harm. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister advise whether the government has assessed the potential safety risk associated with private pool rentals in South Australia?
2. Will the government commit to introducing a regulatory framework that includes mandatory safety standards, insurance requirements and water quality checks for pools offered for hire to ensure that the community is better protected from preventable harm?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:42): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am happy to refer that to the minister in the other place and bring back a response.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:42): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT COMMITTEE ON MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLBEING OF VETERINARIANS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:43): I move:

1. That should the Joint Committee on Mental Health and Wellbeing of Veterinarians complete its report while the houses are not sitting, the committee may present its report to the presiding officers of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, who are hereby authorised, upon presentation, to publish and distribute that report prior to the tabling of the report in both houses; and
2. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly requesting its concurrence.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOMS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:44): By leave, I move my motion in an amended form:

1. That, should the Joint Committee on Algal Blooms in South Australia complete its final report while the houses are not sitting, the committee may present its report to the presiding officers of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, who are hereby authorised, upon presentation, to publish and distribute that final report prior to the tabling of the report in both houses; and
2. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly requesting its concurrence.

Motion carried.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL MEN'S DAY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.L. Game:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 19 November 2025 is International Men's Day, focusing on men's health, championing male role models, and recognising the positive values men bring to the world, their families, and their community;
2. Accepts that men face a series of health challenges that need to be acknowledged and addressed to help our communities function to their full fullest potential;
3. Identifies that these challenges include but are not limited to the fact that in Australia three out of four suicides are men, two out of three violent deaths are men, and that men die years younger than women on average;

4. Recognises that men deserve to be celebrated on International Men's Day in the same vein as we celebrate and champion women on International Women's Day; and
5. Acknowledges that all members of Parliament need to do their best to start changing the negative narrative around men in society.

(Continued from 12 November 2025).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:46): I rise to speak in favour of this particular motion from the Hon. Sarah Game, recognising International Men's Day and the contribution that men and boys make to our families, workplaces and communities. International Men's Day is observed around the world on 19 November. Its purpose is simple and positive. It asks us to reflect on men's health and wellbeing, to celebrate positive male role models and to acknowledge the values and strengths that men bring to their families and communities. Those aims sit comfortably alongside the goals of International Women's Day which is very similar in nature. Both days encourage us to build healthier, more respectful and more supportive communities for everyone.

The challenges facing men and boys are well known and too rarely discussed in a constructive way in some forums. We know that three out of four suicides in Australia are men, and they represent fathers, sons, brothers, colleagues and friends, and that families and communities feel those losses very deeply.

Recognising either International Men's Day or International Women's Day is not about diminishing the experiences of the other gender. It is about taking a balanced approach to gender and wellbeing, including a frank acknowledgement, in this case, that many men struggle in silence and are often reluctant to seek help. We also know from the data that even on the less difficult issues such as getting regular check-ups with their GPs and fairly standard measures, they often do not engage with those. They need someone like me to organise things for them.

They may carry expectations about stoicism and self-reliance that make it harder to reach out. When we shine a light on these issues in a respectful way we help to break down those barriers and encourage healthier conversations.

Given the time and the volume of work that we do, and the fact that the Hon. Ian Hunter is looking at me with those eyes—he is loving every word I am saying but he would like me to stop now so I will do as I am being eyeballed.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:48): I am beyond delighted to stand here today and support, in common cause with the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Sarah Game, this motion to celebrate International Men's Day. I love men. I love men a lot, an awful lot. I love men in all their diversity. I love straight men, I love gay men, I love bi-men, I love trans-men, and I am delighted that Sarah Game is bringing—

An honourable member: And you love right-wing men.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Sometimes. I am delighted Sarah Game has brought to us today a motion that recognises the contributions of men in all their diversity across our community. Mr President, I have also become quite fond of you over our years together, and of your very firm handling of me and other members of the committee in this chamber as we go about our business. With a very instructive and guiding manner, you are often gentle—and sometimes not—but you are always considerate and empathetic of our needs in this chamber. You are the epitome of the qualities that this motion speaks to in terms of men and their values and how we should be operating in our community. We all look up to you, and we will miss your guiding hand on us when you leave.

Some people in the community may see International Men's Day as an opportunity to reinforce old, toxic versions of masculinity, but that is not the purpose of International Men's Day, as the Hon. Sarah Game knows too well. International Men's Day is a reminder that there are real and difficult challenges faced by some of the men and boys around us in our community, and we need to share the challenges that they face, challenges we need to work together to overcome.

This year's theme is celebrating men and boys and offers a chance to celebrate all men and all boys, as I said: gay men and bi-men and heterosexual men and trans-men, and all the diversity

the community offers. I would like to briefly reflect on some positive role models that can be provided to our community in this day and age, role models that I have looked up to.

Firstly, Mr Andrew Barr, the Chief Minister of the Australian Capital Territory, was a prominent advocate for the marriage equality campaign in 2019 and became the first leader of an Australian state or territory government to marry someone of the same sex. Equally important, he has consistently supported anti-discrimination and inclusivity of LGBTIQ communities, being a wonderful role model for men in the ACT and across the country.

Ian Thorpe, former Australian Olympic swimmer, has advocated for sporting bodies to do more for queer inclusivity in sports and has been among calls for greater support to help professionals experiencing homophobia in their fields. Our very own Hon. Robert Simms, former City of Adelaide councillor, Senator for South Australia, and now in a much better place, a member of the Legislative Council, has always put the perspective of the LGBTIQ community at the forefront of his advocacy and is a wonderful role model for young men in our society—although he is getting on a bit now.

Mr Ian Roberts, actor and former rugby league footballer, came out as gay in 1995, making him the first rugby league player to do so. He has since gone on to become a director and co-founder of Qtopia Sydney, a museum dedicated to queer history and storytelling. Uncle Jack Charles, actor and activist, was a gay icon and role model for LGBTIQ Indigenous youth by encouraging them to be their true selves and to be strong in their own image.

The Hon. Michael Kirby, former Justice of the High Court of Australia, was the first openly gay member of the High Court. He has championed human rights throughout his career and is a fantastic role model for men. Finally, there are many others but I will conclude with this: Mr Chansey Paech, former Deputy Chief Minister, Attorney-General and Speaker of the Northern Territory was the country's first openly gay Indigenous parliamentarian. He continues to strive for equity and equality for queer Territorians and is a lovely, lovely man and a great role model for his people.

These are some of the men, just a very small sample, who uphold the characteristics of what masculinity should look like in the modern day. These are men who can challenge harmful norms and support men and boys in ways that benefit everyone. They are fantastic representatives of their community. International Men's Day is an opportunity to celebrate the many men and boys who are already leading by example in our society, particularly those who show respect, kindness and courage every day, as you have done in your job, Mr President. I thank you.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:53): Thank you to the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Ian Hunter for their contributions. I am glad to have bipartisan support on this particular motion, in which I have asked for International Men's Day to be equally celebrated with International Women's Day, focusing on men's health and also championing male role models and changing the negative narrative that is around men.

What is often discussed in this particular topic is the suicide rate, and that is very important. It is often said, 'Well, hang on, men have it really good,' but actually men die earlier, they have fewer years of healthy life and they take their lives a lot more than women do. So those statistics and that focus are valid.

However, as I spoke at this International Men's Day, the other side of it is actually our struggling young boys. They are struggling at school, they are more likely to be suspended, they are more likely to be expelled, they are less likely to be engaged and they are behind girls and more likely to be needing additional support. They are less likely to finish year 12 and less likely to go to university. Hopefully, we are moving away from the idea that men and boys have it so good and we can start, as parliamentarians, to celebrate the positive men in our lives and in our community, as well as raising awareness.

I want to just briefly thank the many members of parliament who attended the International Men's Day that was held recently on 19 November. We had, I think, 360 people attend at the Hilton hotel. It has been really wonderful to see the growth and development of that in this state, and I hope that continues. We had the Premier, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, come to speak. We had the opposition leader, the Hon. Vincent Tarzia.

We had Minister Koutsantonis, Minister Scriven, Minister Bourke, Minister Hildyard and Nadia Clancy MP, member for Elder. We had the Hon. Ben Hood, who generously obtained a table

of 10. We had Penny Pratt MP, member for Frome. We managed to raise almost \$150,000 for MATES in Construction as well as money for Mentally Fit EP and Teen Challenge, which deals with men and boys with addiction. I am glad to see a motion like this supported in this place.

Motion carried.

COUNTRY SHOWS AND FIELD DAYS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the commencement of the spring season of country shows and field days across South Australia, following one of the most difficult seasons in recent memory for many regional communities;
2. Recognises that field days provide an essential forum for industry engagement, innovation, and networking, and that country shows highlight community spirit, showcase regional excellence, and foster friendly competition;
3. Notes that both country shows and field days are important in supporting regional families, strengthening local communities, and attracting visitors and tourists to our state; and
4. Commends the dedication and contribution of volunteers, organisers, exhibitors, and participants—including Royal Agricultural & Horticultural Society of South Australia, Country Shows SA, and the Association of Agricultural Field Days of Australasia—whose efforts ensure the success of these iconic events year after year.

(Continued from 15 October 2025.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:55): I rise today to speak in support of this motion moved by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti to recognise the importance of country shows and field days to our regional communities. These events are a vital part of regional life that matter deeply to the families, businesses and communities who live and work in our regions, especially after one of the most challenging seasons in recent memory.

For many, these shows and field days are welcome opportunities to reconnect, celebrate resilience and look forward with optimism. Country shows are a true showcase of community spirit and regional excellence. They bring together families, schools, service clubs and sporting groups, creating a vibrant atmosphere that reflects the character and pride of our regions. These events combine entertainment with education, offering hands-on experiences that teach the next generation about agriculture, food production and rural life.

Interactive exhibits such as the Agricultural Learning Centre, Bugs n Slugs and animal demonstrations help visitors understand the farm-to-table journey. Competitions like the Young Farmer Challenge and programs such as the Rural Ambassador initiative highlight the skills and leadership of young people in agriculture, ensuring these traditions remain strong for future generations.

Field days are essential forums for industry engagement and innovation. They provide farmers and agribusinesses with direct access to the latest machinery, technology and practices, tools that help them remain competitive and sustainable. Events like the Yorke Peninsula Field Days, which attract tens of thousands of visitors and hundreds of exhibitors, inject millions into local economies and create opportunities for knowledge sharing and partnerships. These gatherings are not simply trade expos: they are incubators for ideas and a chance for the next generation of farmers to see what their future might look like.

Both country shows and field days play a vital role in supporting regional families and strengthening local communities. They attract visitors and tourists, driving economic activity and showcasing the best of South Australia. At a time when many regional communities are still grappling with the impacts of drought, rising costs and environmental challenges, these events offer hope and connection. They remind us that while the challenges are real, so too is the resilience and resourcefulness of country South Australians.

None of this would be possible without the tireless efforts of volunteers, organisers, exhibitors and participants. At the Gawler Show, for example, hundreds of volunteers donate their time and

skills, whether running gates or car parking, coordinating the Agricultural Learning Centre or supporting competitions like the Young Farmer Challenge. Local service clubs, CWA branches and sporting groups work side by side with agricultural societies to make these events happen. Programs such as the Rural Ambassador initiative and Youth Team encourage young people to take leadership roles, while skilled volunteers like blacksmiths and wool handlers share traditional knowledge with new generations.

The Royal Agricultural & Horticultural Society of South Australia, Country Shows SA and the Association of Agricultural Field Days of Australasia provide strong leadership and resources, but it is the passion of individuals—students managing educational programs, community members setting up stalls and families working behind the scenes—that ensures success year after year. Country shows and field days are traditions that strengthen our communities, celebrate our heritage and drive innovation in agriculture. They embody the spirit of South Australia and remind us every single day about the resilience, strength and generosity of our regional people. With those remarks, I strongly support the motion.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (16:00): I rise to speak in support of the honourable member's motion, which recognises the start of the spring season of country shows and field days across South Australia. I thank the member for acknowledging this longstanding annual tradition for our regional communities. Our regions have endured another challenging season, from unpredictable weather patterns to rising production costs, market uncertainty and the ongoing impacts of weather variability threatening crops. However, South Australian farmers and primary producers continue to respond with resilience, resourcefulness and optimism.

Today more than ever, our country shows and field days are essential forums for innovation, industry engagement and the exchange of ideas. They provide an important opportunity to showcase the best of what is emerging within agriculture, horticulture, viticulture, livestock and rural industries. Importantly, country shows tell a powerful story of community. They highlight the creativity, skill and pride of country towns and offer a space where families, neighbours, local businesses and visitors can gather.

These country events generate economic and social benefits; they support regional families and provide important opportunities for small enterprises and local producers. They highlight our townships, boosting visitor numbers and contributing to the broader tourism economy. None of this would be possible without the extraordinary contribution of countless people behind the scenes—the organisers who work year round to deliver these events and the volunteers who dedicate so much of their time, often across generations. We are very grateful for their contribution.

As the warmer months unfold and country shows and field days take centre stage across our regions, it is an opportunity to acknowledge the challenges faced by those who live and work outside our cities and to thank our regional communities for their contributions to our state. On behalf of the Labour Malinauskas government, I commend this motion and extend my appreciation to everyone who continues to support, organise and participate in South Australia's country shows and field days.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:01): I would like to thank those who have contributed to today's motion, and I thank them for their support: the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Reggie Martin. The spring season of country shows and field days across South Australia was an absolute blast this year, and I am glad I got along to so many regions. As has been put so well in this chamber, country shows and field days are critical for regional communities. They bring people together, they showcase local talent, they drive economic activity and strengthen the social fabric of rural South Australia. I encourage everyone in this chamber to consider getting along to the autumn shows next year and continue their support for our regional communities. With that, I commend the motion to the chamber.

Motion carried.

VALEDICTORIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher:

That this council acknowledges the contributions made by retiring members.

(Continued from 26 November 2025.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:03): I rise to make a valedictory speech. I had to look up what that was, particularly for parliament. A valedictory is an act of parting company, a speech made when parting company and designed or suitable for bidding farewell and parting company. While I think we will part company in some ways today, I am not sure that this will be the last you see of me.

I came into this place almost 16 years ago, back in 2010. On that occasion, Kevin Rudd was Prime Minister. In fact, Kevin Rudd was pretty much king. The Kevin 07 juggernaut had been quite successful. He was replaced by Julia Gillard that year, and I certainly remember the very long night in the members' bar as we awaited, like the rest of the country, the news of who our new prime minister was to be.

In 2010, Taylor Swift won four Grammys for *Fearless*—and she dropped one of them, but she caught it just before it hit the ground. Justin Bieber was top of the pops with *Baby*. I still had an active Myspace account. I do still have that Myspace account; I just do not know how to access it. Facebook was the heir apparent in social media; indeed, Facebook was huge. Instagram was launched. The iPad was released that year.

In this chamber, myself, the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Kelly Vincent came in as the three new women members of this place, changing markedly the gender composition of this place. At one stage in my early years, there was only one woman on the benches of the Labor Party in this place, and that was of course the Hon. Gail Gago, a minister at the time, who did all the portfolios and all the work and was the sole woman on the front bench, or indeed in the government ranks. Myself and the Hon. Jing Lee came in together, and I think we very much feminised the place at the time.

I well remember my daughter, Millicent—who is not with us today because she does not actually really enjoy coming into parliament—being a toddler at the time and trying to push through that gate while I was doing my maiden speech. After that, I just kept this particular whole ground floor away from her knowledge because, as a young toddler, she would have run onto the floor anytime I was here. I am so glad now that yesterday the Hon. Laura Henderson was not only able to bring her infant child into this place but actually sat in the President's chair and was able to chair the meeting with her young son, because we have now facilitated that under our standing orders.

Another thing that Millicent did was to change the nature of this place in terms of family friendliness. In her first week in this place, we had the Hon. Kelly Vincent, and many amendments needed to be made. In fact, just right here, next to where I sit now, Kelly had her place in the chamber. It had to be retrofitted to suit her. At the time, my daughter was toilet training and she loved the bathroom. She was very proud that she could go to the toilet. She was about 18 months old.

Down in the Blue Room one day, she threw herself to the floor, screaming, 'I just want to go to the toilet.' It was in front of the then President, Bob Sneath, and the then Clerk, Jan Davis, both of whom were horrified that there might be more bad media about this parliament not being child friendly. They looked at me and said, 'Oh, do we need change tables?' I said, 'No—yes, yes we do.' Of course, my child did not need a change table; however, my child created change tables on every floor of this building, which were installed within the next week. Those Koala Kare change facilities that you now see are there because of my child and her tantrum on the floor of the Blue Room.

Constituents who thanked me for that in those early years included some of my favourite constituents, one of whom was a family: Terri and Joe and their daughter Maddie. My second bill in this place, which passed both houses of parliament, was to recognise same-sex parents on their birth certificates—and that could well have been called Maddie's Law. Maddie was well known in these corridors. That family lobbied on many rainbow family reforms as part of the Let's Get Equal campaign and others. Joe and Terri are now on Maddie's birth certificate because of our work back then in 2010 and 2011. Maddie enjoyed the change tables, and Joe and Terri thanked me because they had always had to change Maddie on the floor of the corridors prior to that. Also, we have made a small accommodation for people who come into this building, not just for those of us who work here.

I saw on Facebook this week that Maddie has graduated from high school and that she is 18. So these things happened quite a while ago but are still in her lifetime, and I cannot believe that we have to fight for what are small accommodations to include all of our community. But that is why

we are here in parliament: we are here for a purpose, we are here for passion, and we are here to change the world and reflect our constituents.

We of course do not always agree, but I certainly do respect the views of others and note that this is a difficult workplace—that we are in a workplace where we are here to be adversarial and we are here to put a contest of ideas, and that the institutions of democracy must be upheld if we are to do that in a way that does not see our democracy fail.

Something that has changed since 2010 is the threat to democracy and the threat to our institutions. We are seeing post-truth politics. We are seeing the fall of media and their ability to ensure that we have transparency and proper accountability, not clickbait journalism but real journalism. Investigative journalism, of course, as we probably all well know in this building, is a thing of the past.

When I first started I was told that a bingo at a press conference was if you got every single news channel to turn up to your press conference. Back then it was ABC, SBS, 7, 9, 10 and 2, maybe Sky if you were lucky, and that was at the time Stacey Lee. Now a bingo can be one camera operator turning up and no journalist whatsoever. That is the poor state of the media, the fourth pillar we currently have in this new society, where social media is king and where media, in terms of mainstream and traditional legacy media, have definitely fallen on hard times as they try to find a way that they can make money out of the job that they do, and that job is incredibly important.

I do want to reflect on that, because I am not sure what the solution is, but our democracy will be much poorer unless we see those institutions also strengthened. Without them, it is also beholden on us to ensure that we act with truth and integrity in what we do to make sure what we bring to this place is well researched, is thoughtful and considered and does not rely on populist approaches without substance. We should hold ourselves to that account, where we cannot be held to that account currently by the media.

Over my time in this place I have had many wins with all sorts of people in terms of law reform. I was just making a note to myself. I have co-sponsored bills with the usual suspects. Certainly former Deputy Premier Susan Close, who is also my current local member, and I, unsurprisingly, as did the Hon. Ian Hunter, co-sponsored a marriage equality bill way back in the day. More surprisingly, I have co-sponsored same-sex parenting legislation with the member for Unley, David Pisoni, also honourable. Even more extraordinarily, I have co-sponsored a bill with Michael Pengilly, the former member for Finnis, on free-range eggs, because on Kangaroo Island there were only free-range egg providers.

Willingness to work across the aisle and eyes on the prize of the cause has always been something I have been able to achieve in this place. I certainly think that my legislative record of legislative reform, of getting motions up, of getting bills through both houses of the parliament—not just one, but both houses of the parliament—will stand the test of time. They have not been necessarily on the simple and easy issues. I am very proud that I was able to achieve reforms on cancer compensation for firefighters. I am very proud that I was able to see what will hopefully one day be the social work registration scheme. While it was controversial in some ways at the time, I am very proud of my role in instigating an inquiry into a Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme in this place.

I am going to share a little secret, which some of you know, but I will put it on the public record. I put up a bill, which was one of my very first bills in 2010, for a Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme. I had worked for Senator Natasha Stott Despoja in the 1990s in the Senate and I had been horrified when, after the heady days of the prime ministership of Paul Keating, we saw the Bringing Them Home report rejected under the Howard government. I was shocked and horrified that reconciliation took not just steps backward but turned right around. I remember a lack of awareness about what the stolen generations really were, and a complete denial that they even existed.

Mr President, you and I worked on an inquiry into the stolen generations through the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, and I was able to achieve that by referring my bill to that committee via a motion of this house. Under the standing orders, which you should all actually read, only two houses can do a referral to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, and I did not have the motion that I needed to achieve that, but nobody checked the standing orders.

The Clerk at the time, Jan Davis, said, 'Nobody is going to check them, Tammy, so don't draw it to their attention.' Stephen Wade was an absolute champion and said, 'This is a great idea, and the parliament should be looking at it.' So we had an inquiry, which went over two years, through the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee into a Stolen Generations Reparation Scheme, where we heard evidence. First the opposition—the then Marshall-led Liberal opposition—came on board, supporting it and taking as an election promise to the election, where they were successful. Then, eventually, the Labor government came on board. But had you read the fine print I would never have got that inquiry up. Read the standing orders; I think that is one of my bits of advice. But sometimes it is better, of course, to ask forgiveness than seek permission.

I also note that many of us in this place cop a lot just for putting our hands up to be a politician, to be a member of this place. It does not matter what our beliefs are, and it does not matter what we do; we are simply judged and dehumanised for being politicians. I was reflecting on this today, because I saw an article about new Senator Charlotte Walker, who is a 21 year old. It was in the Daily Mail—as I say, post-truth politics—and it said, 'Senator slammed for her expenditure' and had a red-hot go at her in the headline, and then all the comments were like, 'How dare she be spending public money when she is 21?' and 'This is outrageous. Who does she think she is? She has never had a real job,' blah, blah, blah. I was reading the comments, and then I read the article.

Senator Charlotte Walker spends one of the smallest amounts of her allowance in the entire country in the Senate. That was actually the substance of the article, had anyone cared to read it. None of the people who made comments had read it, of course. They all judged her on her age and made assumptions about her life experience. We all in this place know what that is like, whether it is that we do not fit whatever somebody thinks we should be doing or saying or thinking or believing, and then we get judged unfairly and misrepresented.

That is something that I will not miss at all. I will not miss the public life where you cannot control what people think about you. The thing is, you never can control what people think about you, and it is actually not that important, but it gets to us. I know it gets to everyone at times, particularly when it is deeply unfair. I wish Charlotte Walker all the best, because I saw it with Natasha Stott Despoja.

I would not be involved in politics without the leadership of Natasha Stott Despoja. I know she is listening and watching. She cannot be here today because she is not in South Australia, but she is the one who gave me a chance and gave me a job. I had never thought I would actually work in politics, except she rang me up one day and said, 'I have just filled the casual vacancy. Do you want to come and work for me?' For five interesting years I was her higher education and youth affairs adviser. That was quite a wild ride.

She was judged for who people thought she was—that she was too young, that she could not possibly have anything to contribute, because what life experience could she have? As we know that is not necessarily the measure by which we should be judged, and it is certainly not known to any human what another human being knows, does, thinks or is going through at any particular time.

I say to everyone: do not read the comments. But I also say: please read the actual articles. Maybe if we had less paywalls that might happen a bit more, but I am not sure that is going to happen any time in the near future. I think we are in a situation where democracy is in peril unless we start to ensure civil education and civics and, I think, a strong civil society.

I think the leadership of Premier Malinauskas on this is incredibly inspiring. I hope that his investment in early education, civics education, will start to turn the ship around in South Australia, but we are nowhere near having strong democracies, when you look at the international studies into democracy and the lack of faith that young generations have. They are cynical—and understandably so—and they are not trusting of democracy. I think that is something we should all work together on across party lines to ensure that we turn it around, and I commend the leadership of the Malinauskas government on that.

I got my own bingo this week, which is the last sitting week. A long-held cause for me—and members are not going to be surprised—I have long advocated for the decriminalisation of sex work in this state, unsuccessfully. I still have not got there, but I held a forum because a motion to refer that off to the SA Law Reform Institute for a report on the decriminalisation of sex work in this state

and legislative models for that to happen passed the parliament in the late hours of the previous sitting week. I held a forum with members who I hope to pass the baton over to, and also sex workers themselves and their advocates who walk alongside them, earlier this week.

I also have a bill, which I think will be the last bill to go to a debate today, possibly ending the year, to legalise cannabis. I am reasonably sure I do not have the numbers. I am reasonably sure it is going to fail but, on a more successful note, today I tabled in this place on AusMusic T-Shirt Day a live music and creative venues report where myself, the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Reggie Martin and the Hon. Frank Pangallo—right across the political spectrum—have made really good recommendations, I think, that will ensure we do not see situations like losing the Crown and Anchor being on the books, and that we restore our live music scene, not just for the musicians but for the punters and for the good it can do in our community, and for our mental health as well. I hope that report will not sit on a shelf and gather dust. I do hope that it will be put into action.

My bingo this week was I did sex, drugs and rock'n'roll in the parliament, and I have been wanting to say that all week. It was quite an achievement, and I did not think it was going to happen, but we had joked in my staff team that it was a possibility that they all might come together for this final week.

I want to thank those members who I have worked with over the years on various issues. I know that we are all here to create better lives for our constituents and, for those in particular who can put aside the political differences to do so, I really appreciate the effort that everyone puts in, the time that you all give up that should be spent with your families or doing things you actually would rather be doing, but you put in the grind and you work the long hours, and you dedicate yourselves to what is a cause of democracy. I salute you all for that. You have my eternal respect, and I probably look forward to every once in a while dipping in to see what you are doing, but without having any investment in it whatsoever. That might be quite fun.

I also particularly want to thank my friends and family, some of whom came today, some of whom I have met through politics, and some of whom I have not, and some of whom are family. When I first started this job in 2010, I did not have much family here actually. I had my daughter, who was still the one throwing herself to the floor in the Blue Room. My mother does not live in South Australia; she lives interstate, and she came over for that speech, but she is not here today. She is living in rural New South Wales now and quite far away and difficult to get to because regional rail does not exist to the town of Nyngan due to the floods that washed away the train tracks.

I do have my aunt and uncle here. My Aunt Roma Gorringer and my Uncle Brian Gorringer have retired to South Australia, which was a delightful surprise for me to have family in this place. I actually know that they have a connection with the Hon. Laura Henderson and her family from Riyadh days, which will probably surprise many people. Laura, it did not surprise you and I because we met at a Christmas function many, many years ago, and well before your election. I am really thrilled that you could join me today.

I am also amazed that my friend Sergei turned up on time. I have never seen Sergei ever in my life turn up on time, so I was really surprised before when he was 15 minutes early. People like Emma Webb are sitting behind me, and they have been an enormous amount of support to me over many years. Emma Webb and I were once mortal enemies in the political field, back in the student politics days when, of course, the left can always fight against itself, but then when you grow up you realise you have a lot more in common than you do in difference, and she is one of my best friends and I thank her for everything that she has done, particularly in the last few years. She is an icon. She has an Order of Australia Medal for her service to the arts and the community and she has done such enormous, amazing work for working people and for arts in this state and I absolutely admire her and thank her for being here today.

I also note friends such as Deb Thorsen, Dom Heeney, Michelle, Erin and Craig (who cannot be here at the moment), my quiz night team, who with Emma finally won a quiz night last week, but we hope to win many more in the future, have been really good friends away from politics and aside from politics, who do not necessarily understand politics, but that is actually quite a good thing, and I really thank them for being here today and showing their support. Danica Moors, who has been around for many, many years and who is an absolute icon and a legend, is also here, and I just want to thank her for not just her friendship but also everything that she does as well. Martine Hawkes, too, is on my list.

I want to move to the unlikely allies: Bruce Djite is here and Mark Carroll, and Ian Horne sends his apologies. Such is the nature of this place that you may have many disagreements on many issues but you can always find something to agree on and work towards progress on, and so particularly to Ian Horne I want to say when he was the head of the evil empire and David Penberthy was having a red hot go at him as the head of the AHA, he and I did a power of work on live music. Around that time we saw a Weatherill government investment and attention to live music that I hope to see again under the Malinauskas government, and Ian Horne and I actually found that we had a lot more in common than we did in difference.

Similarly, you would not expect somebody who was the former head of the police union to be here for my valedictory, but I thank Mark Carroll. He was an incredible support at times over the past few years. We found that we agree on workers' rights and we worked really hard on workers compensation and workers' rights—while we will always disagree on the police complaints and discipline authority lack of transparency, and I will not give that one up. But we just will not talk about it in polite company. Bruce Djite, of course, is, again, a legend, and I have gotten to know him as a friend and I respect everything he does, but I do not agree with hardly any of it, so here we are.

My staff: Jamnes Danenberg, who has been with me since 2010, went off to other bigger and better things. He worked in WA for a while for various Greens MPs and is back with us. Michael Donato, Monti, Belle, Tina, Joanna Wells and Keiran Snape: I gave them shout-outs yesterday, Mr President, as I think you are aware, with Taylor Swift lyrics and eras. I hope they appreciated that, but I hope they understand how much I appreciate them. They have been absolutely stalwart in what have been reasonably difficult times in the last year and I just could not have done it for the last few months without them and so I thank them for everything and I hope that they go on to bigger and better things.

Monti, Joanna and Keiran in particular, I hope they end up as elected representatives in parliaments. I think that would add so much to parliaments. I obviously know that Keiran Snape is currently Deputy Lord Mayor, but people might be aware he is running as an Independent for the City of Adelaide. I hope that he has great success with his political endeavours. I have watched him grow and blossom from a young man who had great ambitions to someone who is keenly able to listen to those who do not agree with him and work with them and work through things, and, again, shows up, is diligent, turns up to the events, takes on board criticism and then serves his community. It might not even be what he believes necessarily is best, but if it is best for his community, he is willing to do that hard work and so I commend him for that.

Joanna Wells and Monti, of course, polled incredibly well in the federal election for the seats of Boothby and Adelaide respectively, and I hope that they get the chance to live out their political ambitions, goals and dreams in the near future, and I will be there every step of the way to support them as they do.

Finally, I particularly want to thank Leesa Chesser in the gallery today, a former member for Taylor and a former minister. Leesa has been an outstanding friend ever since 2010, and that is actually when we first met. We both first came in at the same time, we both had children much the same age at the same school, and we did that whole mum and then single mum thing together through this place. Leesa has faced adversity and survived it and is a great example to me that there is life after this place, and has done not just a lot today to wrangle everyone but so much over the past few years and was always there when needed.

I am a single mum in this place. In my first speech I spoke about my mother going through domestic violence when I was a child and ongoing. In the entire time I have been in this place I have had a situation where I have been in what you would call a domestic violence situation, with the father of my child always spewing abuse, always being difficult and always seeking to destroy me. I will not miss that when my child turns 18 and I do not have to have any connection there. But it is one of the things that I have carried the entire time I have been here, since 2010.

Mr President, you, of all the people in this place, gave me the greatest support with that. You and I know that you offered me a pair should I ever need it with regard to my child. We had a secret arrangement for a few years when she was really young and I would have to drop everything at short notice and manage really difficult family situations. I thank you for that, and I thank you for your

friendship and also the way that you have been a really considered, thoughtful and down-to-earth President in this place, using humour rather than power to control and manage this place.

I value your friendship and I know that politics will be different in this place when you leave. I have watched over my years every time one person leaves it changes markedly so I imagine it will change quite a lot without me. I am not sure if you will enjoy that or not—perhaps you will—but as the Hon. Kyam Maher once said in a particular mention of me at the end of a particularly nicer year, I always spent more time on the steps outside than I did in here anyway. So I look forward to being on the steps and seeing you from there and continuing to advocate for the causes I believe in, and holding firm to that.

I will get to spend more time with my family and see my daughter, Pippa, and my son, Geordie, and his wife, Brooke, and their daughter, who is my granddaughter, Peyton, a fair bit more I hope and have the flexibility of not being tied to parliamentary duties in order to do so. I might also get to see my brother, Shane, in Queensland a little more. He has given really outstanding support, reaching out when he could see that I was in trouble. Both of us will always deeply miss my brother, Brian, who died by suicide in the time that I was here.

Again, I reflect on the kindness that was shown to me by some members of this place when my brother died by suicide during a sitting week, and I again thank my aunt and uncle for being there through that really difficult time. It is something that you do not want to join the club of, but it is a club that I am a member of, and I do know and acknowledge the work of the Hon. Sarah Game with regard to men's mental health.

I often think my brother would have loved to have been here today. He is never with us for birthdays, for Christmas or for events like this, but I remember him today. He was a bit of a poet and a footballer, so there was an odd assortment in that as well. I think he would have quite enjoyed some of the sex, drugs and rock'n'roll fun that I have had this week.

I want to conclude by noting that one of the suffragists for South Australia, who was part of women getting the vote—which actually means that I could have been here in the first place—Mary Lee, always said, 'Let's always be leaving this place better than we found it,' or, 'Let's be up and doing.' She was embodied by Steph Key, who was always the one to say, 'Onwards and upwards.' When she first would say it, it was always in the face of adversity, and I always thought it was a really black humour thing to say. I came to adopt it myself and use it to uplift me as we faced these challenges. So onwards and upwards, and to use the Ngarrindjeri phrase, 'Nukkan ya.' That is my valedictory; that's it.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr President, is flowers on the floor parliamentary?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, today it is okay.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:35): I would like to thank the mover of this motion, the Hon. Kyam Maher, for making this possible. This is the last time I will be speaking in this chamber, and I am going to try to do something I have not managed in eight years, and that is keeping it short, simple and to the point. I promised my wife not to be gratuitous and certainly not to wallow in any sentiment. She has already warned me that if I start getting too emotional she will stage an intervention from the gallery.

After 46 years in a media career full of experiences, crossing paths with countless colourful and interesting characters, celebrities and events I never imagined would be possible for the school dropout I once was, my life took an unexpected turn in March 2018 when I was elected to public office. Of all things, I became the very person I had spent decades chasing down hallways, pointing cameras at, peppering with questions dipped in hardened cynicism. Sometimes, I still half expect a journalist to jump out from behind a pillar now and shout out, 'Gotcha.' In fact, they already have done it.

There was never any fear or favour in my reporting, except for one man, the person who convinced me to take this leap of faith, Nick Xenophon. Nick and I share the same values: fighting for the underdog; exposing wrongs in our society; fixing the broken and bloated systems of government; and working through legislation to make life better and fairer for our children and grandchildren, the future generations of South Australians. I am eternally grateful for Nick's faith and friendship.

His faith reminds me of a story. A bloke falls off a cliff and grabs onto a branch sticking from the cliff face. As he clings precariously, he looks down at the sheer drop below and calls out: 'Lord, is there anyone up there? Give me faith. Tell me what to do.' Then there is a booming voice, and it answers: 'If you have faith, let go.' He pauses, looks down again, looks back up and says: 'Is there anyone else up there?' That is like politics. There are plenty of voices, not always the ones you want, and sometimes the safest option is hanging on to that branch.

I thought journalism was the best job in the world—the things you learn, the people you meet, the ones you cross, the doors that open, often unexpectedly—but being a parliamentarian has been the most fulfilling and satisfying work I have done. It became an extension of my previous life, still driven by the belief that the stories and struggles of everyday people matter. People counted on me to be their voice, to listen when no-one else was hearing, to see when no-one else was looking, to be part of shaping the history of this state, sometimes in big ways, sometimes in small, but always with purpose.

I am particularly proud of having defibrillators made mandatory in our communities. If just one life is saved because of it, it has been well worth it. The other experience which has stood out is the way this place managed the pandemic, an uncharted catastrophe that confronted us and our thinking. At times, it felt like trying to navigate your way through a blinding blizzard in sheer darkness, praying you did not make the wrong decision or take the wrong turn because of the impact it would have had on all our lives. It affected everybody in the state, in this country and, of course, in the world. It was an extraordinary time.

I have tried to pursue justice when it was cruelly denied, to achieve outcomes that made a genuine difference and to face difficult and divisive issues with honesty and courage, though I suspect not everyone agreed with me all the time—that is politics, too. The community I have met along the way has been extraordinary, diverse, enthusiastic, resilient. From those who welcomed me warmly to those who challenged me fiercely, thank you. You have sharpened my thinking, broadened my compassion and occasionally tested my patience, though I am sure the feeling was mutual.

They say a lesson learned is a lesson earned, and after eight years I have earned a fair few. I have made mistakes. I have never been afraid to admit them, and I have tried to be a better person because of them. I hope I have been trusted and dependable, especially when someone was in desperate need and had nowhere else to turn. Those moments—quiet, unpublicised, sometimes unseen—are the ones that stay with me.

There have been bruising knocks, times I have walked out of this chamber feeling battered, and times I have walked out feeling 10 feet tall—that is something, coming from me. There have been defeats and there have been victories, some small, some significant, that gave me pride and satisfaction. I leave without regret and certainly without feeling like I have failed.

No-one survives eight years in this place without help, and I would like to thank those who stood with me. My staff, loyal, dedicated, occasionally long-suffering: Sean Whittington, my former Chief of Staff and the most ethical and talented media adviser I have come across; Adrienne Gillam, my senior legislative adviser, whom I hold in such great esteem; my indefatigable and proficient office manager, Kim York, who so capably organises my hectic life; and Hugh Salter, a talented adviser who went on to better things. I could not have asked for a more professional team, and those friendships will endure.

My parliamentary colleagues across all parties: who argued with me, collaborated with me and at times wondered, 'What on earth is he doing?' I will single out some here. The Hon. Robert Simms: we are opposed politically, but on a personal level, our relationship has been one founded on mutual respect. The Hon. Russell Wortley: an extraordinary human being, especially for a Labor man, who introduced me to deconstructed milk coffees and his footy multibets. He is an engaging, ageless bloke. I am still searching for a single strand of grey hair in that magnificent mane of his, and I must say his President's portrait is quite impressive.

The Hon. Dennis Hood, who has been a pillar of support and friendship over many years, including before I entered parliament, is a man of courage, faith and conviction. I have great admiration for the Hon. Mr Hood's principles and values, many of which align with mine. Thank you to my Liberal mates and colleagues in here who have welcomed me into the stable.

You, Mr President: I can still recall our first meeting when you and your wife, Donna, extended to me a genuine hand of congratulations the morning after the 2018 election on Norwood Parade. In fact, you had just been re-elected yourself, and the Marshall government had been swept into office. I am really appreciative of your guidance and advice, indulgences of my long brief explanations, your friendship and your words of support and encouragement during some contentious and difficult times we both faced in this place. I wish you the best in your retirement and thank you for your exemplary service.

My sincere appreciation also goes to your predecessors, with whom I became friends. The Hon. John Dawkins' elevation to the job was unprecedented in the history of this place—out of a hat; could you believe it? He held no grudges against me after I confessed to him that I did not vote for him, not once but twice. The Hon. Andrew McLachlan's wise counsel, knowledge and experience was most welcome and still is.

To the committee staff I have worked with, the Clerk, the Black Rod, our attentive and efficient chamber attendants—Super Mario sitting in the corner there; Todd, Charles, Kylie—our diligent librarians, the thorough Hansard reporters who have had to endure my long speeches, thank you. Thanks also to Creon Grantham and his professional catering staff, the every-cheerful Blue Room girls, Nicky, Belinda and Karen, and David Woolman and his team—all the people who keep this place functioning with professionalism and grace.

To all the members of parliament from all sides in here and the other place who are leaving today, I extend my congratulations on their service in their electorates and to the wider community. To the Hon. Tammy Franks, her contributions on the committees that I worked with were extremely astute and valued. She is passionate about all the issues she tackles. Even though I would have been opposed to many of them, I had to really respect the stands that Tammy would take. Outside of this chamber, outside of this place, she is a really decent human being, and she will be missed. As she pointed out, parliamentarians do get an unfair, bad rap from an every-cynical media, but I will be the first to defend most of my colleagues for their work ethic. It is a tough job when you are constantly under scrutiny and under attack.

To my family—my sons, Mark, Alex, his wife, Nina; Connor and our grandsons, Max and Alessandro—thank you for your love, your patience and your honest feedback. It is sometimes a little too honest, particularly from my son Connor. As many would know him, particularly for his connections to the Liberal Party, we had challenges with Connor when he was a young boy. He was diagnosed with having neurodiverse issues and was told at the age of eight he would never make anything of his life and would never finish school. Only last week, I was proud to attend his admission in the courts as a barrister and solicitor. This came after he became dux of the same school that said he would fail.

Furthermore, this week we received more good news that we are expecting another grandchild and also that Connor has been awarded a university medal from Flinders University for his efforts. We are extremely proud of the work that he has put in to be the success that he is. I cannot leave out my exceptional and wonderful wife of 30 years, Angela—or Angel, as I have always called her, because it is a perfect reflection of the type of person she is. She is my anchor, my sounding board and the first to remind me when my speeches or social media posts are getting too long and boring, starting now probably. Thank you for being the caring person you are and standing by me and our family. We are blessed to have you in our lives.

For those who have been asking me, yes, I have started outlining my memoirs. It has become more fascinating and controversial with my time in here. So while this chapter closes, there is still one more to be written for an ending. I leave the Legislative Council with gratitude, with pride and with the hope that the work that we have all done together through the triumphs, the trials and the hard conversations has made this state a little fairer, a little safer and a little better.

Finally, to the people of South Australia: thank you for trusting me. Thank you for giving a former probing journalist, a school dropout and a lifelong seeker of justice and fair play the chance to serve you. It has been an honour. Thank you.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:50): I rise to offer a reply, on behalf of the opposition, to recognise the extraordinary parliamentary careers of three members of this place: the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Frank Pangallo and you, Mr President. Valedictories

remind us in this place that this place works best when people arrive with purpose, work with conviction and depart having left a mark, and the three of you have done exactly that.

I will start with the Hon. Tammy Franks, who is someone who has had over 15 years in this chamber. The Hon. Ms Franks has been one of the most prolific and persistent contributors to public life in South Australia, and the record speaks loudly. By my best count, after sifting through a considerable amount, the honourable member has more than 2,800 references in *Hansard*, has served on 42 parliamentary committees and has advanced 63 pieces of legislation under her name. Few members can point to such breadth.

Her work has touched industrial manslaughter, medicinal cannabis, animal welfare, human rights, workplace safety, protections for the LGBTQ+ community, the Port River dolphins, arts and live music, mental health, First Nations justice, and the issue she and I most vigorously and passionately disagree upon: sex industry law reform.

This is where I want to pause, because the Hon. Tammy Franks and I occupy opposite ends of the political spectrum on many issues. On some matters we not only disagree but disagree fundamentally. We have debated fiercely, sometimes repeatedly, always completely sure of our own position, but never once—never—have those differences diminished the respect we hold for one another and certainly not the deep respect I hold for her. In fact, those differences sharpened that respect because, while we often see the world through very different lenses, I think we have recognised in each other a shared honesty, a work ethic that never wavers and a willingness to argue openly and be transparent with conviction. In this place, that matters.

The Hon. Tammy Franks has never been a member content to sit quietly in the back row. Her tenacity is unmistakable and so is her humour, her patience when it is required, and her impatience when it is demanded, as she has called out hypocrisy, challenged complacency and shaken debates that risked becoming sterile. Yet she is just as capable of generosity: generous with her time, collegial in committee work and respectful of the institutions. From the crossbench she has shaped legislation, influenced government priorities and ensured that voices often unheard were placed firmly on the parliamentary record. I think that has earned the honourable member mutual respect across this chamber.

The Hon. Tammy Franks leaves this place with the genuine respect and good wishes of our team. On behalf of the opposition, I acknowledge her remarkable service to the people of South Australia and her unwavering advocacy for those without a microphone. Whatever comes next, inside or outside of this chamber, history tells us that she will continue to prod, to challenge and to demand that we think a little bit more deeply.

So thank you, Tammy, for your service, your dedication, your persistence and your unmistakable voice in this chamber. I do hope I will continue to see the honourable member, perhaps inside this place but, if not, maybe outside this place—perhaps even in the next footy season, at the Berri Football Club, watching her son, Geordie, and the beloved Berri Demons win next year's premiership flag.

I want to now speak briefly about the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I will do it briefly because it is our firm belief that the honourable member will be back in this parliament, just not in this chamber, after March next year as the member for Waite. However, today we gather to acknowledge the contributions of those retiring from this place and the Hon. Frank Pangallo has unquestionably been a significant contributor to this council. His career is characterised by tenacity, a commitment to public service and an unwavering pursuit of accountability of office holders in public life.

The Hon. Frank Pangallo, following a long and distinguished career in print, radio and TV media, first entered politics as an adviser to Nick Xenophon and was then elected in 2018 as a member of SA Best in this place. We on this side of the chamber are extremely pleased to have welcomed Frank to the Liberal Party in August this year. The honourable member has a long list of achievements in this place, including active participation on many committees, with a particular focus on matters of probity and integrity. One of his most significant achievements was his leadership in delivering world-first legislation to make defibrillators mandatory in public places, reforms that will save lives for years to come.

Today, I want to focus on Frank the person. He has approached every committee, every inquiry and every bill with a reporter's eye for detail and a deep belief that transparency strengthens democracy. He has been guided by what he believes is the best outcome for the community and this commitment and clarity of purpose must be respected. The honourable member has brought a unique approach to his service: as you pointed out in your valedictory speech yesterday, Mr President, we have all become fondly accustomed of Frank's so-called 'brief explanations'. He must hold the record for one of the longest speeches in this place, I am sure—five hours and 21 minutes. With this timing we may well have seen the duration of the honourable member's speeches measured by the calendar rather than the clock.

As we know, the Hon. Frank Pangallo is a committed family man: a father of three, a grandfather and, as the honourable member pointed out earlier, soon to become a grandfather again, and congratulations on that. We must also pay tribute to his family because, while candidates and members sign up for this, families are conscripts. I acknowledge his family and in particular his wife, Angie, in this place. Frank has always been willing to put himself out there for the cause. I am sure we will never forget his willingness to offer critique about the refurbishment of the men's bathrooms in this place. He has brought energy, dedication and humour to his service, and for that we thank him.

This may be a valedictory speech for this place, but I am sure it will also be a 'see ya later'. While Frank is retiring from this place, he is, as we all know, contesting the seat of Waite, where he lives and has long lived, a community he has been a part of for many years. We certainly hope that he will be back in the House of Assembly and, if Frank is successful in his campaign to enter the lower house, those in the other place will probably be slightly pleased that the speeches are capped at 20 minutes. We acknowledge his commitment and application in this place today and we look forward to continuing to work with him as a Liberal team member.

Last, but certainly not least, Mr President, I would like to pay tribute to you and your extraordinary parliamentary career as you prepare to conclude more than two decades of service to the people of South Australia and to this council. Your story, Mr President, is in many respects a story of South Australia itself: grounded, hardworking, honest and always remembering your roots. You have often said, 'You can take the boy out of Whyalla, but you can't take Whyalla out of the boy', and you have lived that truth every single day that you have walked into this chamber.

Elected to this place in 2002, you quickly established yourself as one of the most diligent and level-headed members of our team. You have served under premiers, opposition leaders, ministers and leaders and, through all of it, you have remained exactly the same person: steady, principled and deeply committed to the people who entrusted you with your role.

Across your long career you have held an enormous number of roles: shadow minister across a raft of portfolios (sport, tourism, gambling, correctional services and Aboriginal affairs), Government Whip and, of course, the role that has defined these later years—President of the Legislative Council. Your committee work alone reads like a recent political history of South Australia: Aboriginal lands, Budget and Finance, Natural Resources, corrections, poverty, health services, Valuer-General, Statutory Authorities Review Committee, environment and development, marine parks, electricity, fuel supply, even the O-Bahn and the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. You have been right here in the engine room of nearly every major political conversation that this parliament has grappled with over the past 20 years.

Beyond all the titles, committees, debates and thousands of contributions recorded in *Hansard* what will remain in this chamber is the way that you have treated people. You have been a mentor to our Liberal team, particularly to those of us fortunate enough to sit beside you, to learn from you and to benefit from your sense of calm perspective and, of course, your wine collection, which has offered its own moments of wisdom. You have been the person who could cool the temperature, steady the course and remind us why we are all here whilst you have been in the chair.

I will never forget our introduction. It went a little bit like this, Mr President. You walked straight up to me, stuck out your hand and said, 'G'day. I'm Terry Stephens. I hear you're a bloody good lass from the Riverland who thinks a bit like me, and that's a good thing.' Since then you have been one of my closest friends, and you have been an incredible mentor. I have sought your advice on countless occasions—and I apologise for that—but on every occasion your advice has been generous, honest and sound, and that is something that I will certainly miss.

Your generosity is one of your greatest strengths. It is not a quality often spoken about in politics, but it should be, because you have shown it time and time again. You have backed others, you have supported the team and you have put institutions ahead of yourself. As President, you have been equal parts firm but fair, authoritative yet approachable, and you have protected the dignity of this chamber with seriousness and deep respect.

Presiding over the Legislative Council is not simply a matter of keeping order. It is, as we all know, a bit of an art. It requires judgement, clarity, patience, the occasional well-timed raised eyebrow and a very rare but unmistakable stand up and glare. You have perfected each of these with trademark precision.

It would also be remiss of me not to acknowledge one of your lesser known but highly developed skills—your extraordinary patience in managing the Hon. Russell Wortley's ongoing phone-based contributions to chamber debate. Few presiding officers in the commonwealth have had to rule not only on points of order but on ringtone selection. And, of course, you have spent a good portion of your presidency offering quiet but constant protection to the Leader of the Government in this place, who we all know feels deeply threatened by those of us on this side of the chamber, and in that sense your service has been nothing short of heroic.

Today, as we mark your retirement we acknowledge the personal cost and deep commitment that come with the two decades of public life. Your loyalty to your party, this chamber, your community, your committees and the integrity of parliament has been unwavering. To this end I also extend particular thanks to your wife, Donna, whose support has been integral to your service.

As you step out of public life I know there is one thing that you are looking forward to much more than committee meetings and procedural rulings, and that is time with your family. I hope Donna is equally thrilled at this new opportunity. We will perhaps ask her in about six months' time, but you will finally be able to spend more days with your children, Courtney and Riley, their partners, Fraser and Keela, and of course your beautiful grandchildren, Teddy and Frankie. I truly hope that you enjoy the far more rewarding role of Pa. Something tells me that Teddy and Frankie will not yell at you or interrupt you nearly as much as we all have here in this place, but if they need any lessons feel free to send them our way.

On behalf of the opposition, with genuine affection and deep respect we thank you. South Australia owes you more than what can be captured in a valedictory. This chamber will not be the same without you and nor will our side of it. You leave with our gratitude, our admiration and our very best wishes for the years ahead. Wherever life takes you next, one thing will remain absolutely certain: you can take the boy out of Whyalla, but you will never ever take Whyalla out of the boy. I will miss you deeply—as well as your excellent wine cellar. Congratulations for all that you have achieved in this place. It has been a remarkable career, and we honour you for it.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:04): I just want to speak very briefly about our three retiring members. I have known you all over the period of your careers, except for yourself, Mr President; you were here before me. To the Hon. Ms Franks, who is no longer in the chamber with us, best of luck. I have served on a number of committees with the honourable member, and it has always amazed me how aware she is of all the issues and how she has never been frightened to take someone to task on an issue.

The first experience I had with the Hon. Tammy Franks was around about 2011 when I was a minister. In the first week of parliament as a minister, the opposition moved a no confidence motion in me. Of course, it was all nonsense, it was just a political thing, and I thought to myself, 'Well, they haven't got the numbers here because the Greens and Kelly Vincent will see through it and won't support it.' They did see through it, so they abstained, and the vote got through. I was one of the few who had a no confidence motion moved on me. I wish Tammy, her family, her daughter, all the best.

Frank, you have only been in here eight years, and I have developed a very good relationship with you. You are one of the most tenacious people I know. I did not know you before you got into parliament. I had seen some of your antics on *Today Tonight*. I think you have played a very, very important and contributing role in this place and you do look after the underdog. There are occasions in the morning when I come into parliament when I go to see if Frank wants a coffee, and there is always someone in his room. There is always somebody he is talking to regarding an issue. That is

really refreshing to see. I wish you all the best in the future. Angie, I wish you the best, and I will look forward to catching up with you in the future.

Mr President, there is not much I really can say about you. It has been a great pleasure knowing you, Terry. When I first got into Parliament, I was told that you are an absolute right-wing monster, and to be wary of Terry.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: And it was confirmed.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: And it was confirmed very well, but I found you to be a very decent human being. We all come into this place with the intention of doing good. We just come from different directions. I wish you well, Mr President. You have done a great job as President, and I must say, your portrait out there is almost as good as mine, but it is rustic, and when you look at it you know that is Terry. It is a beautiful portrait. Best of luck. All the best for the future and hopefully I will catch up with you as well for a nice barbecue in Wallaroo.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:07): It has been great hearing the contributions, and I acknowledge the amazing contributions that the members who are leaving have made. I would like to thank them for their service. To the Hon. Tammy Franks, thank you. I must admit, when I first came in here I was a little terrified of you, but I learnt very quickly what a wonderful person you are, Tammy, and the contribution that you have made to our state and to this parliament has been quite exceptional. I wish you all the very best for what lies ahead.

Certainly, obviously, we had different opinions on things, but it has always been a very respectful relationship here with all members across the chamber. I think that is so important and I hope that continues after the election as other people are coming through, but thank you very much. I wish you and your family all the very best.

To Frank, I am very hopeful that we will continue working together after the election. It has been an absolute privilege working with you and having you here within our state team as well, and Angie. I know Connor very well, and you must be incredibly proud of how well he has done. I have known him for many years through the Liberal Party. I think it is great to see him progress, and I wish him all the very best as well. Angie and Frank are a really important part of our team and it is wonderful to be able to speak today, and to hopefully see Frank in the other place after the election as well.

Mr President, I have known you for over 25 years. You have been one of the most supportive and encouraging influences in my political life. From day one you have been someone I go to for advice, honesty, a reality check, or often just for a laugh. I will always be grateful for the support that you have offered.

I remember when you came into parliament in 2002, the first election I had worked on. On election night, we thought that we had won. Sadly, that was not to be the case, but I think it was fantastic that you were able to come in and you have made a genuine contribution to this place and always been approachable as well—qualities that are not always guaranteed in politics but it is really important that that does continue on for someone like Terry. He has been able to make such a wonderful contribution while always making sure that we keep things balanced and are able to have a laugh along the way as well.

On a personal level, I have always loved our chats. We share a passion for the Crows, which means there have been a few highs and a few lows over the years, and we both enjoy a good red wine. To Donna, Riley, Courtney, Fraser and your gorgeous grandsons, they have not only been a great support to Terry but also a great support to our team. I have known the Stephens family for a very long time and was at school with Courtney, who was in the year below me at Loreto. I know what a wonderful family they are and that they are very much looking forward to more time all together.

I do also want to thank Terry. You have always been such a wonderful friend to all of us. From my days in the Young Liberals to my days here in the parliament, it has always been your humour, your friendship and your support and your enormous contribution that you have made to our party, our state and to the chamber. You leave behind a legacy built on fairness, decency and authenticity. We hope that your retirement brings you more time with your family, especially with your grandchildren, a few more wins for the Crows and plenty of good red wine. Thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:11): I was not listed to speak, but I did just want to make a few remarks about our departing members. In particular, I wanted to start by acknowledging you, Mr President, to express my thanks to you as our Presiding Member. I have really enjoyed working with you over the last four years and enjoyed the great sense of humour and the fairness that you have brought to the role. So thank you for that, and I do wish you and your family all the best.

I want to acknowledge the Hon. Frank Pangallo. He and I have our offices next door to each other. I will miss our regular coffee catch-ups, Frank, and often chats in the corridor about various news of the day. I might say, the honourable member and I often have different views on issues, but I have always enjoyed that collegial relationship. Thank you and I do wish you all the best as well.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the Hon. Tammy Franks. Tammy and I have known each other for a very long time. Her contribution to the parliament has been significant. In particular, I want to acknowledge Tammy's work on LGBTI law reform, on drug law reform, and sex work. I think she has really put these issues on the map during the last 16 years, so I also wish her all the best.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Autism) (17:12): I rise today to acknowledge someone I perhaps never thought I would rise to say I would miss. But when I first started my first year, we debated sex work and abortion and I thought, 'My gosh, what have I got myself into here?' These were some very heated moments, but these debates also triggered a complete appreciation for the Hon. Tammy Franks, and while we did not always agree, I wanted to give this speech.

Tammy, you have dedicated so much of your life as an adviser, as we have heard today, as a member of this house and as a party leader, to be a voice for those who often are unheard. You have stood up when others have stepped back and you have carried people's stories into this place with genuine courage.

But we do have a shared interest. Whilst there was a debate in this place, there was also the sales of tickets for the Taylor Swift tour. There was a moment when I got tickets and Tammy had not, and I thought she was going to get very, very angry at me. She is clearly the number one Taylor Swift fan in this chamber. I will never be able to live up to her standards, but I did want to give her some words from Taylor Swift. If you do not understand Taylor Swift, you are going to find this very hard to keep up with. I guess to start with, 'Who's afraid of little old me?' Well, you should be. Because you are fearless, and your questions are always the ones that I was the most afraid of, and you shook off any critics and made the invisible feel visible.

You made change, a real, lasting change, the kind that leaves a legacy and not just headlines. Just like Taylor's The Eras Tour you take us back through every chapter of our success. Your time here has been fearless. You have never been afraid to speak. You represented your values with pride from the red chamber, and like reputation you have been defiant when defiance was required.

You will be folklore in this place and just like Taylor Swift's album, which was named in full after her, you came into this place knowing who you are. You are Tammy Franks, and you will leave having been bold and clear and unapologetic. Just like *Life of a Showgirl*, a story about finding fame, feeling the pressure and ultimately finding the contentment off stage, Tammy, I hope you feel that contentment. You have been successful. Your Eras Tour does not end here, it just moves to a new stage outside this chamber.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (17:15): I will conclude the debate and thank all honourable members who have made contributions: those who have made contributions who are leaving on their own behalf and reflections, and those who have spoken about people's time here.

If you tally up the years that the three leaving members have served in this chamber, it is just two years short of a half century. It is a significant contribution that has been made between the members who are leaving. I will speak a little bit more, but also very briefly, at the end of year wrap-up adjournment debate about each individual member.

A common thread, from what everybody has talked about today, is that we come with very different positions. You can hardly see daylight between the Hon. Tammy Franks and me on nearly every issue. There is a bit more daylight between the Hon Frank Pangallo and me on some issues, but you, sir, do not get to vote on issues sitting up in that chair, so we just do not know what sort of daylight there is. But I thank you for acknowledging how helpful I have been over the past four years in what you are doing.

With a chamber of 22 people it is a really difficult workplace if you do not get along. I think what has been demonstrated here today is that despite very significant differences on some issues, particularly social issues, there is a willingness to work together and a willingness to get along. How could you work with 22 people if you did not have that? Thank you to all members who have made a contribution. I commend this motion to the chamber.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL DROUGHT POLICY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That this council—

1. Note that a national drought policy was established in 1992 to provide a coordinated nationally consistent approach to drought;
2. Acknowledges that throughout the 1990s drought was progressively removed from natural disaster classifications as governments adopted a proactive risk-management framework;
3. Recognises that in 2013 the Intergovernmental Agreement on National Drought Program Reform replace disaster relief measures with preparedness and resilience initiatives, including farm management deposits and concessional loans;
4. Notes that from 2014 drought was formally excluded from national disaster funding arrangements;
5. Acknowledges that the 2013 agreement was reviewed in 2017, with industry groups calling for greater national consistency;
6. Recognises that in 2018 the National Drought Agreement was signed, continuing the emphasis on preparedness, risk management and resilience;
7. Notes that the 2020 Royal commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements identified the policy gap created by the exclusion of drought from natural disaster classifications;
8. Notes that algal blooms, represent an emerging and unprecedented challenge to South Australia and its regions;
9. Notes conflicting views about whether marine environmental disasters, including the algal bloom event in South Australia, are captured under the existing natural disaster frameworks; and
10. Acknowledges calls for a new national framework for managing significant marine mortality events and marine environments disasters whether through a new mechanism or explicit reform of the existing framework.

(Continued from 17 September 2025.)

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:17): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Insert paragraph A1.

- A1. Acknowledges that in 1989 drought was removed from the Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements as governments adopted a proactive risk-management framework, as a result of a review finding that previous drought policy was poorly targeted, distorted farm prices and worked as a disincentive for farmers to prepare for drought;

Paragraph 1:

Leave out 'a' and insert 'the'

After 'approach to drought,' insert 'encouraging preparedness and management of climate variability'

Leave out paragraph 2.

Insert paragraph 2A.

- 2A. Acknowledges that between 1997 and 2012, farmers main source of support relied on exceptional circumstances declarations, which had narrow application and created inequity;

Paragraph 3:

Leave out 'disaster relief measures' and insert 'exceptional circumstances arrangements'

After 'concessional loans' insert ', to assist farm businesses to become better equipped to withstand droughts, which are forecast to increase in frequency, severity and length in many regions;'

Leave out paragraph 5.

Paragraph 6:

After 'resilience' insert 'while also recognising the role of government to assist farmers and rural communities by implementing coordinated and complementary drought policies in accordance with the National Drought Agreement;'

I am standing up today to give the government's response to the National Drought Policy, with an amendment. The national policy relating to drought is constantly evolving, based on continual testing and reviewing of the efficacy of existing and past policies. In September, a National Drought Forum was held in Gawler where the current National Drought Policy was reviewed extensively. In 1989, drought was removed from the Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements. A review found that previous drought policy was poorly targeted, distorted prices and worked as a disincentive for farmers to prepare for drought.

Up until 2012, the Australian government made exceptional circumstances declarations, which was a prerequisite for access to most drought support. EC declarations required three key conditions to be met, being that the drought in question is (1) rare and severe—that is, it must not have occurred more than once in every 20 to 25 years, and must be significant; (2) has resulted in a rare and severe downturn in farm income over a prolonged period of over 12 months; and (3) not predictable or part of a process of structural adjustment.

The decision to close the exceptional circumstances program was based on successive reviews of drought policy which found that those arrangements were inequitable. Eligibility was determined by lines on a map. Some farmers who experienced the same drought as their neighbours were located on the other side of a boundary line and could not access support. This approach was reflected in the 2013 Intergovernmental Agreement on National Drought Program Reform.

The year 2013 was when the current approach to drought was first broadly implemented, with the formal abolishment of the inequitable exceptional circumstances arrangements and replacement with a focus on management and resilience initiatives in a climate where drought is predicted to become more frequent and severe. This approach was taken forward in the National Drought Agreement, which was first agreed in 2018, where the commonwealth and states and territories have agreed to the principle that there should no longer be exceptional circumstances declarations and associated lines on maps. The Premier of South Australia signed the most recent National Drought Agreement 2024-2029 in June 2024.

Algal bloom Senate inquiry submission: the South Australian government made a submission to the inquiry dated 28 August 2025, addressing the inquiry's terms of reference. We have taken action to strengthen the legislative framework by explicitly requiring marine environment emergencies to be incorporated into the state emergency management plan. The South Australian government has advocated for broader national reform and that the disaster recovery fund arrangements would provide an essential mechanism for supporting communities, industries and ecosystems in responding to these complex climate-driven events.

The disaster recovery funding should be amended to specifically include long-onset and complex emergencies, such as harmful algal blooms and biological events. In the event the commonwealth is unwilling to recognise harmful algal blooms and similar events under the disaster recovery funding, an alternative mechanism would be established.

Algal bloom funding: the federal and state governments in July announced an initial joint \$28 million harmful algal bloom support package. The comprehensive package covers industry support, science and research, communications, community support and clean-up. This is in addition to the fee relief measures and the \$1,500 direct support payments to impacted primary producers. The key measures in this harmful algal bloom support package include:

1. Coastal Monitoring Network—investing in expanded early detection and monitoring of harmful algal bloom species through real-time sensors mounted on buoys in the sea, satellite imagery and oceanographic modelling, with rapid detection of harmful algal blooms and early warning systems for industry.

I seek leave to have the remainder of my speech inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

2. New national testing laboratory in South Australia for harmful algal bloom and brevetoxin testing. Currently, samples are sent to New Zealand for analysis, resulting in delays of up to a week
3. Assessment of fish stocks and fisheries to quantify impact, including modelling ecological impacts on near shore marine ecosystems and all sanctuary zones utilising remote underwater video surveys and dive surveys
4. Citizen Science—rapid meta-analysis of citizen science records and documented ecological impacts to provide a baseline understanding from which to assess recovery
5. Develop a dedicated harmful algal bloom response plan for future bloom events
6. A Harmful Algal Bloom Taskforce that meets weekly, with a media conference to follow to keep the public informed on latest developments
7. Public forums for impacted coastal communities and a trusted single point of information and contact for timely, accurate, and clear communication to industry and the public including a single phone hotline, website, consistent physical signage and information
8. Public information campaigns focused on rebuilding confidence and driving visitation to our coastal regions and marine based tourism businesses and promoting the seafood industry and benefits of recreational fishing
9. Community support and clean up initiatives
10. Community Fund to support activities and small projects in affected communities
11. Beach clean-up funding for local government to assist cleaning up dead fish and marine life.

During a visit to Kangaroo Island in August to see some of the impacts of the algal bloom and meet with impacted businesses, Prime Minister Anthony Albanese committed further Commonwealth funds as follows:

12. \$4 million for direct funding to local government for grants to assist those local communities who are dealing with challenges posed by the algae
13. \$2.25 million in targeted scientific research support
14. \$2 million to enhance the monitoring and data collection of marine heatwaves through the CSIRO's water quality system called AquaWatch
15. \$250,000 for algal bloom related research informed by the South Australian Algal Bloom Science Panel through the National Environmental Science Programme.

On 14 October, the Premier announced the \$102.5m Algal Bloom Summer Plan, a comprehensive suite of measures to protect South Australia's coast, back coastal communities and support our summer lifestyle.

The plan, jointly funded by the Albanese and Malinauskas Governments, is the culmination of significant consultation with experts, industry and the broader community and has three core objectives:

16. Ensuring South Australians can enjoy their summer
17. Backing coastal businesses and communities
18. Advancing research and protecting our environment.

This includes more than \$37 million in science and the environment, including \$20.6 million invested in our natural environment for:

19. Large-scale native oyster reef restoration
20. Community shellfish reef restoration
21. Seagrass and blue carbon restoration
22. Threatened and vulnerable marine species breeding.

The Summer Plan also includes a further \$17.3 million for science, research and monitoring, including:

23. Water monitoring and forecasting
24. Offshore water analysis
25. Establish an Office for Algal Bloom Research
26. AI Cytobots
27. Algal bloom mitigation

A further \$48 million is also being invested in backing coastal businesses and communities through the following initiatives:

28. Dining Cashback – up to \$50 off meals across coastal hospitality businesses
29. Travel vouchers – between \$100 and \$500 for coastal experiences and stays
30. Coast is Calling tourism advertising campaign
31. A new round of industry support grants for businesses which have already received a grant and can demonstrate a further three months of downturn, including:
 - Grants of up to \$10,000 for small businesses
 - Grants of up to \$100,000 for fisheries and aquaculture licence holders who have been unable to catch or harvest their usual catch.
 - An additional up to \$25,000 for hardest hit fisheries and aquaculture licence holders to support their workers.
32. An Industry Response and Resilience Program with grants of up to \$150,000 for commercial fisheries and aquaculture licence holders to invest in projects that build business resilience.
33. Extending licensing fee relief for the fishing and aquaculture sectors through to 30 June 2026.
34. Programs to help grow the recreational fishing industry.
35. Supporting industry research and development projects.
36. Grants for coastal recreational facilities.
37. Grants of up to \$20,000 to help promote events in coastal communities.

And more than \$16 million in ensuring South Australians can enjoy their summer, including:

38. 'Between the Flags' beach patrols every day across eight popular beaches
39. Beachsafe app providing up to date information for 23 locations, updated four times per day during summer
40. Daily beach clean-ups along metro and southern beaches
41. Activating school pools to increase swimming pool capacity
42. Active Club Grants for aquatic-based sporting clubs
43. Free access to coastal parks
44. Mental health support programs
45. Keeping South Australians informed through public information campaigns, the official algal bloom website and hotline, community forums and signage.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is granted against the advice of the Clerk. I want that noted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:23): I rise to speak to the motion brought forward by the Hon. Connie Bonaros. I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to the council. We are speaking in favour of this motion because it places on the record something we can no longer ignore, that is, Australia's national disaster framework is no longer fit for purpose.

I indicate that the opposition will not be opposing the government member's amendments, as it is my understanding that the mover of the motion has indicated she is comfortable with those amendments. I also seek leave to have the remainder of my speech inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This motion traces the evolution of national drought policy, from the early 1990s, when drought was still treated as a natural disaster, through to the major reforms of the last decade which shifted governments toward risk-management, preparedness and resilience. Those principles are sound ones. They are principles the Liberal Party has long championed. We believe in strong and self-reliant communities. We believe in proactive preparation and long-term planning.

But Mr President, resilience is not an excuse for neglect. And for the past eighteen months, communities across regional South Australia have been living the consequences of a national system that no longer recognises drought as the devastating event it truly is.

In 2013, a national intergovernmental agreement—the Intergovernmental Agreement on National Drought Program Reform or IGA—was entered into, shifting the focus from exceptional-circumstances declarations and post-drought relief to preparedness and resilience. In essence, drought was formally removed from national disaster classifications.

That created a structural policy gap that the 2020 Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements explicitly warned about.

The Commission could not have been clearer: excluding drought from disaster arrangements leaves governments without the tools they need when slow-onset events become too severe for ordinary preparedness measures to cope.

And we have seen that gap play out in real time—and, in fact, we are still seeing it unfold today.

Farmers, businesses, contractors, local stores, regional towns, every layer of our rural economy, has been hit by a drought that has stretched well beyond what farm management deposits or ordinary risk-planning can absorb. Families in areas which are yet to see sufficient rains are exhausted. Local government is stretched. Industry bodies are pleading for national consistency and clarity. And yet the current national framework provides none of it.

This gap has also allowed the Malinauskas Government to hide behind process rather than take responsibility. Instead of showing leadership and acting decisively, they have used the exclusion of drought from national disaster settings as a shield. The result has been over a year of avoidable hardship, delay and confusion for communities who deserved clarity but all they got was empty headlines and bureaucracy.

The motion also turns our attention to another subject: significant marine environmental disasters.

The harmful algal bloom that has devastated South Australian waters this year has become extraordinary in scale, impact and duration. It has caused mass fish deaths, destroyed incomes, disrupted industries and shaken coastal communities.

Yet, incredibly, it seems unfortunately clear that an event, even of this scale is not captured within the current national disaster framework.

South Australia now has lived experience, very painful experience, Mr President, that events like harmful algal blooms can have consequences every bit as severe as fires, floods or storms. The lack of national clarity has slowed decision-making, complicated coordination with the Commonwealth, and left affected industries unsure of what support they could expect.

That is not acceptable. Not for our fishers. Not for coastal towns. And not for a state that relies on its marine environment for economic and social wellbeing.

Mr President, the South Australian Liberal Party has been consistent in our drought advocacy. We have been clear that droughts should be declared based on formal criteria and advice from local governments and industry bodies. We have said repeatedly that government must be able to activate practical, on-ground supports quickly when communities are in strife. This includes access to truly low- and no-interest concessional loans delivered through a state authority, as outlined in our Drought Response Bill 2025.

Our position has always been simple: take the politics out of disaster response. Establish a permanent, transparent and independent system for immediate response and recovery. When a society is in crisis, it needs clarity.

We know that in the middle of a drought, prevention is no longer the priority. Preparedness must give way to relief. Infrastructure grants and long-term planning are important in normal seasons, but right now, as has been the case for months and months, communities need help they can feel. It needs to be immediate, direct and practical. While our strong preference remains for state-level independence in disaster oversight, including a defined role for a Drought Response Coordinator, the motion before us is a reasonable and tolerable middle ground, especially when compared to the ad-hoc approach of the current government.

Mr President, the Liberal Party believes deeply in building robust and agile communities, but robustness is not built by ignoring reality. A modern disaster framework must recognise that both slow-onset events like drought and sudden environmental shocks like marine mortality events can devastate entire regions. We know all too well that the ongoing exclusion of these events from national arrangements leaves communities more vulnerable than they should ever be allowed to become.

Updating the national framework will not undermine resilience, or preparedness, it will strengthen it. Governments will have the tools to respond when shocks exceed what reasonable preparedness can manage. And it will be far better than the patchwork system communities are currently forced to navigate.

For these reasons, the Liberal Party supports the motion.

Also, for these reasons we will not be supporting the Government amendments put forward by the Hon Mr Wortley, which significantly dilute this motion to the point of uselessness.

The Opposition urges the Commonwealth Government to modernise national disaster classifications and funding arrangements so that drought and significant marine environmental events are properly recognised, both immediately and into the future.

I commend the motion to the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: Again, leave is granted with the absolute disdain of the Clerk.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I do what I am told, Mr President. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: I normally do, too. The Hon. Ms Bonaros to conclude the debate.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:24): Thank you.

Amendments carried; motion as amended carried.

GREYHOUND RACING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

That this council notes that—

1. Greyhound racing is currently legal in only eight countries across the world, specifically being Australia, the USA, the UK, Ireland, New Zealand, China, Mexico and Vietnam;
2. While there are over 50 active tracks in Australia, there are only two operational tracks in the USA, six in New Zealand, 21 in the UK, 17 in Ireland, one in Mexico, and none in Vietnam;
3. New Zealand announced a bipartisan phased ban on greyhound racing in 2024 to take full effect in 2026;
4. Scotland and Wales have recently announced they will soon ban greyhound racing;
5. Tasmania is set to end its funding to greyhound racing by 2029;
6. The ACT banned greyhound racing in 2018; and
7. South Australia is now in the second half of the two-year timeframe first given in late 2023 when the Malinauskas government gave the greyhound racing industry notice to clean up or be shut down; and that to date slow progress is being made to that goal.

(Continued from 15 October 2025.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:24): I believe I am standing to conclude my remarks on the greyhounds motion, and in doing so I seek to update the chamber on some of the latest developments and statistics around greyhound racing across the world, as well as here in South Australia. Indeed, as I previously noted, greyhound racing as a so-called sport is now on its last legs. With that, I seek leave to insert my comments in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Originally began as coursing, greyhound racing as we know it dates back about a century—in the UK, USA and Australia. Elsewhere it never really took hold, whilst in the former jurisdictions it's been in steady decline for decades.

As members may be aware it's now banned in 44 US states with the most recent states to ban it including Arkansas, 2025, Connecticut, 2024 Florida, 2018, Oregon, 2022 and Rhode Island joining 34 other states including Nevada (including Las Vegas, arguably the world's gambling capital) where greyhound racing was banned in 1997.

While it is still legal in Alabama, Iowa, Texas, Kansas and Wisconsin there are no active tracks in these states and racing only actively takes place in one single state (West Virginia) at two tracks and these are linked to legislation supporting a casino in that state—although the casino operators have said they'd be happy for that to be de-linked.

At a federal level in the US a bill with cross party support is currently before the House. The *Greyhound Protection Act of 2025* (H.R. 5017) will not just prohibit dog racing nationwide but also bars US gamblers from betting on foreign races and will block the export of American dogs for racing elsewhere. This groundbreaking measure is

endorsed by over 250 shelters, animal protection groups and civic organizations across the country and around the globe.

Members will have received correspondence from US legislators advising them of this initiative and I have written back pledging my support. In Australia similar legislation banning online gambling on greyhound racing was just introduced in the House of Representatives with Andrew Wilkie's *Interactive Gambling Amendment (Ending Online Wagering on Greyhound Racing) Bill 2025* introduced this Monday with an aim to ban the online wagering that is propping up this deeply unpopular and cruel industry.

In the UK where greyhound racing was once seen as a sport for the working man the sector too is on its last legs. As I've mentioned previously both Scotland and Wales have announced plans to ban greyhound racing with the Welsh Deputy First Minister, Huw Irranca-Davies saying in February this year *now* is the right time to move to ban greyhound racing in Wales.

A Welsh government consultation on a national model for animal welfare, received over 1100 responses. Within that, a question asking for evidence and views on a phased ban of greyhound racing found almost two thirds of respondents were in favour.

Popular support for the move was also reflected in a petition in support of a ban on greyhound racing in Wales receiving over 35,000 signatures.

It's no surprise—greyhound racing has attracted growing and continuing scrutiny due to a litany of animal welfare abuses that have been exposed, with serious governance issues and drug cheating being detected across all Australian states.

We have now had legislated inquiries in Victoria, Queensland (2015), and in NSW in 2016 and *again* last year in 2024 after yet *more* damning allegations of poor animal welfare standards, governance and the operations of GRNSW following the NSW Chief Veterinary Officer Dr Alex Brittan turned whistleblower—with bombshell allegations around track safety and animal welfare. Dr Brittan revealed harrowing allegations of cruelty in his report including where he alleged that there are vets known by the industry who will willingly euthanise high numbers of greyhounds and named two corrupt vets who he says were responsible for half the euthanasia in New South Wales.

These revelations forced the NSW Government to establish yet another inquiry. The Drake Inquiry conducted by that states Greyhound Welfare Integrity Commission (GWIC) and headed by Acting Commissioner Lea Drake concluded its public hearings and submitted its report to the Minister approximately 12 months ago — yet the final report and any recommendations have not been published. One might wonder exactly what they have to hide?! Time will no doubt tell.

Dr Brittan's initial report gives us some idea though: Dogs were raced at 'barbaric' intensity, some dogs locked in metal cages (for up to 23 hours a day as we know) and re-homing figures were inflated.

Dr Brittan wrote, and I quote: 'There are cases of extreme distress, deep claw marks gouged all over the inside of metal cages and recent pools of blood from toenails that had been ripped off from clawing at the cage door in distress'. For a so-called 'industry' that professes to love its animals it sure has a funny way of showing it.

Now since I previously spoke on this motion, the Liberal Government in Tasmania has introduced legislation (on Nov 6th) to end the code by 30 June 2029. The *Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025* will provide the framework to deliver on this promise.

A *Joint Standing Committee on Greyhound Racing Transition* has been formed and is working together to oversee and progress the phaseout. This is certainly the next step that I hope South Australia will take — once the GIRI produces his final report at the end of the two-year period in the middle of next year — unfortunately after the next election and the scrutiny that that would bring to the issue however.

Members might be familiar with the noted economist Saul Eslake — his recent report '*The financing of greyhound racing in Tasmania*' makes a compelling case for the sector to cease getting government funding.

While his conclusions are quite-Tasmania specific, there are commonalities with other states greyhound sectors; all have attracted growing scrutiny due to animal welfare abuses and integrity and governance concerns (which led to the ACT banning it in 2018); and it is in decline pretty much everywhere.

Falling attendances at race meetings, fewer dogs starting, significant reductions in amounts wagered (compared to other racing codes and overall) and an over-estimation of the economic contribution it claims to make to employment. In Tasmania despite the government's largesse, it amounts to only 0.2% of gross state product and total employment.

The economics of greyhound racing across Australia indeed make for some disturbing reading. Bernard Keane in a recent Crikey article highlights the Parliamentary Library study into the economics of the greyhound sector commissioned by NSW Greens Federal Senator Mehreen Faruqi showing the annual bill to taxpayers from greyhound racing in Australia adds up to over a *quarter of a billion dollars*!

What did taxpayers get in return?

Well, hundreds of dead greyhounds and thousands more injured for starters!

The take home message was despite massive taxpayer funded subsidies greyhound racing is a massive money loser – making losses in every state – bar SA and WA where a small surplus is returned.

Referring to the study, Keane noted:

'Government funding totalled around \$194 million in direct handouts to the industry in 2024 around Australia, and another \$60 million dollars for publicly funded regulating bodies. The total figure however is likely a significant underestimate given that government funding for industry-controlled regulators in several states isn't made available to the public, and the figure doesn't include capital grants to 'upgrade' dog racing tracks, the costs which runs into millions per track.'

Keane continues:

'Parliamentary Library data allows taxpayers to find out what their money has purchased in terms of canine pain and misery'

'Based on dog trauma data collected by the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds for 2024, NSW taxpayers bought 17 dead dogs, (remembering these are only the greyhounds killed at the track, not injured dogs killed afterwards by owners unwilling to pay veterinary bills), 938 major injuries and 4,240 injuries with their \$48 million dollars in 2024. Victorians achieved much better value for their money, buying 46 dead dogs, 605 major injuries and 3,329 other injuries for their \$48 million. Queenslanders got 20 dead dogs, 315 major injuries and 1,865 other injuries, while West Australians got 23 dead dogs, 140 major injuries and over 600 other injuries. South Australian taxpayers can reflect on money well spent with 17 dead dogs and 242 major injuries for just \$2.5 million in taxpayer handouts. In Tasmania, just two dogs were killed in 2024, there were 40 major injuries and 282 other injuries.'

Senator Mehreen Faruqi called taxpayer handouts '*obscene and sickening*', noting that greyhound racing would have vanished long ago without the taxpayer largesse and I concur. '*Greyhound racing lost its social license years ago, yet shameless governments across Australia continue to pour hundreds of millions of public dollars into this deadly industry... Gambling and racing have their hooks deep in the Labor and Liberal parties and the only way to end the misery of the greyhounds is to ban greyhound racing for good.*'

While we do not have the benefits of Saul Eslake deconstructing the SA greyhound sector, we do have GRSA's own Annual Reports (noting the 2023-24 Annual Report is the most recent available) which demonstrate a sector in terminal decline.

GRSA's 2015–16 Annual Report counted 180 licensed breeders. By 2024 there were only 121—a 33% decrease. Trainer numbers over the same period have declined from 386 to 222, a 42% drop. This is a concern as the Ashton Review identified, given a diminished trainer pool increases integrity risks. Fewer independent participants create more conflicts of interest.

The biggest decline however is among registered owners and handlers, sinking from 1,401 to 575, a 59% fall. These three groups of breeders, trainers, and handlers are the only people genuinely financially involved in racing and represent the true operational capacity of the sector.

This collapse also exposes how inflated the industry's employment claims are. GRSA routinely counts anyone loosely connected to racing as a job, including syndicate members who have never met the greyhound, hospitality staff near a track, and vets who treat injured greyhounds.

Racing SA's recent IER report assessing the economic, social and community benefits of the South Australian racing industry for 2023/24 included thoroughbred, greyhound, and harness racing in South Australia, but just doesn't stack up. There are serious shortcomings with this report— and it lacks credibility.

Notably the report itself admits it's based on self-reported data from GRSA and the estimates provided may be subject to '*level of duplication*'. A similar report was produced by IER in 2023 funded by Racing and Wagering Western Australia (RWAA) to assess similar economic and employment data for greyhound racing in Western Australia during the 2021-22 financial year.

In February 2024 however a review of the report by economist Sebastian Broadhurst (published by the group Free the Hounds) found that the report '*presents a series of misleading assertions and faulty analysis that aims to justify taxpayer support for the greyhound industry.*' This included '*counting the same individuals performing multiple roles as separate people*' which represented '*an overstatement of more than 8 times*' the actual employment figures when compared to average worker numbers in the racing industry as published in ABS data. [Data from 2021-22 found an average of 1,235 FTE employees in the racing industry in Western Australia, while the IER report claimed 10,249 FTE employees.]

In South Australian the figures seem similarly inflated – examination of the publicly available data published by ABS indicates that during the May 2025 quarter there were approximately only 600 in SA employees in dog and horse racing activities, (however it was not possible to isolate what percentage of those employees worked specifically in dog racing).

Clearly therefore GRSA's claims to sustain 1,684 jobs (including 254 volunteers) should be taken with a rather large grain of salt.

This is corroborated by the Ashton Review's industry participant/staff survey [page 107] showing that 71% of breeders and trainers identify as hobbyists, meaning they do not meet any reasonable definition of full-time employment.

The organisational chart in the Ashton Review [page 106] also shows a small corporate workforce, nowhere near enough to support the industry's employment claims.

While Eslake notes attendances in Tasmania have declined relative to government expenditure, it is not possible to directly determine the situation in SA as GRSA does not publish attendance figures in any annual report. We can extrapolate however from proxies such as 'Food, Beverage, and Gaming' revenue, which while it increased from \$4.87 million in 2015–16 to \$6.85 million, this is essentially accounted for by inflation. Given GRSA now runs more than 1,100 additional races per year than a decade ago, flat revenue actually suggests lower attendance per race night.

However, I'd argue attendance is no longer a meaningful performance indicator, because as the Ashton Review noted, structural changes within the sector have shifted greyhound racing away from community engagement. Most wagering now is online and dog racing today operates primarily as a business responding to the needs and timing of corporate bookmakers, rather than as a community activity.

While Saul Eslake uses race starters as a metric to highlight trends, this is potentially misleading in the SA context. Race starters do not account for individual dogs racing multiple times, the shift to six-dog fields, or the increased frequency of races.

GRSA reports 32,377 race starters at SA tracks in the last annual report. While the number of races has risen from 3,855 to 5,016 since 2015–16, six-dog fields mean each race is intentionally smaller – a move supported by corporate bookmakers while the TAB strongly opposed them.

Many experts, including the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds who I acknowledge have assisted in my research, are fundamentally opposed to using race starters as a performance metric because they are often manipulated to sanitise poor statistics and, at best, are unreliable due to numerous variables specific to SA.

The industry also uses race starters to understate the impact of injuries by representing harm as a percentage of starters, with an overall injury rate of 2.95%. However, what we know from analysis of the GRSA's own reported Category F data indicates that the severity and frequency of injuries are the highest in Australia relative to the size of the SA industry. The Ashton Review also highlights that this approach is misleading and underreports the severity of harm. Overall, focusing on race starters does not reflect industry health or efficiency and ignores welfare and rehoming pressures.

Industry-commissioned IER modelling can provide long-term comparisons but is well known to inflate economic activity. A far clearer indicator of real employment is the number of registered breeders, trainers, and handlers, the people who actually do 'hands-on work'. All three categories have collapsed while government funding has increased significantly under this current government. The result is an industry becoming more dependent on public money as its genuine workforce shrinks.

The Ashton Review made a broader point that is relevant here. It noted that relying heavily on one income source can distort organisational priorities and drive decision making that undermines other goals. This does apply to South Australia. GRSA's overwhelming reliance on wagering revenue, supplemented by government support, means sustaining that income stream often becomes the primary organisational focus.

Meanwhile we know that putting profits ahead of principles mean the animals suffer.

Members will be familiar with the damning Ashton Review and its two-year timeline the review granted to GRSA to acquit the 86 recommendations, so it's appropriate to reflect now – nearly three quarters of the way through the given timeline how that's tracking.

While the GIRI informs us that 47 of the 87 recommendations of the Ashton Review have been acquitted, it remains unclear as to how the GIRI has determined that, and on what basis he has signed off on many of the recommendations.

While I supported the establishment of the role of the GIRI, his published progress reports to date raise serious questions about how and why they've been signed off on.

Some specific examples are the GIRI's midway report noting the RSPCA recommendation 7 to increase penalties for banned substances as 'complete.' Yet, from the (limited) Internal Hearing Panel report outcomes on GRSA's website there is a significant pattern of *reduction* in sentences and fines for doping in the 2023-2024 period. For example, two individual trainers in this state that had a disqualification for positive swabs of methamphetamine and testosterone were substantially reduced on appeal during 2024. In fact, Zipping Elke (who was given methamphetamine, was transferred to another trainer and was raced and making money while the original trainer served a short-lived suspension which was quickly overturned. This is a matter of public record. How does the GIRI, reconcile his finding of 'completion' with the reality that the most serious penalties are being systematically undermined? How can the independent inspector, sign off on a recommendation as 'completed' when the practical application of it by the industry itself is failing? When questioned in the Budget and Finance Committee he was unable to explain or detail the specific metrics that were used to determine completion.

The GIRI signed off on the recommendation to pursue prosecution for breaches of the *Animal Welfare Act*, yet in the highly publicised case of trainer Jack Trengove, the RSPCA confirmed that GRSA made no contact to pursue a prosecution.

How can this be reform be considered 'complete' when the most fundamental step the active pursuit of accountability is not being taken by the industry the GIRI is supposed to be overseeing?

GRSA's model maintains a self-regulating framework. The GIRI's one-year progress report (if you can find it buried deep with the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing's website) contains very little of the specific, verifiable data the public would need to determine for themselves whether change is really happening or not. The Premier said we '*will not be taking the industry's word for it*,' yet the GIRI's progress report appears to do exactly that. His report includes no raw data, only broad statements of progress. What are the specific data points that underpinned his assessment for all 41 completed recommendations? For example, regarding Recommendation #25 on track safety, what are the key injury rate trends that showed this was completed?

In SA we know from the GRSA's own reporting the rate of category F injuries – this includes major fractures, sever soft tissue tears and injuries requiring 60+ day stand downs are the highest in the nation.

On what basis could anyone claim that reforms related to animal welfare and track safety are 'complete'?

While the GRSA Animal Welfare Policy recommends dogs '*should*' have 30 minutes of daily exercise, rather than mandating it, the GIRI admitted he had not conducted any unannounced inspections of kennels to verify that this is actually happening. Yet even if he had, it'd be impossible for him to know or confirm whether kennels were fulfilling their obligations other than by taking them at their word. How then could he sign off on this this recommendation?

But even if kennels are following this to the letter, the reality is that greyhounds can therefore be confined for up to 23.5 hours a day in their kennels!

The public was promised independent oversight, however an inspector who receives reports from the industry and takes them at face value does not meet that test.

The reality is the GIRI's process to date has been a 'tick and flick,' public relations exercise for the government rather than any genuine audit of reform.

The *Greyhound Industry Reform Inspector Act* gives the GIRI the power to compel information and inspect premises. He has publicly spoken about his engagements with over 300 people, yet apparently not one of those people provided him with information significant enough for him to use his legal power to compel GRSA to provide further information. As a former Racing Integrity Commissioner in Victoria, a role with investigative powers, the GIRI should be uniquely qualified to understand the difference between oversight and enforcement – especially as the reforms in that state made no outcome to overall injury and death rate.

While the Premier has told us this reform is so important, he has set up a model with a toothless inspector to oversee a self-regulating industry.

You can but wonder whether the GIRI's role is part of a political strategy to appear to be doing something, while leaving the industry free to continue with business as usual?

It is clear the government has put the onus for upholding integrity and welfare squarely back on the very industry that has already failed to police itself.

Even after the halfway point –the SA greyhound racing sector is still self-regulated with no enforceable animal welfare code and no published birth to death traceability system.

Why is the sector still offering breeding incentives? This only adds to the rehoming burden placed on the South Australian community, when recent research suggests up to ¼ of the greyhounds being adopted in SA are being returned, for a variety of reasons.

Amongst the Ashton Reviews' most shocking revelations were its finding that, due to a loop-hole in local racing rules, greyhounds retired to sector participants in SA can be euthanised or killed, and with no tracking system to capture the individual dog's status we do not know how many retired or unraced greyhounds (i.e. commercially unviable dogs) rejected by the sector are being killed in SA.

Closing this loophole should have been prioritised.

Recommendations that directly impact dog welfare still haven't been implemented, e.g. (GRSA's Rec #39) that requires greyhound housing to be of a certain size, and (RSPCA Rec #24) that requires participants to be trained in animal welfare. Given the incidents of cruelty highlighted by the review and by the media, it's inexplicable why these haven't been prioritised!

Less than a quarter of the recommendations to address the greyhound rehoming problem have been enacted. These include RSPCA Recommendation #15 calling for GRSA to verify and follow up all third-party adoptions (i.e. non-GAP), properly fund their GAP program, and publishing an audit of all retired and non-raced dogs in the program prior to adopting a lifecycle tracking system (e-Trac) have not been enacted either as per Recommendations #52 & #54).

Neither have recommendations to enforce breeding caps and require the home states of interstate dogs coming to SA to take responsibility for their rehoming (Rec #55 & AJP Rec #8). The community has limited rehoming capacity and with some research suggesting a return rate of up to 25% of the greyhounds being adopted in SA, this problem seems insurmountable.

More fundamentally, there is still no birth to death tracking system (e.g. eTrac) for greyhounds in line with GRSA Rec #17, RSPCA Rec #14 and AJP Rec #9).

Nor has Freedom of Information legislation been amended as per AJP Rec #13 to ensure that the South Australian greyhound racing industry is not exempt from scrutiny and is open and transparent about its conduct.

Then there are concerns about the reform process itself.

Community confidence in the process is undermined by the difficulty the average person has in locating the GIRI Progress reports. Neither do these reports detail the frequency of follow-up monitoring or how it will ensure ongoing compliance.

With the GIRI stating that reducing the rate of greyhound injuries is specifically not in his terms of reference either, the community at large is right to be sceptical of the reform progress to date.

This is made worse by the Parliament failing to subject GRSA to FOI legislation when it had the chance—as every other greyhound regulatory body nationwide is (bar the NT). SA remains, along with WA and Victoria the only states to allow oversight of animal welfare to remain with the commercial operators who have a clear and overarching financial vested interest in maximising gambling income and cash returns. While NSW, Queensland and Tasmania at least maintain welfare and integrity commissions at arms-length from the commercial racing aspects GRSA remains hopelessly conflicted.

GRSA's promised to eliminate unnecessary euthanasia in 2016 – yet without the transparency of FOI or birth to death tracking systems how can the public ever know exactly what happens behind closed doors?

GRSA promised in 2016 that '*none of the [live baiting] issues that plagued NSW... exist in SA*'... well, we all know now just how that hollow that reassurance turned out to be.

Premier Malinauskas' promises to ban puppy factories meanwhile will mean nothing if he does not address one of the worst offenders – the SA greyhound racing sector.

It is clear that this Government delaying the commencement of the GIRI until July 2024 will mean the inspector's final report won't be delivered until after the election next March and will avoid the scrutiny of the people at the ballot box.

I can only hope that the GIRI will do his job with due diligence and regard for the welfare of the animals at the centre of this sector – animals who have no choice but to run for their very lives, and will come to the inevitable conclusion as other jurisdictions have – that greyhound racing is a relic from a bygone era, that it is incompatible with what the general public expect of animal welfare in this day and age and it must be phased out as soon as possible.

I can only hope whoever is in this place in the next Parliament will consider the GIRI's report very carefully when it is finally delivered and act accordingly to stop this cruel and harmful gambling-driven industry before it is responsible for yet more greyhound deaths in pursuit of profit above principle.

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

Bills

CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (INTERGENERATIONAL EQUITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 September 2025.)

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:25): I rise very briefly in support of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction (Intergenerational Equity) Amendment Bill. This bill will amend the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 and make related amendments to the Parliamentary Committees Act.

The amendment, if passed, will require that the health and wellbeing of children and future generations in this state will be at the front of mind for key decisions made under acts that deal with energy, mining, planning and development and any other acts prescribed by regulation. South Australia has declared a climate emergency, but we are not treating it with the urgency that it requires. We are not looking ahead to the future, and we are not taking climate change into consideration as part of all of the decisions we make. I welcome this bill's focus on the needs of future generations and commend it to the chamber.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:26): I rise to speak on the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction (Intergenerational Equity) Amendment Bill 2025. I thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for bringing this bill to the council, but I indicate that the opposition will not be supporting this bill. I seek leave to insert my speech in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Opposition recognises her genuine commitment to the welfare of children, seen through this and her further advocacy across the Child Protection legislation space, and of course, to the future of our environment.

The Liberal Party believes profoundly in stewardship—of our environment, our economy, and the opportunities we safeguard for future generations. But we also believe Mr President, that stewardship is not achieved through additional layers of bureaucracy or processes that look impressive on paper yet deliver little in practice.

Good environmental policy must *work* Mr President—on the ground, in the regions, in our industries, and in our communities. It must plant the trees, restore the habitats, improve the water quality, and strengthen the ecosystems we all rely on. What it cannot be is a cycle of ever-expanding paperwork that slows down genuine environmental improvement while creating the illusion of progress.

Mr President, we on this side of the chamber believe that environmental leadership is not measured by the number of assessments or procedural hurdles imposed on decision-makers. It is measured by real, measurable outcomes: healthier soils, cleaner water, restored reefs, thriving biodiversity and resilient landscapes. That is the Liberal approach—practical, evidence-based action that delivers outcomes rather than obstacles.

This Bill proposes a new, mandatory Child Rights Impact Assessment for a wide range of administrative decisions. Decisions involving energy, planning, infrastructure, mining, and environmental approvals. It imposes obligations that go well beyond the existing, extensive safeguards already embedded across these Acts. It requires decision-makers to consider not only direct emissions, but also downstream and upstream emissions, including scope 3, over the lifetime of a project.

It would bind our decision-making to assessment tools created by the Australian Human Rights Commission, an organisation that may do important work but is not a regulatory authority, nor has any accountability to this Parliament or the people of South Australia.

This Bill, however well-intentioned, risks substituting practical environmental progress with procedural complexity. It adds another mandatory assessment regime to areas already governed by some of the most rigorous environmental and planning requirements in the country. It creates more red tape, more uncertainty, and more delay, without necessarily planting one additional tree or improving one hectare of natural habitat.

That is not the path to a stronger, more sustainable South Australia.

The Liberal Party believes in empowering innovation, supporting sustainable industry, partnering with community groups who are restoring landscapes, and delivering the infrastructure and programs that practically improve our environment. This is how we achieve intergenerational responsibility—not through duplicative frameworks, but through tangible, enduring environmental gains.

Mr President, South Australia already has robust environmental protections. Our frameworks already consider long-term impacts. And we already have obligations under the Climate Change Act.

From opening up greater recreational spaces for first-hand environmental participation, to circular economy innovations, to biodiversity protection, and water security projects, Liberal governments have delivered real, practical environmental outcomes.

The question before us today is not whether we care about children. We all do. The question is whether this legislation makes our State better governed, more competitive, and more sustainable.

I think there is a real risk with a burdensome, duplicative framework in deterring investment, slowing major projects, and injecting subjectivity into decisions that must be clear, consistent, and evidence-based. It would potentially undermine certainty for the industries that employ tens of thousands of South Australians and sustain our regions.

And most critically, it sends a message that our young people are defined by fragility rather than strength. I truly do have an issue with that Mr President. That is not the message they need.

Young people's mental health is reported, constantly, as at an all-time critical impasse. They need confidence. They need opportunity. They need a State that believes in their capacity to thrive.

Mr President, stewardship requires balance. It requires ensuring that decisions support both environmental protection and economic growth. It requires respecting the role of families and communities. And it requires legislation that strengthens South Australia's future, not legislation that complicates and constrains it.

For these reasons, the Opposition cannot support the Bill.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:26): I would like to advise the chamber that the government will indicate our support for the principles of taking action on climate change and reducing emissions in relation to this bill. This is evidenced by the fact that, just last sitting week, this chamber unanimously passed a government motion reaffirming our commitment to net zero by 2050. We will support the second reading stage of the bill to enable it to be further considered. We have not had time to properly consult on the impacts of the bill, so we are not in a position to progress it any further than the second reading stage today. We will reserve our right on our support of the bill for future stages.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:27): I rise to thank those members who have made a contribution: the Hon. Robert Simms, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and the Hon. Ian Hunter. I thank the government for their consideration. I would also like to thank Senator David Pocock and the duty of care team, on whose work I and my team have drawn. Additionally, there was a truly inspiring breadth and depth of stakeholder responses to that bill, too, that we will be very happy to provide the government with. I commend my adviser Joanna Wells for all of her extensive work on this.

I note also the support and engagement of Parents for Climate Action; Doctors for the Environment; the Environmental Defenders Office; the Law Society of South Australia; Melbourne Climate Futures, which is based at the University of Melbourne; Comms Declare; Jesuit Social Services; the Australia Institute; and the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, just to name a few. They, just like I, want the best possible world for their children and grandchildren.

Many of the responses that were received on the Pocock bill called for it to go further and suggested improvements, so we have drawn on those, too. I wish to acknowledge the work and thoughtfulness for our children and future generations that went into those submissions. With that, I seek leave to insert the rest of my comments in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

In 2024, 90% of global CO2 emissions came from burning fossil fuels, and yet we plan to produce more than double the fossil fuels in 2030, than is consistent with keeping warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius.

We can't simply keep burning fossil fuels, increasing our emissions and try to offset our way to net-zero.

We can't plant our way out of this either. To achieve net zero through tree planting, we need a billion hectares, an area larger than the United States of America.

Only seven G20 members are on track to achieving their nationally determined contributions targets. Few are even on a clear trajectory towards their net-zero emissions pledges.

Much of the rise in fossil fuel electricity emissions may well be due to a hotter climate. Heat related events around the world and on most continents during 2024 consistently drove temperatures above 45 degrees. The direct cost of climate-linked disasters since 2000 has reached more than \$US18 trillion since the year 2000.

The Greenland and Antarctic West ice sheets may well have already passed critical tipping points, and the Gulf Stream, which controls global climate, is weakening. We're in significant trouble when it collapses. Based on the pledges currently in place, the world is heading for up to 2.8 degrees of warming.

If we don't drive emissions down rapidly and sharply, future generations will pay heavily for our inadequate action.

Happily, in many cases, mitigation aligns with economic growth, job creation and energy security: we have no reason not to embrace the changes required of us to drive down emissions.

The recent International Court of Justice opinion on the obligations of states with respect to climate change states clearly that climate obligations are not aspirational; they are legal, they are substantive, and they are enforceable.

In the words of Inger Andersen, the executive Director of the UN Environment Program: Climate action is not philanthropy; it is national self-interest.

Acting in the best interests of future generations is also not philanthropy.

That too, is blatant self-interest: for when we make decisions that positively impact on our children, every single one of us does better.

Bill read a second time.

Motions

THE SOCIETY OF SAINT HILARION

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:29): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates The Society of Saint Hilarion on its 70th anniversary in October 2025;
2. Recognises that the society was founded as a cultural and religious body in 1955 by a passionate group of Italian migrants and is named after the patron saint of Caulonia, in Southern Italy;
3. Notes that the society owns and operates two beautiful facilities, namely the House of Saint Hilarion and Villa Saint Hilarion, where both facilities embrace the best of the rich Italian culture, faith, traditions and values for caring for families and community;
4. Acknowledges the founding members, current and past chairpersons, board members, executive management team, staff, sponsors, and volunteers of The Society of Saint Hilarion for their dedication and contribution to aged care and community care services in Adelaide; and
5. Commends The Society of Saint Hilarion for 70 years of cultural and community contributions, including the Feast of St Hilarion festival, aged care facilities, community care, and pastoral care for Adelaide's multicultural community.

It is a great honour to rise today to move this motion to congratulate The Society of Saint Hilarion on reaching a significant milestone of its 70th anniversary in October 2025. This milestone is an extraordinary achievement that is testament to the vision, leadership and community spirit that drive this remarkable organisation. I seek leave to insert the remainder of my speech in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Society of Saint Hilarion had humble beginnings. It was founded in 1955 when a group of passionate Italian migrants from Southern Italy came together to preserve their cultural and religious traditions in their new home of South Australia. The society was named after Saint Hilarion, the patron saint of Caulonia, a small town in the region of Calabria, and over the past seven decades it has grown into a respected and much-loved institution in our state.

What started as a cultural and religious body has evolved into a leading provider of aged care and community services, while continuing to uphold the values of family, faith, and community that inspired its founders.

I was proud to move a similar motion in 2015 to congratulate the Society of Saint Hilarion on its 60th anniversary—it is truly remarkable to be here again ten years later to acknowledge the significant contributions of such an iconic multicultural organisation.

I wish to acknowledge and commend the founding members, past and present presidents, board members, staff, volunteers and community supporters who have worked tirelessly to maintain and grow the legacy of community service at the heart of the society.

While many families were instrumental in the development of the Saint Hilarion community, it was the Ciccarello, Costa, Fazzalari and Lamberto families who were instrumental in bringing the community of new migrants together, who had arrived in South Australia with very few possessions and practically no English.

In 1955, the society held the first Feast Day of Saint Hilarion, a tradition that has been continued every year for seven decades, becoming one of the largest and most beloved events of its kind on South Australia's multicultural and religious calendar.

In the late 1980s, the society made a bold decision to enter in the aged-care sector to deliver much-needed culturally specific services and support for the ageing Italian community. In 1987, the society purchased an existing 50-bed residential facility at Lockleys and built two more aged-care homes in Findon and Fulham, enabling them to cater for older people across Adelaide.

Today, the society owns and operates two aged care facilities, the House of Saint Hilarion, a stunning 122-bed facility in Seaton, and the Villa Saint Hilarion, with spacious individual villas for 54 residents. These facilities are more than just aged-care homes; they are vibrant community hubs that reflect the richness of Italian culture and traditions. Residents enjoy compassionate care in a warm, inclusive environment, supported by programs that nurture physical, mental, and spiritual wellbeing.

While more than half of their residents are of Italian descent, the society is a true leader in multicultural aged care, welcoming people of all cultures and religious beliefs to experience their care, compassion and feeling of community.

I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank and congratulate the Chair of the Board, Rosemary Velardo, the Chief Executive Officer, Vincenzo Libri, and Chair of the Religious and Cultural Committee, Vince Greco, for their steadfast leadership and contributions to the society.

Their leadership and commitment has ensured that The Society of Saint Hilarion continues to thrive and serve not only the Italian community but all South Australians who value care, compassion, and cultural heritage.

It was an honour to join the society to celebrate its seven decades of community service at the 70th anniversary gala dinner on Saturday 18 October 2025. It was a spectacular and elegant event, celebrating the legacy and tradition of the society and the many families and individuals who have contributed to its growth and success over the years.

The celebration continued the following week with the 70th Anniversary Feast Day of Saint Hilarion held at Mater Christi Parish Church, Seaton. More than 150 dedicated volunteers supported this wonderful event, and I wholeheartedly congratulate Rosemary, Vince, and the entire organising team for an incredible celebration of the enduring spirit of faith and community.

The Mayor of Caulonia in Italy, Dottore Francesco Cagliuso, was a special guest at the Anniversary Gala and Feast Day, highlighting the strong connection that continues to exist between the society and its origins in Caulonia and its foundation in tradition.

The 70th anniversary of the Society of Saint Hilarion is a testament to the vision, dedication and hard work of everyone involved. Its significant achievements and contributions would not be possible without the tireless efforts and dedication of the board, staff and volunteers, whose leadership has helped guide this organisation over the past seven decades.

The society continues to evolve, adapting to the changing needs of its residents and the shifting aged care landscape—but it always remains committed to its mission of providing culturally specific care and exceptional services to the South Australian Italian community.

It is a great honour to recognise this significant milestone today and wish the Society of Saint Hilarion a very happy 70th anniversary and a very bright future ahead.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NOT-FOR-PROFIT HOSPITALS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms:

That this council—

1. Notes that not-for-profit hospitals such as Burnside Hospital, Glenelg Community Hospital, North Eastern Community Hospital and the Stirling Hospital play a pivotal role in providing health care for local communities.
2. Recognises that these hospitals partner with local health networks to deliver critical services, playing an important role in reducing the patient load burden on public hospitals.
3. Notes that the new national standards introduced by the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care, in particular standard AS4187 (now AS5369):
 - (a) imposes tighter minimum requirements for health service organisations' compliance with reprocessing of reusable medical devices in health service organisations; and
 - (b) will necessitate major multimillion-dollar infrastructure upgrades at some health service organisations to remain compliant.
4. Calls on the Malinauskas government to make available no-interest loans to community hospitals to allow them to undertake the necessary infrastructure upgrades to remain operational.

(Continued from 13 November 2024.)

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:30): Today, I stand before you to address the critical issues raised by the honourable member of the Legislative Council, Robert Simms, regarding the pivotal role of not-for-profit, community-owned hospitals in our healthcare system and the impact of the national standards introduced by the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care.

Firstly, I want to acknowledge the significant contribution of the community-owned hospitals, including Burnside Hospital, Glenelg Community Hospital, North Eastern Community Hospital and Stirling Community Hospital. These organisations have served their communities for many decades and continue to play an important role in providing accessible, high-quality care close to home.

These hospitals are also valued partners to SA Health. Under the Patient Services Panel agreement, all community-owned hospitals are contracted to deliver public patient care on behalf of the state. This partnership has been critical in supporting elective surgery activity and bed capacity, and in helping to manage demand across the public hospital system. We continue to work closely with these providers on longer term strategies to enhance system capacity and patient access.

Across South Australia, the private hospital sector plays a key role in the delivery of public health care through the panel, which has facilitated more than \$240 million in public patient activity

since 2019. Regular discussions are held with private partners to strengthen partnerships, build capacity and develop sustainable models of care.

The introduction of AS5369 of 2023 marks a significant update in the standards for cleaning, disinfecting and sterilising reusable medical devices. This standard builds on the foundational principles established nearly three decades ago in response to a serious incident where five patients contracted HIV following procedures in an office-based practice setting. AS5369:2023 provides comprehensive guidelines to ensure that reusable medical devices are effectively reprocessed, maintaining the high standards of safety and quality.

We understand that implementing AS5369 will require investment for some hospitals. Under the Patient Services Panel agreement, private and community-owned hospitals are responsible for the procurement and maintenance of plant and equipment required to deliver services safely and in alignment with Australian standards. Historically, governments have not provided financial assistance for compliance-related capital upgrades within private hospitals; however, as with any request for support, proposals will be considered on their merits and with regard to broader public benefit, equity and fiscal responsibility.

In our 2025-26 budget, the Malinauskas government reaffirmed its commitment to health with an additional \$1.9 billion in funding to meet demand and create sustainable, more efficient systems. The latest funding boost means that, over the past four budgets, our government has delivered \$9 billion in additional funding for the health system. This additional funding is enabling us to add more clinical staff and more hospital beds.

While we promised to deliver 300 beds, we now have increased that to over 600 extra beds across the health system being put in place. Unlike previous governments of both political persuasions, we are not cutting beds, we are not cutting staff and we are not bringing in corporate liquidators to run hospitals.

We have comprehensive plans to address every aspect of the blockages that lead to patients waiting longer on the ramp and in the community for an ambulance and are investing in new health initiatives to meet demand pressures, ease pressure on hospitals and address ramping.

I thank the honourable member for raising this matter. Community-owned hospitals remain valued partners in our health system, and we will continue to work cooperatively with them to ensure that they can meet contemporary standards and continue to provide high-quality care to South Australians.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:33): I rise to speak in favour of the motion of the Hon. Mr Simms regarding the role of not-for-profit community hospitals. These hospitals are part of the fabric of their local communities. Burnside Hospital, Glenelg Community Hospital, North Eastern Community Hospital and Stirling Hospital are more than just medical facilities: they are trusted institutions which families and individuals rely on, staffed by people who often live locally and understand the needs of the patients they serve. They also provide something our health system desperately needs: capacity. They partner with local health networks to deliver critical services and constantly take pressure off our public hospitals and emergency departments. If their services shrink, the public system will feel it immediately.

The challenge many of these hospitals face is the requirement to comply with updated national sterilisation standards, which are important for patient safety but do come with a substantial capital cost. Major capital upgrades are required, and, unlike the large private hospital corporations, community hospitals do not have the level of reserves or large asset bases to cushion these expenses. This is why this motion is so important. It calls on the government to make available no-interest loans to help these hospitals meet their obligations.

The Liberal Party has long recognised the value of community hospitals, which is why we committed \$1 million to support the Stirling Hospital if we are elected in March next year. This was the direct result of the member for Heysen, Mr Josh Teague, listening to his community, advocating consistently on their behalf and ensuring their concerns are heard. He understands what the Stirling Hospital means to Hills residents, and he will make sure they are not forgotten.

Backing community hospitals with real support is the difference between simply talking about their value and actually doing something for them. For these reasons, we support the motion and encourage the government to work constructively so that these hospitals can continue their essential contribution to patient care in South Australia.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:35): I thank members for their contributions. This is a really important issue. It is really important that these not-for-profit hospitals get access to the funds that they need. I know this is a big issue for people in Stirling, in the seat of Heysen in particular. I note the government's opposition to the motion, and I will be sure to make sure that the local community knows the government's position on this issue in coming months.

Motion carried.

ASIA PACIFIC BUSINESS COUNCIL FOR WOMEN

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:36): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Asia Pacific Business Council for Women (APBCW) for reaching the special milestone of its 30th anniversary in 2024;
2. Recognises that the APBCW was established to provide mentoring, networking opportunities and business support to South Australian professional and business women with a special connection with the Asia-Pacific region;
3. Acknowledges the founding members, current and past presidents, committee members and volunteers of APBCW for their hard work, dedication, and contributions in fostering business opportunities, professional development and cultural exchange for its members of diverse backgrounds and industry sectors;
4. Commends the APBCW for continuously advancing the status of women in South Australia through APBCW Women of Distinction Awards and other business forums; and
5. Reflects on the journey of the Asia Pacific Business Council for Women over the last three decades and recognises contributions by women of diverse backgrounds in fostering multilateral relationships between South Australia and the Asia-Pacific region.

It is an absolute pleasure to rise today to congratulate the Asia Pacific Business Council for Women on reaching the special milestone of their 30th anniversary. As a woman of Asian heritage and with a business background, the Asia Pacific Business Council for Women is particularly close to my heart. As the patron of the council it is a great honour to reflect on the journey of the Asia Pacific Business Council for Women over the last three decades and recognise contributions by women of diverse backgrounds in fostering multilateral relationships between South Australia and the Asia-Pacific region. I seek leave to insert the remainder of my speech in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

APBCW is a not-for-profit membership-based organisation that was established to provide mentoring, networking opportunities and business support to South Australian professional and business women with a special connection with the Asia-Pacific region.

For 30 years, the Council has been dedicated to fostering business opportunities, professional development and cultural exchange for its members of diverse backgrounds and industry sectors.

I would like to take this opportunity to firstly thank and congratulate the current president, committee members and volunteers of APBCW for their hard work and contributions to the Council. Heartfelt thanks to:

- President—Laurel Qiu
- Vice-President—Enya Crockford
- Secretary—Audrey Lian
- Treasurer—Anna Chong
- Committee Members—Suppatra Hom-on, Prae Wongthong, Stella Wu, and Shirley Tan
- Advisor—Cathy Chong AM

The Council had a humble beginning, established in 1994 by a small group of passionate and pioneering businesswomen, who recognised the dire lack of services or support available to South Australian professional and business women at the time.

As these founding members, including Cathy Chong AM, were migrant women from Asia-Pacific countries, they put their passion, knowledge, and connections to purpose to connect like-minded business and professional women in their new home in South Australia.

Over the last three decades, APBCW has attracted many inspiring women who generously donated their time, experience, and expertise to serve on the Council.

I wish to recognise and express my sincere appreciation to the Past Presidents of the APBCW for their leadership and dedication to championing business women in our State.

Special thanks to: Dr Tji Srikandi-Goodhart, Peggy Lau-Flux, Kim Tolotta, Susie Loh, Yvonne Rothall, Soo-Lee Chan, Dyan Francis, Gosia Hill, Teresita Sarmiento, Ning Zhang, Leah Grantham and Haley Welch.

At this point, I feel I should disclose to Honourable Members that I was honoured to serve as President of APBCW for 2 terms in 2002 and 2003. I was supported by fabulous and dynamic women on my committee and with their support, I was proud to found the APBCW Woman of Distinction Awards Program in 2003.

The APBCW Woman of Distinction is a prestigious award program that recognises outstanding women who have demonstrated strong leadership and made a significant contribution to the South Australian and Asia Pacific community. The award program aims to promote the achievements and status of professional and business women in our community.

The Woman of Distinction Awards ran successfully for a number of years and as the founder, it was very exciting to be involved in the judging panel when the Awards were reinstated as part of the APBCW's 25th Anniversary celebrations in 2019.

The Woman of Distinction Award recognises the successful and distinguished journey of a business or professional woman who has gained the respect and admiration from her peers, industry colleagues and the community. These successful women may be high profile individuals or quiet achievers who set themselves apart through their business, philanthropic, community and professional contributions to our community.

There are so many outstanding women who have been recognised through the APBCW Woman of Distinction program over the years, and I encourage Honourable Members to head to the APBCW website to learn more about all the deserving winners.

APBCW continues to have a special interest in the Asia-Pacific region as well as having a global perspective. The Council embraces the rich diversity of South Australia as a multicultural state and the global nature of trade and cultural exchange to expand its linkages beyond the Asia Pacific.

The strength and growth potential of APBCW lies in the diversity of their members. APBCW Members come from leading organisations as well as small to medium size enterprises, from all industries and sectors.

Members include many successful professionals and prominent businesswomen as well as quiet achievers.

APBCW encourages all women interested in expanding professional connections and international markets to help each other to develop new networks and expand their business opportunities.

Over the last thirty years, successive committees have worked tirelessly to promote APBCW and bring new initiatives to the Council which have led to its long-standing accomplishments and positive outcomes for its members.

During my time as President, APBCW was awarded Highly Commended Chamber of the Year in 2003 by the Council of International Trade and Commerce of South Australia.

I also had the pleasure to lead trade missions to Malaysia, Hong Kong and Shanghai for APBCW. Many business and professional women joined these missions, building vital trade and cultural connections.

APBCW organised and led a range of Trade Missions to the Asia Pacific region, building trade and cultural connections for its members.

APBCW was a proud sponsor of the Annual SA Migrant Small Business Expo between 2016 and 2019, a fantastic initiative that was supported by the University of Adelaide to promote, inspire and educate migrants who are entrepreneurial and wish to start or expand their business.

APBCW continues to advance the status of women in South Australia through a range of services and business forums. The Council has always worked collaboratively with other not-for-profit organisations and business chambers, with members often volunteering at and supporting events hosted by multicultural and professional associations.

The Council has also hosted countless insightful and inspiring events over the years, including networking functions and business seminars with leading business women who generously share their hard-earned advice and experience with members.

Business site visits are always popular as well, giving members the opportunity to tour premises and see behind the scenes of successful local businesses making their mark on their respective industries.

An event last year at the Australian Space Discovery Centre showcased the opportunities available in the burgeoning space industry in South Australia.

I was delighted to attend the 2025 APBCW AGM and Christmas Party on 18th November 2025. It was wonderful to come together to celebrate this significant milestone with the committee, members, and many supporters and friends of the Council.

The business landscape in South Australia has changed drastically in the thirty years since APBCW was founded and it is wonderful to see so many more opportunities available for Asian female professionals and entrepreneurs to build their connections, develop their skills and grow their careers in our State.

APBCW is a pioneering organisation with a special focus on fostering multilateral cultural and business relationships that is only becoming more relevant as our region becomes ever more interconnected.

Once again, I wish to congratulate the Asia Pacific Business Council for Women on achieving this significant milestone. It is wonderful to have this opportunity to shine a light on their work and thank all those involved over the last three decades for their dedication and contributions to our community and economy.

I wish APBCW all the very best for a very bright future ahead.

With those words, I wholeheartedly commend the motion.

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

Bills

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (ASBESTOS REMOVAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 March 2024.)

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:38): I rise to indicate that the government will not be supporting this bill. While the intention behind it is understandable, particularly given recent events, the proposal to proactively remove every trace of asbestos from every government building and preschool by 31 December 2034 is simply not practical.

Contained asbestos poses limited risk unless damaged. That is why South Australia uses a rigorous risk-based approach that is grounded in expert advice. The Department for Education's asbestos management procedure, developed with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and reviewed by SafeWork SA, sets out exactly how asbestos is identified, monitored and removed, ensuring compliance with all legislative requirements.

When category 1 asbestos, or high-risk asbestos, is detected, it is removed immediately. No government school site in South Australia sits in the high-risk category on the statewide register. Other asbestos is removed during planned upgrades or when buildings are demolished. This approach is working. Category 2 asbestos has been reduced by 81 per cent, from 94 sites in 2020 to just 18 in 2025. This has occurred safely, systematically and without unnecessary disruption to school operations.

The Department for Education is responsible for around 5,700 buildings across 900 schools, preschools and children's centres. For some older buildings and transportables, the only practical solution would be full replacement or demolition. The replacement cost of transportable buildings alone has been estimated at more than \$1 billion by the Department for Education. I note that the honourable member cites Victoria as having removed all asbestos from their schools as a reference point for the introduction of this bill. The information I have been provided is that this commitment, though noble, never came to fruition and the practical realities of the task overwhelm the policy. Lower-risk asbestos in Victorian schools is now managed in largely the same way as in South Australia.

The bill also only compels government schools to remove asbestos, leaving Catholic and independent schools untouched, even though the risks are the same. This creates an inconsistent system where public schools carry the cost and pressures, while non-government schools have no equivalent obligation.

I do thank the member for her advocacy and ambition on the issue. The past weeks have shown us how vigilant we must continue to be to ensure asbestos is treated seriously, managed properly and removed safely wherever necessary. However, for the reasons I have outlined, the

government cannot support this bill. The current approach—removing asbestos during planned upgrades and demolitions—will achieve asbestos-free sites over time, safely and responsibly.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:41): I thank the honourable member for putting this bill forward. The opposition will not be supporting this bill. Whilst the intent is important, and I appreciate her putting it forward, our concern is that, by having a very short timeframe of nine years for removing the asbestos, the bill does not focus on the areas where there may be need for some of this infrastructure to be repaired. We know that in many schools the infrastructure is crumbling and falling apart, and I think investment in those areas is extremely important. We want to make sure that the safety of children, students, educators and staff in our schools and preschools is really important. It is something that should be taken very seriously.

We also know that there are schools, like Beachport Primary School, where the ceiling of the reception room has fallen in. This is not acceptable. That is the sort of repair and maintenance that needs to be focused on. We need to make sure that more is being done in that space so that our schools are kept safe, but at this stage we cannot support a bill that mandates complete statewide asbestos removal without a clear plan.

Regarding the costings, I have a lot of concern around the overall costing and assurance that the government would be able to deliver on such a significant plan, which is of concern. From our perspective, schools and families deserve clarity, making sure there is safety when it comes to our schools and making sure that the right focus areas and the schools' facilities are up to scratch and safe. That should be a most important focus. For those reasons, the opposition will not be supporting the bill.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:43): I thank those members of the crossbench who have indicated their support for this bill. I am disappointed but not surprised with the views that have just been expressed. I will be sure to let Mat Werfel, ADSA and AVA know that you do not support their campaign and call to action.

Second reading negatived.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOSS OF FETUS) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned reading on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November 2022.)

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:44): I rise to speak briefly as the lead speaker for the government on the Statutes Amendment (Loss of Fetus) Bill introduced by the Hon. Sarah Game and indicate that the government will not be supporting the bill.

This bill seeks to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to create a new strict liability offence of causing the loss of a foetus. The proposed new offence is committed if a person commits a prescribed offence, as defined in the bill, and if the conduct of the prescribed offence causes another person to lose their foetus, a separate offence is committed. In relation to that separate offence of causing the loss of a foetus, the prosecution would not be required to prove that the alleged offender knew or ought to have known that the person who lost their foetus was pregnant, so the offence could be committed despite there being no intent to cause the loss of a foetus.

This would be a significant departure from the longstanding principle of mens rea in this area of criminal law. Another significant departure from the existing law is that the bill would also allow further offences punishable by imprisonment to be prescribed through the regulations. With the regulations not voted on by parliaments, such powers would likely attract criticism from the public.

Further, the bill does not define what a foetus is. Consequently, there are several practical and legal consequences, including evidentiary and causation issues, particularly in relation to the loss of a foetus where the pregnancy is in the very early stages of gestation. For those reasons the government will not be supporting the bill.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:45): I rise—it is probably no surprise to anyone—to support this bill, which seeks to establish an offence for conduct causing harm to or the destruction of a

foetus. I note that this bill does not define a foetus for the purpose of this new offence but instead refers to the presence or absence of a pregnancy regardless of the gestation period or weight of the foetus. I imagine it would be no surprise that I am of the strong belief that the loss of a life should be recognised when a baby dies in utero no matter what the circumstances and no less as a result of a criminal offence or perhaps especially as a result of a criminal offence.

As it stands the law in our state legally considers the loss of an in utero baby due to a criminal act as an injury to the mother. As the Hon. Sarah Game stated when she introduced this bill, there is presently no validation whatsoever for the profound and significant loss and grief for the mother, father and loved ones who lose a baby due to the crimes prescribed in this bill. Those crimes specifically include, among others, murder, manslaughter, criminal neglect, assault causing death by dangerous driving and rape. It would undoubtedly be deeply distressing for any individual anticipating the birth of a baby to have the death of him or her in such horrific circumstances simply recorded as an injury to the mother. To me it is much more than that.

There is, of course, precedent for this type of legislation in Australia. New South Wales in 2021 enacted what is commonly known as Zoe's law, which I note had bipartisan support in that parliament. It was supported by both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party.

Members are likely familiar with Brodie Donegan's experience of losing her daughter, Zoe, who passed away in utero after being struck by a vehicle driven by a drug-affected individual. It is my sincere hope that our parliament follows New South Wales' lead and passes this bill. The death of a baby in utero should be acknowledged as that of a victim of a prescribed criminal act in their own right.

Indeed, in South Australia, at 20 weeks in utero a baby who is unfortunately delivered stillborn receives a birth certificate and a death certificate. This provision in our current law gives further weight to the need for the passage of this bill before us. Because of that, I think it makes it even more important that we pass this bill. I support the bill.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:48): This bill is about justice for families—families that were meant to be and families that remain incomplete because of criminal acts beyond their control.

Brodie Donegan's life was changed forever on Christmas morning in 2009. At 32 weeks pregnant she went for a walk in a New South Wales neighbourhood ahead of leaving for lunch with family further up the coast. On that walk she was struck by an out-of-control van and pinned against a tree. She had to be extracted by emergency responders. It took nine hours. She lost a lot of blood, and she lost her unborn baby daughter, Zoe.

The woman driving the van was affected by drugs. She was charged and convicted of drug-affected driving and causing grievous bodily harm. Zoe's loss was simply accounted for as an injury and collated as part of the grievous bodily harm offence. Ms Donegan recalls:

I just didn't understand how my daughter, who didn't survive, wasn't being accounted for in the charges, that she would just be listed in my injuries...

We wanted a separate bill to reflect and acknowledge the loss of the child rather than just be counted as an injury...

It took 12 long years for New South Wales to pass legislation acknowledging the loss of an utero baby due to a criminal act. In South Australia we can build upon the example from interstate. Our families should not need to wait that long.

The separate charge that Ms Donegan refers to is exactly what we find in this bill; division 19, reading:

- (1) A person commits an offence against this section if—
 - (a) the person is found guilty of a prescribed offence; and
 - (b) the conduct to which the prescribed offence relates, whether an act or omission or a series of acts or omissions, causes the loss of a fetus of another person.

I give credit to the drafter from parliamentary counsel for collating such a thorough list of prescribed offences subject to this amendment. I have sought my own counsel to understand why each item was included, and I am satisfied with the list as presented in the amendment bill today.

I understand there are a few key differences between the legislation presented by the Hon. Sarah Game and what has passed in the New South Wales legislation. In New South Wales, to be applicable for their legislation an unborn fetus must be of at least 20 weeks' gestation and 400 grams in weight. Today's bill allows a prosecutor to advocate on behalf of a victim for the loss of a fetus at any stage of their gestation. I believe this new distinction is important.

The want and love a family, whatever that family looks like, may have during an expectant pregnancy can occur from the moment a mother knows they are pregnant. Some expectant mothers have spent years trying to get pregnant and may have spent thousands of dollars on fertility treatment. Imagine finally knowing you are pregnant, passing that early milestone of growing hope and growing love and then having that life ripped out of you by a drunk driver or from an assault or rape. It is an absolute injustice. To then be told by police that the offender will only be charged for injuries to you, not also for tearing apart your dreams of finally starting a family, compounds that injustice.

Sometimes these prescribed offences result in the death of a mother or such shocking injuries that they are not able to ever have a baby in the future. Ms Jacqueline Sparks was about 32 weeks' gestation when a driver affected by the drug ice caused a head-on collision with Sparks and her two brothers, simply on their drive to have lunch together. All three siblings had to be extracted from the wreckage. Ms Sparks' womb was catastrophically ruptured in the accident and had to be removed to save her life. Ms Sparks was able to hold her baby in hospital, her baby, Mia, as she passed away. The images of a bruised and scarred mother-to-be cradling her dying baby circulated the nation's front pages. Ms Sparks has lifelong scars from her chest to her pelvis. Not only did she lose her baby, Mia, but she will never have a baby because of the injuries caused.

Another important part of this bill is specifying that the prosecution does not need to prove which specific act within the offence caused the death of the baby. If a pregnant woman is punched multiple times in the stomach as part of a physical assault causing serious harm and she loses her baby, the prosecution does not have to prove which specific blow caused the loss. Once a person is found guilty of the offence, the prosecution can elect to follow on with the charge of causing the loss of the fetus due to that offence.

Whilst it has always been the right of a victim to give an impact statement prior to sentencing, in this case the mother-to-be, part 3 of this bill allows other relevant people to give a statement as well. The insertion of 14(6a) in the Sentencing Act 2017 ensures the rights of others, such as the father of the baby or a grandparent, to make an impact statement on the loss. This is justice for the trauma caused to the families through criminal offences causing the loss of a baby. Finally, part 4 of this bill enables families to make a claim to the Victims of Crime Fund on behalf of the baby that was lost.

As I said at the beginning of this speech, this bill is about justice for families. It is a family's right to recognise by law the loss of life taken by prescribed criminal acts listed in part 2 of this bill. We must acknowledge the loss and grief of a life taken from their mother. This bill is not about choice, it is about criminal acts that require proper accountability, and it is time we delivered recompense and acknowledgement for all women who have been in this terrible situation. I support the passage of this bill.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:53): This bill aims to deliver more appropriate penalties for the loss of an unborn baby through criminal acts. Under current South Australian laws, parents, extended family and friends have zero validation for the life-changing loss and profound grief they experience when an unborn baby is killed, and that is because, as it stands in our state, an unborn baby killed via a criminal act is simply recorded as an itemised list of injuries.

This bill is similar to existing legislation in New South Wales, passed in 2021 with bipartisan support, known as Zoe's Law. Sadly, earlier this month in the northern Sydney suburb of Hornsby, a 33-year-old pregnant woman and her unborn baby died after being struck by a car. A 19-year-old man was subsequently arrested and charged with various charges, including negligent driving (occasioning death) and cause loss of fetus. Had this tragedy occurred in South Australia, police would have been unable to lay that charge.

In this chamber, I have previously highlighted the case of Brodie Donegan and the loss of her baby daughter, for whom Zoe's Law was named. Brodie was walking in her neighbourhood when she was struck by an out of control van piloted by a drug-affected driver. Tragically, Zoe died in utero after the collision. Since I introduced this bill into our parliament, the Queensland parliament has also seen fit to address this issue through Sophie's Law.

Sophie's Law is named after Sophie Milosevic, who was killed in 2014 when a driver under the influence of drugs and alcohol crashed into a car her mother was in at 140 kilometres per hour. At the time, she was 39 weeks and six days pregnant. The driver was given a five-month driving disqualification and a \$950 fine. This is wholly inadequate to the loss faced by Sophie's family.

Sophie's parents first campaigned to parliament in 2016 and it was not until 2023 that the law was passed as part of the Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2023. To be clear, this bill does not impact a woman's right to choose an abortion; instead, it acknowledges the death of a baby when that baby, while still in utero, dies as a result of prescribed criminal offences outlined in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Those offences include crimes such as rape, criminal neglect and causing death by dangerous driving.

As mentioned, at present the loss of an in utero baby due to a criminal act is legally recognised only as an injury to the mother. A key difference between this bill and the New South Wales legislation is that the latter only recognises babies over 20 weeks of gestation or weighing over 400 grams.

The legislation presented today encompasses all fetuses of any gestation period or weight, and I only reached this important variance after careful legal consultations and some deep thinking because: is a 19-week-old in utero baby of any less significance to the family than a 20-week-old one? Is the person who deliberately and violently assaults their partner, targeting a woman's stomach and causing a miscarriage, any less guilty of doing so when the baby is at 14 weeks than when it is at 20 weeks? I draw attention to part 2, new division 19 of the bill, which states:

- (a) the prosecution is not required to allege which act or omission caused the loss of the fetus;

This is important because, to use a real-life example, if a woman is assaulted and struck in the stomach and then deliberately stomped on, resulting in the loss of her baby, the prosecution does not need to establish which of the multiple punches or stomps was the fatal blow. Or, using another real-life example, if a woman loses her baby in a traffic collision caused by a reckless drug-affected driver, the prosecution would not have to determine that the foetus was lost specifically due to the blunt impact of the car hitting her belly, the catastrophic rupture of her womb, blood loss from injuries incurred waiting for extraction from a wreckage, or the stress and psychological trauma of the accident.

This bill simplifies the prosecution's case to bring strong consequences to the perpetrator. It is consistent practice with other established areas of South Australian law. Parts 3 and 4 of this bill acknowledge the loss endured by families. Logically, it is important that a formerly pregnant woman who has lost her baby due to a criminal act be allowed to give a victim impact statement on that loss, and that statement should affect the sentencing of a perpetrator found guilty. It is also important for other family members to do so.

If a partner loses the person they are preparing to have a baby with and that baby also dies in the criminal act, the trauma is twofold. The insertion of new subsection 14(6a) in the Sentencing Act 2017 ensures this right. Part 4 of this bill, amending section 17 of the Victims of Crime Act 2001, ensures that the loss of a foetus is valued as a death of a family member, not just as an injury of the pregnant woman. It honours the unborn baby as a separate victim of a prescribed criminal act in its own right and it allows some compensation from the Victims of Crime Fund to be applied for.

As mentioned, this bill does not impact healthcare teams associated with the pregnant woman, such as doctors and midwives, from providing medical assistance, care and advice. It must not be conflated as such; rather, it is about women and families having the right to be recognised by law the loss of a life taken by criminal acts beyond their control.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes6
Noes.....13

Majority7

AYES

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

Game, S.L. (teller)
Hood, D.G.E.

Girolamo, H.M.
Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Hanson, J.E.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P. (teller)

Bourke, E.S.
Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.
Scriven, C.M.

Franks, T.A.
Lee, J.S.
Martin, R.B.
Simms, R.A.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.

El Dannawi, M.

Second reading thus negatived.

CANNABIS LEGALISATION BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 June 2022.)

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (18:02): I rise to very briefly indicate my support for the Cannabis Legalisation Bill 2022. This bill seeks to legalise cannabis and cannabis products to regulate the sale, supply and advertising of cannabis and cannabis products, and to make related amendments to the Controlled Substances Act.

The Greens have long supported the legalisation of cannabis within a world regulated market that prioritises public health, that ends criminalisation of cannabis for users, and that creates government revenue that can be reinvested into public services. It is high time—if you will excuse the pun—that we saw a harm minimisation approach adopted to drugs, so I certainly support this bill and urge other members to come on board as well. I thank the member for putting it forward.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (18:03): I rise to speak on the Cannabis Legalisation Bill 2022. I want to take this opportunity to sincerely thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for her advocacy across a number of things that she and I believe in very deeply, such as live music and medicinal cannabis and other things.

Unfortunately, we will not be supporting the bill today as the opposition, but I do not pretend that the status quo on cannabis is perfect or beyond review, and I can see that there are many opportunities in a rational health-based approach, including legislation under the right framework at the right time and with the right safeguards.

Again, the Hon. Tammy Franks, you have been a great friend and I will miss you. With that, I seek leave to insert the rest of my speech in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The bill before us today would legalise and regulate the sale, supply, advertising and production of cannabis for recreational use by adults. It would create a licensing agency, issue commercial licences for production and retail, set rules for labelling and packaging, restrict advertising and give the minister wide powers to appoint authorised officers and enforce a new range of offences.

Schedule 1 would amend the Controlled Substances Act to carve out activity that is lawful under this new scheme.

On paper, that looks 'comprehensive'. In reality, it is a very large step with far-reaching consequences, without the groundwork that other jurisdictions have spent years doing.

Let us look quickly at that experience.

Canada legalised recreational cannabis nationwide in 2018. By 2023 the sector was valued at around \$10.8 billion, up from \$6.4 billion when non-medical use was first legalised.

Legalisation has reduced cannabis-related arrests and shifted many consumers into a regulated market. Adult use has increased, but use among 15 to 17 year olds has not risen, which suggests some success in keeping legal supply to adults.

In parts of the United States, such as Colorado and Washington State, legalisation has brought strong tax revenues and economic gains. A recent study found that early legalising states collected higher marijuana tax revenues and saw increases in GDP, jobs and house prices.

So the 'for' case is real. A legal market can reduce arrests, shrink the illicit trade to some extent, raise revenue and create jobs.

But the 'against' case is just as real.

Evaluations from Colorado, using federal and state road safety data, show that after recreational marijuana was legalised, traffic deaths in which drivers tested positive for marijuana increased by about 109 per cent, from 55 deaths in 2013 to 115 in 2018, while all traffic deaths increased by around 31 per cent.

The presence of THC does not prove causation, but the trend should give any transport minister pause.

International reviews report more emergency department visits for cannabis-related problems, including psychosis, in jurisdictions that moved to full legalisation.

In Canada, hospitalisations linked to cannabis among older adults have risen sharply, and an Ontario study found that people needing acute care for cannabis-related problems had a higher later risk of dementia, although the causal links are still being studied.

In Uruguay, the first country to regulate recreational cannabis nationally, the system is deliberately restrictive and built around public health. Adults can grow at home, join cannabis clubs or buy through pharmacies, but advertising is banned and the state controls price, potency and supply. Progress has been mixed. The framework exists, yet supply has often been limited, pharmacy participation patchy and a large share of users still rely on the illegal market.

So legalisation has clear benefits, but also clear costs. The research is still evolving and serious public health experts argue for careful design, not a rush to roll out a commercial market.

Here in Australia we have our own experiments.

South Australia has long used expiation notices for simple cannabis offences, and the Northern Territory has a similar infringement scheme, so many low-level cases are dealt with by fines rather than full criminal proceedings.

The Australian Capital Territory goes further. Since January 2020, adults in the ACT can possess up to 50 grams of dried cannabis and grow up to two plants per person, four per household, for personal use.

Supply remains illegal, public use remains illegal and drug driving remains illegal. A statutory review in 2024 reported that possession charges fell sharply and stayed low, and there has been no clear surge in problematic use so far, though the data window is still short.

Nationally, the Alcohol and Drug Foundation has called for decriminalisation of personal possession and use within a public health model that focuses on treatment and harm reduction and uses strict rules to protect young people.

New South Wales and Victoria have both held major inquiries. The NSW inquiry recommended decriminalisation and, in time, a regulated legal market for adult use.

In Victoria, a recent inquiry into a bill for personal adult use made a series of recommendations, but the Allan Labor government has rejected legalisation ahead of the 2026 election.

At the federal level, a Legalising Cannabis Bill 2023 was examined and then defeated in the Senate late last year.

So South Australia is not operating in a vacuum. Other jurisdictions are moving cautiously, mainly toward decriminalisation and limited personal use, not full commercial markets.

Looking at this evidence, I draw a few conclusions.

One, criminalising low-level users has not stopped cannabis use and has pushed many people, often young men, into the justice system with little benefit to safety.

Two, a legal market can bring revenue and some order to a messy situation, but if it is built around a profit-driven commercial model it tends to increase heavy use and harm.

Three, if you are going to move, the safer path is a staged public health approach: fix medicinal cannabis first, modernise driving and planning laws, consider decriminalisation and diversion, and only then look at any broader regulatory model.

That brings me to the unfinished business on medicinal cannabis.

Medicinal cannabis was legalised federally in 2016. On 10 March 2023, this Parliament established the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the Legalisation of Medicinal Cannabis in South Australia.

It called for submissions, took evidence and in September tabled an interim report with 13 recommendations, including changes to the Road Traffic Act and reforms to support legitimate medicinal cannabis businesses.

One key recommendation was to deal fairly with medicinal cannabis patients who are currently at risk of losing their licence simply because of a positive THC test, even when they are following medical advice. Those are practical reforms. They would help real patients now. They would support legitimate industry now.

But to date, we have not had a response from Government.

So before we race towards a full recreational model, we should finish the homework on medicinal cannabis and the Government should respond to the committee's recommendations.

For all these reasons, the Liberal Opposition will oppose the Cannabis Legalisation Bill 2022.

We oppose it because it asks South Australians to take a very large step without proper government advice from Health, SAPOL, DIT, Treasury and others.

We oppose it because the international evidence is mixed and still emerging. There are clear benefits, but also serious health and road safety concerns that this bill does not fully address.

We oppose it because a private member's bill is not the right vehicle for such a far-reaching change.

I am open to a more rational, health-based approach over time. Many in the community are open to that conversation. But any reform must be careful, staged and evidence-driven.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (18:04): I rise to speak on behalf of the government, who are opposed to this bill. While the intention to legalise cannabis may be well-meaning, the bill before us has some significant issues. This bill makes a substantial departure from the current approach to cannabis regulation. Whilst the ACT has legalised the personal use, possession and cultivation of a small amount of cannabis, in all other Australian jurisdictions cannabis is considered a controlled substance.

The legal framework in place today reflects decades of public health research, intergovernmental cooperation and carefully balanced harm minimisation principles. Beyond the policy shift itself, this bill also contains operational flaws. Most notably, there is no commencement clause. Without a delayed or staged implementation date, the bill would commence the moment it received assent. This would mean the new regulatory agency, the licensing schemes, the compliance framework and the associated IT and administrative systems would all be expected to exist from day one. The establishment of a new statutory agency, essential data systems and enforcement mechanisms all require significant lead time.

Although it is important to acknowledge harm minimisation strategies and emerging evidence about medicinal and therapeutic cannabis use, this government believes that full legalisation rushed through without adequate planning or coordination could complicate the way in which cannabis is controlled across this country. For that reason, the government opposes this bill.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ngo says no.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:06): I rise for possibly the last time in this place to thank those members who have made a contribution: the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Rob Simms and the Hon. Tung Ngo. I note that this is a bill to legalise cannabis, something that has been done in many jurisdictions around the world now. I note, for example, that in Canada it has been in place for some period of time. Indeed, poll after poll shows conservative and liberal/progressive voters alike support its legalisation and know that it is doing good for their economy.

It also breaks the criminals' business model. It is high time we legalised cannabis. If the government had a problem with the commencement clause, they could have moved an amendment. It is pretty simple, and also it is completely within the control of the government in the other house to decide whether or not the bill got through, in what form it got through and when it would then

commence. I find that a really spurious argument to pull out, but I will take heart that that means that they did not really have much else to offer in terms of constructive criticism.

I want to thank Jamnes Danenberg, my staffer, who has put a lot of time into this issue over decades, and who I first met when he was working on the hemp campaign and running for parliament in various guises and supporting the HEMP Party. He and Jessica Nies, who is the current lead candidate for the Legislative Council for Legalise Cannabis SA, are certainly among many people who have exercised their vote in support of legalising cannabis across this country.

We have seen members in the upper house in parliaments in Australia—in WA and New South Wales, and moves in Victoria as well—and we may well see a Legalise Cannabis candidate come into this place unless we see a change in the attitudes of Labor and Liberal to legalising cannabis. Why? Because people know it is actually a sensible, commonsense approach. Prohibition has failed.

If you want to put money in the pockets of criminals through a drug that many people use and you want to continue to see it unregulated and made more unsafe, then you will continue to make it criminalised. If you want to break the criminals' model, if you want to allow patients to access affordable medication in an easier way, you will look at legalising cannabis. If you want to pay for the education—say higher education—of all of the eligible people in South Australia, as a state in the US has done, you could do it, as they have done, by legalising cannabis and using the tax money to go into education.

We have a lot of social services that are in need of funding in this state. We have a population that is ready for this debate to be held in an informed, adult and mature way. Adult use of a drug that was once lawful, that is less harmful than alcohol, should be something that is within our wits to debate and come up with a model to make it work to benefit the state, to benefit people who are currently criminalised and to ensure that we actually are providing a way to break that criminal business model.

With that, I do believe it is not a matter of if, but when. If South Australia were to act first, we would have that advantage of being the first mover, where there would be money to be made and there would be lives to be made better should we legalise cannabis. I seek leave to insert the rest of my remarks in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

I rise to conclude my remarks about the *Cannabis Legalisation Bill* before the house today. As I have said before – it is high time cannabis was available made in a regulated and legal fashion for adults instead of leaving its cultivation, supply and distribution to the black market and organised crime.

Since I first came to this place we have seen significant reform – indeed reforms that many people thought would never happen around cannabis and hemp – for indeed that is the plant that we are talking about – *Cannabis sativa* – known for many years as Indian Hemp, (or to others as the 'Weed with its roots in Hell' as the 'Reefer Madness' propaganda film of the 1930's termed it).

Of course, cannabis does have a much longer history than the last hundred years – indeed its roots stretch back millennia—some historians and anthropologists consider it may have been one of the first cultivated plants, others note its potential role in the transition from hunter gatherers to sedentary farming cultures... in any case in the last decade we have seen a massive realignment of societal and legal attitudes to cannabis – across Australia and across the globe.

Here in South Australia we legalised the cultivation and utilisation of hemp for industrial purposes back in 2016. Industrial hemp, that is *Cannabis sativa* bred to have a very low psychoactive THC content of less than 1%, can now be grown by South Aussie farmers and used for all manner of products, whether for its strong and useful fibres, that can be spun into thread and tuned into durable and soft fabrics, or harvested for its hurds that can be manufactured into building products such as fibreboards, insulation or hempcrete, or utilised for its nutritious seeds and oils for foodstuffs or fuels.

The utilisation of cannabis as a medicine has also been possible in South Australia and nationwide since 2017. The only question is why it took us so long to officially acknowledge the multiple benefits this unique plant can offer. Sufferers of serious and debilitating conditions as varied as juvenile epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, glaucoma, anxiety, Crohn's Disease, nausea associated with chemotherapy, chronic pain and many, many other conditions are given hope through the prescribed use of a substance with remarkably few side effects – aside from in some cases the psychoactive high that recreational cannabis users seek.

The personal use of cannabis – whether for recreational purposes, self-medication, spiritual enlightenment or philosophical or psychonautical experimentation remains prohibited in South Australia – unless of course you are a medicinal cannabis user.

This quasi-legal pathway has developed recently and has allowed many tens of thousands of people to legally access cannabis – if of course they have a medically recognised condition that warrants it.

For those that don't they are forced to resort to illegal sources of supply – whether it is growing their own or purchasing cannabis from a black market source. Whilst this can often be a benign transaction from a trusted friend, all too often it is from a contact associated with organised criminality – for whom the massive profits engendered are re-invested in other far less benign substances or activities.

The need to break the nexus between cannabis and organised crime is one of the main drivers for this bill. Another comes down to a simple human rights and social justice argument: why should one substance like cannabis used by some people be illegal and others like tobacco or alcohol with far more serious health implications used by other people be legal?

All are drugs, all have effects, side effects and health impacts. What our black and white legal framework fails utterly to recognise however is that the legal status of a substance has very little, if anything, to do with its propensity for actual harm.

Whilst anyone can drink themselves to death in a single session with relative ease (even experienced drinkers sadly) there is no record anywhere of anyone dying from an overdose of cannabis.

Of course, this raises many questions – if cannabis does not have serious and significant health impacts then why is it cannabis is illegal?

Now to clarify, this is not to say cannabis is harmless, or its use has zero consequences for everyone – indeed for some people who are genetically predisposed to it – cannabis may unmask or trigger unwanted and distressing psychotic episodes. Cannabis is certainly contra-indicated for people with a family history of schizophrenia in particular, although it must be noted, alcohol and other drugs are also of great concern in this regard.

The greatest harms that cannabis has though for the vast majority of users are as noted by the Sackville Royal Commission in 1979:

'The biggest risk to cannabis users' health, wellbeing and long-term life opportunities, are the consequences of legal proceedings in the criminal justice system'.

We in this place are fortunate – few of us have had to deal with the police stopping us, searching use or raiding our homes on the pretext of uncovering or detecting cannabis usage or cultivation, but for many, many thousands of South Australians, this is a reality they deal with on a daily basis.

Now South Australia led the way with its Cannabis Expiation Notice (CEN) scheme in 1987 and while there is no one left in this place that was involved in the passage of that legislation – the last member being the Hon Rob Lucas (who incidentally cast the deciding vote in favour of the scheme) the consequences of that reform have been far reaching.

While the clear intention of the scheme was to remove cannabis users from the criminal justice system the ease with which police could issue CENs and a seeming lack of understanding of the consequences of the failure to expiate, meant many, many thousands of South Australians still received criminal convictions for small scale personal use or cultivation offences.

Extensive evaluations of the CEN scheme have been conducted both locally and nationally, and while the CEN made enforcement easier it did not substantially alter or impact patterns of usage – indeed some jurisdictions with total prohibition approaches such as WA had higher rates of reported use – so there was no opening of the floodgates as some had catastrophically predicted.

This is significant because it supports research from other places too such as the Netherlands that has long had a tolerant approach to cannabis use and demonstrated that it is possible to relax restrictions on cannabis without necessarily increasing the rate of use.

Closer to home this is also reflected in the ACT's experience. Decriminalisation of the cultivation and possession of small amounts of cannabis was allowed from 2020 onwards with usage of cannabis in the ACT having remained stable. In fact, according to the Australian Institute for Health & Welfare's (AIHW) National Household Drug Survey 2023 at just 8.7% who have used cannabis in the previous 12 months, it is lower than the rest of Australia.

So let's take a step back and first acknowledge that our legal approach to drugs of all kinds must be research and evidence based; it must be in sync with community expectations, and it must have the support of the broader community.

Our current legal approach to cannabis fulfils none of these criteria.

Increasingly community values are moving away from 'Tough on Drugs' rhetoric and policies. Public opinion clearly does not support punitive sanctions, nor aggressive law enforcement aimed at cannabis users or growers.

The AIHW's National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2023 show that is still the case with more people supporting legalisation of cannabis for personal use (45%) than opposing it (33%). This was also the first time that more people supported legalising cannabis for personal use than supported increased penalties for the sale or supply

of cannabis (39% in 2022–2023), reflecting a continuing trend in public views towards cannabis becoming more positive with only a tiny fraction (~5%) supporting prison sentences.

It is therefore essential we separate the arguments about morals from the arguments about facts and the efficacy of policy. This is not a contribution to a moral debate about cannabis and whether it is 'right' or 'wrong'. We must face facts, and the facts are that the prohibition of cannabis serves to actively promote, not prevent, cannabis use in Australia.

The current laws on cannabis have failed by every criterion. cannabis is overwhelmingly the most used illicit drug, with literally millions of Australians having tried, used, or currently using cannabis.

National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2023's Snapshot of Cannabis use in 2022-23 among people aged 14 and over in Australia has some salutary statistics highlighting some 41% or 8.8 million people had ever tried cannabis sometime in their lives. Some 11.5% or 2.5 million people had recently used cannabis (ie within the last 12 months).

So, when over 40% of Australians could theoretically be considered to have committed a crime or be actual criminals under our current laws, it's fundamentally obvious governments should refocus their approach and prioritise dealing with cannabis use as a health issue first and foremost and not a criminal justice problem.

To recap, this bill does that and provides a way forward. It establishes a legal market, which legalises the use, possession and cultivation of cannabis for adults and is designed to end the black market monopoly over the cultivation, supply, and distribution of cannabis to anyone – including children.

This bill would establish an SA Cannabis Licensing Agency to oversee and regulate the cannabis market with the overarching aim of harm minimisation and ensuring compliance with conditions of what would be commercial licences. It will be safer.

It will separate the markets between so-called 'hard' drugs (substances that often have far more serious if not potentially lethal side effects such as opiates) and drugs such as cannabis that are relatively benign for most users.

It will undercut and undermine the black market and re-direct hundreds of millions of dollars of currently tax-free sales into a regulated, taxed system that can be used to support health, education and welfare initiatives for people in need, instead of being spent buying bling for bikies.

It will ensure that those cannabis consumers—and let's acknowledge that we are potentially talking about many hundreds of thousands of people who use or have used cannabis illicitly—most typically between the ages of 18 and 60, but some younger and some older—have access regulated products of known potency, with no adulterants or contaminants as can sometimes be the case with black market sourced products.

It will require cannabis products to be labelled with health warnings and information about the strains—for example, the THC or CBD contents and will make provisions for health, harm reduction and education information to be provided at point of sale.

It will prohibit those retailers who would participate in this industry from publicly promoting or advertising cannabis. It will provide a strong deterrent to keep cannabis out of the hands of minors, and it will prohibit retail cannabis outlets being operated within 200 metres of schools or childcare centres.

It will reduce the demand on police resources that we currently put towards the so-called 'War on Drugs' that is in reality a war on people, especially indigenous people, minority groups and young people. It will free up court resources and allow redirection of resources into services that will allow users to seek assistance if they have problematic usage without the fear of police interdiction or stigma.

It will create new literally green industries for our state in the production and distribution of products which will in time perhaps come to develop benefits in terms of tourism too, in the same way our wine industry has developed a world class reputation for price and quality.

While this bill creates legitimate pathways for commercial supply and distribution it also recognises the need to allow consumers to grow their own, with up to six cannabis plants being permitted, with more possible on compassionate grounds. This is analogous to the home brewing of beer and similar to home brewed alcohol the on-selling of home-grown products would not be permitted.

This bill also looks at the harm that our previous approaches have caused through the many thousands of criminal convictions that have been issued and recognises the sometimes-devastating impacts that those convictions have had on peoples' lives, their careers, their relationships and their travel opportunities – impacts way out of proportion to the harms they may have faced from experimentation of even regular use of the cannabis itself.

The time for expungement of past criminal convictions for minor cannabis offences is also long overdue.

To conclude, I'd like to reiterate this bill is based on extensive research, a sound evidence base, a commitment to harm reduction, human rights and social justice. It is a deliberate and intentional shift from war on drugs rhetoric, and zero-tolerance approaches that in reality cause more harms and actively worsens individual and societal outcomes, towards a common-sense approach that deals with the reality of life and drug use as it actually is, not as we may wish it may be.

I can certainly say I will be taking this to the state election as a key reform that the next parliament should enact. I hope members will be interested in continuing this conversation, and there are many and varied ways to do that.

As I've noted previously, in the past, when things have been too morally difficult, we have referred things off to SALRI, and that is an option here. We have seen the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee call for further work and investigation and, should it happen, that work on the use of cannabis in this state and ways of breaking the business model of serious and organised crime should be cross party. One would imagine that we could do our heavy lifting as a parliament, as well as then perhaps draw on bodies such as the Productivity Commission, as the Queensland government has done.

This is not an intractable issue; this is an issue of opportunity.

I was very heartened last year that the parliament of South Australia's Crime and Public Integrity Committee, and their work on organised crime, has identified what many of us already know; that the legalisation of cannabis does actually need to be addressed if we are to tackle organised crime. The committee there recommended, and I quote *'the establishment of a parliamentary committee to inquire into and report on potential benefits and issues associated with the legalisation of recreational use of cannabis in South Australia'*.

That committee also recognised the potential revenue to the state and the 'potential to significantly disrupt the activities of organisers involved in serious crime'. By ending this war it is a win-win. We take away the business model of organised crime and we help people, particularly medicinal cannabis users, to have a better quality of life.

The benefits of legalising cannabis are clear: It takes money from the pockets of organised crime and it puts it in the hands of government to be redirected into socially useful pursuits. Rather than spending money chasing down users of cannabis we can actually put that money towards healing our sick health system.

We can prevent health issues arising by putting that money into health prevention and education. We can also, as I say, drive people away from the criminal justice system.

It's high time we legalised cannabis in South Australia.

I will not be dividing; I am not going to put you through that right now. I know that this is the last thing on the agenda, and I know that people are trying to now juggle many things, but I hope that this is not the last time that this chamber debates this issue, and I look forward to more considered debates than ones that dwell on a commencement clause.

Second reading negatived.

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT (CUTTLEFISH—NORTHERN SPENCER GULF) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

Resolutions

JOINT COMMITTEE ON MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLBEING OF VETERINARIANS

The House of Assembly agreed to the Legislative Council's resolution.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOMS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The House of Assembly agreed to the Legislative Council's resolution.

Adjournment Debate

VALEDICTORIES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (18:12): I move:

That the council at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 5 May 2026.

In moving the motion, I might take a moment, as is tradition at this time of the year, to reflect on the year that has been in this chamber during 2025. It has again been a year of substantial progress, robust debate, the occasional raised eyebrow—mostly from you, Mr President—and more than a few moments when time itself bent in curious ways as we tried to fit 12 months of work into what often felt like 12 minutes.

At the conclusion of business this afternoon, I am advised this chamber has passed 71 separate pieces of legislation totalling, as of nine minutes ago, some 211 hours of debate. If you consider this tally—71 bills over a total of 211 sitting hours—it means that for every bill that we pass, we sit for nearly three hours. This chamber has scrutinised, amended and looked at legislation very carefully, and that is something I think we can all be proud of. A significant portion of this year's work has centred on the safety and the rights of people in the community. We have seen legislation during the course of the year that will no doubt change lives.

As the 55th term of parliament comes to a close, I would like to take a moment to make some acknowledgements. To the crossbench: you bear workloads entirely disproportionate to your headcount. Thank you for your constructive engagement and spirited contributions, and a particular note of gratitude to the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Tammy Franks, whose telling offs of various members of this chamber could fill a short novel easily.

Thank you to the Hon. Robert Simms, whose love for regional rail and the banks of Coober Pedy have become somewhat legendary. Thank you to the Hon. Sarah Game, whose new party Sarah Game Fair Go for All Australians has one of the most difficult acronyms of all parties: I think it is SGFGFAA. I would like to recognise the newest member of the crossbench in this chamber, the Hon. Jing Lee, who is yet to find an 18½ anniversary of a community organisation that she has not moved a motion for.

To the honourable member who is a most recent departure from the crossbench, and soon from this chamber, I am advised at moments like this—one of my staff did this for me—ChatGPT would say, 'Frank Pangallo leaves a legacy of sharp questionings and brief explanations that were anything but. The chamber won't forget his passion or his talent for turning a quick point into a full tour of the issue.' I do not have any references for this, I am afraid.

To the two whips, the Hon. Ian Hunter and the Hon. Laura Henderson, our thanks for ensuring members are where they need to be when they need to be there. To the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Leader of the Opposition, thank you for your regular pragmatic discussions that actually often prevent issues before they emerge. I have said it before: I think people find it quite strange how well we all get on, but particularly the leaders of parties necessarily need to have dialogue to make sure this place functions as it should. It leaves us with a better sort of parliament. I would also like to take a moment to appreciate the ability of the Leader of the Opposition to turn any given question time into The Country Hour.

Thank you to the Clerk, the Usher of the Black Rod and everyone in the Legislative Council team: Leslie, Kate, Emma, Anthony, Super Mario, Charles, Kylie and Todd. Thank you to the new Executive Officer of Joint Services, Megan Bradman, as well as all the people who work on the committees: Hansard, library, finance, building services, IT, cleaning, Centre Hall security and People and Culture staff. Thank you also to the catering staff and the Blue Room staff who keep us fuelled—particularly the Blue Room staff who, for reasons I do not understand, still will not allow me to buy anything that has white bread, pasta or sugar in it.

I also extend my sincere appreciation to my staff in the Attorney-General's office: Leanne, Nikki, Sophie, Maddy, Luke, Scarlett, Karla, Ashton, Caroline and Rachel, as well as the legislative services team in the Attorney-General's Department who regularly work very late into the night so that members receive timely and deeply informed advice. Thank you to my ministerial staff: Patrick, Roland, Angas, Laura, Elliette, Jenny, Riley and Amelia. Thank you for your support, your patience and your ability to recommend episodes of a series I have never seen anything of but is talked about often called *Below Deck* and their regular references to Taylor Swift songs that I know nothing about, except her first two country albums.

I particularly would like to thank Craig Williams, my ministerial driver. I am getting a bit emotional. Craig is retiring. Craig started only a month after I became a minister way back at the start of 2015. I think we worked out we have clocked up something like three quarters of a million miles together, largely to remote Aboriginal communities in South Australia and occasionally across the borders in the Northern Territory and Western Australia. In many weeks I will spend many more hours with Craig than I will with any member of my own family. In fact, when Craig and I started, my kids were just starting at primary school and some of them are now halfway through university. It is almost a growing-up of children that he has been with me for.

He has been an absolute champion. He is actually an exceptionally good driver. I think he has won his class 10 times in the Targa Tasmania when it was running. He is a 14-times national Motorkhana champion for Minis. He is an exceptionally good driver and a very, very good friend. I will miss him when he retires at this state election.

It is only right that I acknowledge some of the other honourable members who will not be joining us in the chamber as we come back in the next parliament. To you, Mr President, first and foremost, thank you for your patience, your leadership and your persistence in refereeing the contests that occur in this chamber. On the other side they have been doing it all night, and I am glad you have called them out so often! I am sure the Hon. Russell Wortley is particularly thankful for your leadership here and for regularly pulling him into line.

I believe that your community, sir, is very proud of your championing of investment and services for Whyalla in this chamber, particularly in relation to your commitment to regional infrastructure, business support and housing concerns. I know you have been counting down the minutes until this year ends, I think, sir. I think sometimes you have trouble hiding your contempt for our antics in the chamber, but you have persisted exceptionally well.

On a personal note, it is sad to see one of the last remaining links to my old boss, Terry Roberts, leaving the chamber. I know that we will miss you in this chamber, and, if it is not revealing too much, I have enjoyed your company—even a number of ministers, over the journey, have been to your place at Wallaroo for drinks. It shows how well you work with people right across the chamber, sir. Quite frankly: bravo, our President.

I want to acknowledge the Hon. Tammy Franks. In her time, Tammy has been a tireless advocate for social justice and equality. She has played a key role in advocating for the decriminalisation of sex work in South Australia. As I mentioned in a recent contribution, I suspect that—like her colleague before her, the Hon. Mark Parnell, who left this chamber and within a year saw the passing of the voluntary assisted dying legislation—this is an inevitable reform that will pass because of the work the Hon. Tammy Franks has done. She has also been a relentless voice for the environment, mental health, Aboriginal communities and animal rights, just to mention a few things.

Of course, as always, she has kept everyone in line. I think it was mentioned earlier today that people have been terrified of Tammy Franks, and I cannot imagine that anyone's terror of Tammy has lessened during her time in this chamber. You do not wish for Tammy to get up and be annoyed at what you just said—it is not worth your while.

I also want to acknowledge a retirement in the other place, that of the Hon. Susan Close. It has been a privilege to work alongside Susan. I certainly will miss her dearly as she leaves a legacy for South Australia.

To the electors of South Australia, who entrust all of us who are here, all 22 members, with making laws for the benefit of all South Australians: everything we do, every debate, every reform, every time we are here to 6.58am—thank you, Rob, and thank you, Frank—we do so in the service of the people of South Australia. We might have different ways we come to it, but we are all here because we are trying to make the world a better place for generations to come. As we conclude the 55th term of the South Australian parliament, I wish all members a safe and restful holiday period. May your new year be peaceful, productive and, as always, full of sausage rolls.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (18:22): Before I begin my contribution to this motion, I move an amendment to it:

Delete '5 May 2026' and insert '3 February 2026'.

I do this simply because, given the magnitude of the harmful algal bloom and the deep uncertainty it continues to cast over our marine environments, our seafood sector and our coastal communities, it is clear that this parliament cannot simply pack up for the summer and hope for the best. This government has not provided the confidence, the clarity or the urgency that South Australians deserve, particularly in only tabling key documents to this crisis on the last day of the sitting calendar, prior to an election. Key questions remain unanswered. I further indicate to the chamber that I will be calling a division on this amendment so that the people of South Australia can clearly see which

members of this parliament are willing to return to ensure the standards of good governance are being upheld.

Mr President, given this is your final stretch in the chair, perhaps the final minutes, I thought I would give you a parting treat, or perhaps a trial, by delivering my Christmas message in the form of a poem. So here it goes:

Today, with the year drawing near its conclusion,
I offer my reflections...in rhyme and in fusion.
And I promise, before panic sweeps right through this place
No tapping of glasses, no vocal disgrace.
For unlike Minister Scriven—whose singing we've endured
My own 'talents' would have HR immediately reassured
That poetry, not music, is safest for all—
So a poem it is...let's begin the recall.

T'was a month before Christmas and through Parliament House,
Not a minister was stirring,
except maybe one mouse (and I will let you decide who that is, Mr President)
The government's agenda lay scattered with care,
In hopes that next year competence might appear there.

Five-day consultations, bills half made and half read
It's a Christmas miracle anything moved ahead.
We've rewritten, redrafted, repaired as we go,
While ministers insist 'It's fine', when it simply ain't so.

And the Hon. Tung—dear Tung—our steadfast friend so,
Forever consistent, a resounding Mr 'NO'.
On bills, on amendments, on procedural plays,
He shuts them down in spectacular ways.
If Christmas had Tung written into the score,
We'd all be singing No-el No-el, followed by NO once more.

Now Reggie and I have had quite the year,
Hospital beds side by side—festive, I fear.
He nearly lost a leg, I lost the feeling in mine,
Proof this job pushes the limits of 'fine'.
Yet through pain, politics, pressure and grit,
We still front up here—because we're stubborn, not physically fit.

And outside we've seen farmers work hard, fishers steady and strong,
Communities showing strength all year long.
From droughts to toxic blooms to challenges new,
South Australians have done what they always do.
They pulled together, lent hands and stood tall,
A quiet reminder of the heart of us all.

In here we've pressed on—this chamber and this crew.
Through debates fiery, hilarious and occasionally askew
And credit where due, Deputy Premier, I concede:
You've taught me some things I never knew I'd need.
Like where to find the best sausage roll,
And to breathe deep and smile when debate takes its toll.

You steer the government ship through each parliamentary storm,
While I, from opposition, ensure things don't stay too warm.
And though I do tend to rise...occasionally with speed,

You managed it all with a leadership that does the deed.

And to my Liberal colleagues, a team strong and true,
Each day you show commitment in all that you do.
Through late-night amendments and long committee fights,
Through briefings and questions and endless red lights,
You stand by each other with purpose and grace,
Bringing strength, steady humour and heart to this place.
It's a privilege to lead you, to walk side by side,
In a team where tenacity and duty abide.

And Mira and Laura—our champions this year,
Who brought tiny new humans into our parliamentary sphere.
While we argued amendments and stressed over bills,
You were juggling feeding times and late-night refills.
Your balance, your strength, your soft, steady glow
Have inspired all around you far more than you know.

To the staff, who keep parliament running like a machine.
With patience, precision and professionalism seen—
From Hansard to research, from security to clerks,
From catering to cleaners—your work is the spark
That lights this whole building and gets us all through,
And we are grateful for everything you quietly do.

To my own team on level 2—your dedication shines bright.
You carry me through every long day and long night.
Your commitment, your humour, your brilliance, your pace,
You are the heartbeat and spine of the Centofanti base.
And to colleagues across all parties and sides,
Despite disagreements, bumps and divides,
We somehow survive it, year after year,
With respect and good humour that keeps us all here.

And today brings a moment both heavy and bright.
For you, Mr President, take your final chamber flight.
For many you are our mentor, our compass, our guide,
Who's led this sometimes wild chamber with dignity and pride.
You have brought wisdom and steadiness to every long day,
Though a smile, I admit, did not always come your way—
Especially, Mr President, when I was yelling mid-speech
Or testing the supplementary—just slightly out of reach.
And, though we'll miss your rulings, your presence, your art,
You leave us with our thanks—and a piece of our heart.

As Christmas approaches and the year takes its bow,
Let's exhale the chaos we're all carrying now.
Spare thoughts for those struggling, for families in pain,
For communities praying next year will not be the same.
May kindness surround them, may support find its way,
And may hope shine a little brighter this holiday.

So to all gathered here—may your break be serene.
Your to-do lists shorter, your inboxes clean.
May your sausage rolls be plentiful, coffee strong and your stress levels slight,

And may no-one attempt festive solos on site.

Merry Christmas to all, and to all a good night—
And may next year's legislation be at least half written right.

Sitting extended beyond 18:30 on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (18:29): Very briefly, I will comment on the amendment. I will not be supporting the amendment. I certainly understand the argument around wanting to see scrutiny of the algal bloom crisis in the new year, but we have a parliamentary committee that has been established to look into that. The government have given me an assurance that government members will be available in January and into February, and I will be holding them to that.

I have that assurance in writing that the committee will be continuing during that period. I look forward to being able to scrutinise the summer plan as well as the documents that have been tabled in the parliament. I am also mindful of the significant cost to taxpayers should we bring the parliament in for just one day. Given the other place will not be sitting, there would not be the capacity to actually pass legislation or make laws, so I will not be supporting the opposition's amendment in this instance. However, rest assured, I will be working during the break to make sure we have a spotlight on the algal bloom.

Putting the politics aside, I briefly want to wish everybody a very merry Christmas. One of the things I think that is really great about our chamber is the collegial and respectful way that we all work together. I know all of us this year have had different challenges, whether they be professional or personal challenges, and I think we all make allowances for each other and treat everybody with respect. Long may that continue to be the case.

In particular, if you will indulge me, I want to thank my staff for all their support during what has been a very challenging year: Sean, Tabitha, Jesse and Louise. It is a great team and they all work really hard. To those members who are departing, I wish them all the best, and to those who are standing for re-election, I wish them the best as well. I know it is a stressful time ahead.

Finally, I know all of us at this time of year are thinking about those South Australians who are less fortunate than ourselves. I know that our state is in the middle of a housing crisis and an economic crisis, and Christmas can be a challenging and lonely time for a lot of people. My thoughts, as always at this time of year, are with those South Australians who are struggling. I hope that the new year brings happier times for our troubled world.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:32): I echo the same sentiments as the Hon. Robert Simms and indicate, for the same reasons as the Hon. Robert Simms, that I will not be supporting the amendment to this motion. I will not repeat what the Hon. Rob Simms said. I think he articulated that very well.

Moving on from that, thank you, Mr President, and I wish you a happy retirement. To all the people outside of this place who make every day in here possible and who give so much of their time—I do not know why I am crying today, but I am; I have been crying all week and the week before—freely and fearlessly, thank you. To all my colleagues and to all the very good people in this place, and Nicky and Karen, I thank you sincerely for all your work and service. Bless you all. Like everybody else, I wish you a safe and happy Christmas and holiday season.

To all my team, Jody, Luke and Simon, thank you so much for everything. There is only one thing I want to say today, which is why I am crying, and that is to my family and to my brother, Harry, and Bec, I love you so much and I miss you. To my sister, I cannot do anything without you. To the little apple of my eye, my bubba, I love you. To all my kids, there are no words, just love. To mum and dad, thank you. Go well everybody. Mr President, it would not be a me speech if I did not end by saying, 'Long live Palestine.'

The Hon. J.S. LEE (18:34): I also join the Hon. Robert Simms as well as the Hon. Connie Bonaros to say that I will not be supporting the amendment by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti. I agree with the Hon. Robert Simms' reasonings for that, and I echo those same sentiments.

This has been a very challenging and eventful year, to say the least, but I want to thank the government and all my parliamentary colleagues, the opposition, for the smooth transition. This has

been a very eventful year. I made a departure from the Liberal Party in January this year, then I kind of became a trendsetter in some way—not in a fashion sense—but I was followed by the Hon. Tammy Franks leaving the Greens, and then the Hon. Sarah Game leaving One Nation, and then we had the Hon. Frank Pangallo jumping from Independent into the Liberal benches. It has been a really eventful year.

I do want to thank the President, the Hon. Terry Stephens, for being understanding and working with the Clerk and all the Legislative Council staff to help me make the move to a new office. I want to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for her grace and courtesy and willingness to swap seats with me during that time as well. I really am grateful.

I want to wish the outgoing members—whom I have respect for in different ways—I want to wish you well in your retirement. I want to thank you for your distinguished service in this place. I think we all agree that we are elected by the people of South Australia, and it is a great honour, it is a great privilege. Out of the 69 members in parliament and 1.8 million people, it is a great privilege to be serving the people of South Australia. We are contesting the election, many of us. I wish everyone the best of luck. I am not sure whether I will have the fortune or not to get re-elected again but, with a heart of gratitude, I want to thank every single member of parliament, every single staff member from catering, Hansard, the Clerks, the messengers and everyone who serves in this place. It is a very, very special place.

I do not want to end my speech without expressing my sincere, sincere thanks to my staff, particularly to my Chief of Staff Grace McInerney. Many of you know that Grace actually joined my office as a trainee some nine years ago. She returned to my office later on and became my office manager. Later on, she continued as a loyal staff member to me when I became an Independent. She is smart, she is diligent, she is caring, she is hardworking; it is a dream to actually have such a loyal staff member working for a member of parliament. We all thank our staff, but I particularly want to thank Grace McInerney.

When Grace took maternity leave, Nicholas Shortland—who was at the time a trainee in transition—took on the challenge to become my acting office manager. I want to thank Nicholas Shortland for his dedication and hard work as well. Later on, when I became an Independent, I had two new staff who joined me this year. I want to thank Michelle Cheetham as a policy adviser, as well as Irina Roik as my new office manager. All my staff have been working really hard. Instantaneously overnight I became a shadow minister for every portfolio, and I had to handle every single bill and motion, but I could not have done that work without my staff.

I understand the emotion the Hon. Connie Bonaros was going through earlier. I was thinking: my goodness, there is a lot of sacrifice a member has to make when you come into this place of work. The hours are endless. I have a marathon of events every single weekend. In less than 365 days, I have already attended in excess of 330 events this year. It has been huge. I share the emotion.

I want to thank my husband, Eddie, for his unwavering support. I do not think I could do this job without Eddie's understanding, love and support. So I want to thank Eddie, my husband, particularly as well. Christmas is here. It is the season to be jolly, so I want to end by wishing everyone a very merry Christmas. Spend quality time with family. I wish everyone best wishes and success in future elections as well.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:40): Before everyone worries, I just wanted to add a few names that I forgot to thank earlier. This will not take too long. One of my first staffers was Yesha Joshi, who is now doing amazing things in Washington and was a candidate for the Greens in the last state election. I forgot to thank her and honour her. She is an inspiration. She is now a global leader in climate change doing amazing things, and she will continue to.

I also want to thank Lauren Zwaans, who was also an early media officer of mine, who was in the gallery today to support and is again doing enormously amazing things. She has come back to Adelaide having worked over in America for various social media institutions. I want to also thank PA, who was formerly Peta-Anne Louth, who has been a stalwart friend. I just wanted to ensure that those things were on the record and I will splice them into the video later on for the record.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (18:41): I would like to start by thanking the staff of the Legislative Council and throughout Parliament House. We can sometimes underestimate the amount of pressure that you can all be under, and, please, rest assured that it is well appreciated.

I would like to bid farewell, at least from this chamber, to the Hon. Frank Pangallo and commend him on the passion that he has brought to this place. I also wish the Hon. Tammy Franks all the best for the future. Whilst there are many things that we disagree on, I can certainly sincerely wish her all the very best for the future.

And to you, Mr President, you have been an outstanding President: professional, capable, thoughtful and a fine demonstration of an even-handed and strong President. I thank you for your service in that role, as well as all of your previous roles.

In terms of everyone else, none of us really know what will happen in March next year. There are all sorts of predictions, but for anyone who does not end up being here in this place in the future, I think it is a great privilege to be in this place. All of us should be very proud of the fact that we have been able to contribute in whatever has been our particular passion while also being always conscious of the privilege of being here. I would also like to wish everybody a very happy Christmas and a blessed year.

The PRESIDENT (18:43): I would like to make a contribution before we get the minister to sum up. I am going to be here until March and I am going to be tying up loose ends and continuing with the administration of this place. All of the staff members, especially the catering staff, if I do not give them a shout-out, it will be their opportunity to poison me.

Firstly, to our chamber staff, Leslie, Emma, Anthony, Mario, Charles, Kylie and Todd: thanks for your support over the journey. You are outstanding people and I wish you all very, very well. From a catering perspective: Creon, Casey, Anthony, Baz, Pauline, John, Christian, Kelly, Sharon, Karen, Nicky, Belinda, Swaroop, Ben, Kramer and staff. I wish the Hansard staff all very well. Our new executive officer, Megan Bradman, has been outstanding and I wish her well, along with deputy Travis, Dr Weste, Anna Graves and the library staff, Dave Woolman, Graham, Craig, John, all their building attendants and, most importantly, Kate and the Usher of the Black Rod.

The Usher of the Black Rod and the Clerk have been just outstanding in their support for me, with their guidance, wisdom, knowledge. They are keepers of conventions. I am a bit embarrassed that I went against the Clerk's ruling tonight by letting everybody insert speeches, but we would be here at 9 o'clock if we did not do that, and, of course, that was by leave of the council, so I only serve to the will of the council.

People and Culture and their staff, Aaron and his leadership I really am very appreciative of. I did not thank the Hon. Ian Hunter enough. His behaviour sometimes lacks. I have enjoyed watching the Hon. Mr Hunter in government. Certainly, he was a pain in the backside in opposition. But in all sincerity the way you step up and help us run this place is really very much appreciated and has saved everybody a lot of time and effort at times. I really do thank you for that.

The Hon. Sarah Game, good luck with what you are doing. I know you have challenges with your children. You work really hard, and you get around, so I wish you well. The Hon. Michelle Lensink, I pass the baton to you as the longest serving member of the Legislative Council. I think we probably knew each other before either of us were a member of parliament. Good luck to you. That is quite an achievement, so good on you.

In my valedictory I did not want to make it sound like we had too much fun, because people will refer to that, but when I think of my good friend the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, I think 'drinking mate'. I do not want you to be known throughout parliamentary circles as a drinker—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I know you will all be respectful. I really enjoy having a glass of red with you, the Hon. Heidi Girolamo. We chew the fat, and you are a good friend.

The other thing, of course, is we have the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Dennis Hood, the honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Tammy Franks, who bring a musical component to this place. There are a couple of great singers. Nicola is horrendous on the harmonica, but she thinks she is good. We have a couple of guitarists at the back. So I am really

looking forward to the President's dinner. I hope those of you who can make it will, and I really look forward to some fellowship next Thursday night.

In closing, the only one I think I have not spoken about is the Hon. Justin Hanson. I am retiring, and it is my ambition to try to walk with the swagger that you do, Justin, because it is really cool. I do not know if 'cool' is the right word, but you just seem to be at peace with yourself, and I really like that.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: Sometimes I'm not even here.

The PRESIDENT: There you go. With all of that, I invite the Deputy Premier to conclude.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Deputy Premier, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (18:47): Thank you, sir. That's all, folks.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
Noes.....12
Majority5

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)
Hood, B.R.
Pangallo, F.

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

Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Hanson, J.E.
Maher, K.J. (teller)
Scriven, C.M.

Bourke, E.S.
Hunter, I.K.
Martin, R.B.
Simms, R.A.

Game, S.L.
Lee, J.S.
Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.

El Dannawi, M.

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

At 18:51 the council adjourned until Tuesday 5 May 2026 at 14:15.