

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Wednesday, 2 November 2022

**The SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** took the chair at 10:30.

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

**The SPEAKER** read prayers.

#### *Bills*

### **CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (TARGETS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September 2022.)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (10:31):** I rise to support the bill and to speak on some key points about the bill. This bill amends the South Australian Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 to reflect its climate change policies and targets. The targets include net zero emissions by 2050, to reduce net emissions by more than 50 per cent by 2030 from 2005 levels and to achieve 100 per cent net renewable energy generation by 2030.

If we reflect on the history of electricity production in South Australia, we only really saw movement in the renewables space after the leasing of the government-run ETSA. I am certainly not aware of any investment in renewable energy when that was a government-run instrumentality. Starfish Hill was approved by the previous Olsen government and was the first wind farm in South Australia—private investment.

We know that there have been wind farms and solar farms popping up around South Australia for many years since the opening up of that market to the private sector in South Australia for electricity production. It did not happen under a system that was owned and run by the government, but a system that was opened to the private sector. We saw private sector investment.

It is important to remember that it was a change in philosophy and an updating of the business environment in South Australia that saw this massive investment in renewable energy in South Australia. I have been in this place long enough to remember a fellow by the name of Mike Rann, who used to certainly make a big deal about anything to do with renewable energy and claim ownership of that, not acknowledging, of course, that that process was made available by the Liberal government that preceded him.

I remember a couple of instances where that did not quite work too well for him. We all remember the small wind turbine on the State Administration building. I do not know whether you remember that small wind turbine. It was about 600 or 700 millimetres in diameter and that was featured by former Premier Rann as being the South Australia of the future—the State Administration building.

I remember wondering, 'Surely there's more than one of those. For the Premier to be making such a big deal, surely there's more one of those wind turbines.' I remember doing some FOIs and discovering a whole shed of these wind turbines that were purchased that did not work. They were never installed. I think the member for Hammond remembers that story. That was reported widely in *The Advertiser*, this shed out in the middle of nowhere where the Rann government had hidden these wind turbines that did not work.

I am led to believe from a tour I did on the rooftop of Parliament House that when solar panels were being installed on Parliament House Mike Rann was on King William Road somewhere near the Rotunda, directing the tradespeople at what angle to have the solar panels set up to get the best view for the public on the footpath. We all know that the best place for solar panels to be positioned is where they get the most sun.

My understanding is that Mike Rann himself was down on the footpath directing, 'Up a bit; no, down a bit. I can see them better now; leave them there.' It does not matter that we were going to lose an hour a day of solar generation, as long as the public could see them. That was all about Labor's attempt to claim the ground on renewables in South Australia, completely ignoring the fact that that whole process was enabled by the changes to the distribution of electricity and the bringing in of private investment of electricity generation and distribution in South Australia.

I commend the Leader of the Opposition for his work as the former Minister for the Environment bringing this bill in when we were in government. Unfortunately, we were not able to progress it enough for it to have effect. Having it back here again is a great opportunity for this parliament to reinforce to the people of South Australia that we are in the business of renewable energy in South Australia, we are in the business of providing clean energy in South Australia and we are in the business of innovation.

We are not afraid of the private sector; we partner with the private sector. Thank God there were partnerships with the business sector and the private sector during the COVID period. Imagine what it would have been like if that was managed under a federal Labor government and a state Labor government. We had a taste of that in 2007 with the financial crisis when there were school halls built, some of which were for schools that were due to be closed. That was entirely government expenditure.

There was no opportunity for the private sector to be involved and to co-invest, so the government money did not go as far as it did with the Coalition and Liberal government scheme here in South Australia. That was a partnership, where public money and private money were invested together to get more value for taxpayers' money in stimulating the economy, keeping people in jobs and keeping people connected with their employers and their employers connected with their employees.

As we opened up and as we managed COVID, people were still in a position to go back to work, whether they worked from home or whether they were in a job that meant they needed to be in their place of work, whether that was in retail, in the medical sector, or in schools. We were able to do that because there was an investment and a partnership between government and the private sector.

That is where we are with renewable energy here in South Australia. We know that when there is private sector involvement we get the outcomes, because the private sector are prepared to take the risk. They evaluate those risks, and it is because they evaluate those risks that they have a high success rate, with those projects becoming profitable and growing, and provide opportunities for people to invest in South Australia.

There are some people out there who worry or complain about international or foreign investment in South Australia, but we did not hear them complain at all about General Motors, an American motor company, opening plants at Woodville and Elizabeth, or about the American company Chrysler opening a motor plant down at Tonsley, and then being taken over by the Japanese-owned company Mitsubishi in 1980 to keep everybody employed.

That is the thing about the South Australian economy: it is an international economy. The entire industrial revolution of the Playford period was built on partnerships with government and private investors, and many of those were international investors or companies that saw South Australia as an opportunity.

South Australia has an opportunity for those who want to participate in renewable, clean energy, and we are partners in doing that. I encourage more companies to come to South Australia to participate in our renewable energy programs.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:41):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....24  
 Noes.....17  
 Majority .....7

#### AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Fulbrook, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.P.
Hughes, E.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.	Malinauskas, P.B.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.	Savvas, O.M.
Stinson, J.M.	Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.

#### NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Bell, T.S.
Brock, G.G.	Cowdrey, M.J.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Hurn, A.M.	McBride, P.N.
Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.	Pratt, P.K.
Speirs, D.J. (teller)	Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.
Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.	

#### PAIRS

Szakacs, J.K.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Koutsantonis, A.
Marshall, S.S.		

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

### ELECTORAL (TELEPHONE VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October 2022.)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (10:46):** I am pleased to rise to support the Electoral (Telephone Voting) Amendment Bill. I think all of us in this place are here because we believe in the democratic system. We believe in giving people every opportunity to have their say, every opportunity to participate in the democratic process. I am very proud as an Australian, and as a South Australian in particular, that we can boast that we have one of the most accessible democratic systems in the world here in South Australia.

I know regarding many of the particularly newly arrived ethnic communities—whether they be communities from Africa, communities from India—how surprised they are that they can go to an event and a member of parliament, a government minister, or even the head of the government, the Premier or the Prime Minister will be there and that they have an opportunity to speak with them and even have them sitting at their table. Many migrants tell me that this is a very unusual situation and they would never see that happening in their own country.

I also think it is fair to say that it does not matter where you come from, or what your background is, what your start in life is; in Australia, there is an opportunity for you to participate in many different ways in the democratic process, whether that be at a local government level or even on a school council. Many people, I think, get a taste for making a difference when they simply make

a decision to join the governing council of their child's school and they go in with a view to have a broader contribution to the school.

My experience on governing councils is that that is the majority of those who put themselves forward. There are a minority of people whose motivation is to try to get a better outcome for their particular child, but they do not last very long. I think that is the same in all tiers of governance. Those who go into that process with a view to support the community and make improvements in their community—whether they have a direct benefit or direct interest or not—are the ones who survive in politics at various levels and are actually able to make significant change.

Their representation, of course, whether it be local government, state government, federal government or any other elected body, relies on people having the opportunity to vote for a preference to have a particular candidate or another candidate represent their views. I think most South Australians, and indeed most Australians, know that for anybody they support, or the party they support or the ideology they support, they are not going to support every element 100 per cent.

Something in this country that I think has bipartisan support is the right of people to vote and giving people every opportunity to vote. I remember John Howard, when he was Leader of the Opposition back in the mid-eighties, I think it was, telling a similar story about the Australian system of access, the Australian system of democracy. When he was a young member for Bennelong before he was a minister, he was in line to vote and the person behind him said, 'Hello, I know who you are, but I'm not voting for you.' They continued to chat and be jovial. Can you imagine that happening in another country? Imagine being a Democrat in Texas and being in the same line, for example, and having a similar conversation. I think there might be a different outcome. So we are very lucky.

I say 'luck', but I think it was hard work by our founding fathers to ensure that we had a system that was fair, a system that respected different views. In the end, it was a majority decision of the public to enable the formation of governments and who their parliamentary representatives are, whether that be a majority in an individual seat, whether that be a majority of seats or whether that be a majority of the vote.

That is why telephone voting removes a barrier for a number of people who had difficulty voting before the ability of telephone voting. It is being used for the first time in the current local government elections, I understand. I have heard Glenn Spear, one of the candidates for the City of Mitcham, encouraging people to use telephone voting if they are having difficulty with their ballot papers—reading them, or they have misplaced them or whatever. They can use that telephone voting option.

I thank the member for Heysen for bringing this bill to the chamber. I think every single one of us in here supports a system of government that enables as broad a participation as possible. It is a complete contrast to what we have seen in some states of America, where we are actually seeing barriers being put in place, particularly in front of people who are disadvantaged or who are perceived as being disadvantaged, to make them jump through hoops in order to even register to vote. I certainly would not like to see a process like that happening here in Australia. As a matter of fact, this bill shows that the opposite is happening: we are actually making it easier for people to participate in that process.

It is just like an extended period of pre-polling being important as well because not only might people have physical disabilities but they might not be available, whether they are overseas or they are not well or they are working. Saturdays are never a good day. I know that, certainly when I was in business, Saturday was the busiest day of the week in the shop. Having the option of being able to vote in an election and having that two-week period, I think gave many more South Australians the ability to vote at the last state election and at the federal election. I commend the bill and encourage members to support the bill in the parliament.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:54):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....25

Noes.....16  
Majority .....9

## AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Fulbrook, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.P.
Hughes, E.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.	Malinauskas, P.B.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.	Thompson, E.L.
Wortley, D.J.		

## NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Brock, G.G.
Cowdrey, M.J.	Ellis, F.J.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Hurn, A.M. (teller)	McBride, P.N.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Pratt, P.K.	Speirs, D.J.
Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.
Whetstone, T.J.		

## PAIRS

Koutsantonis, A.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Szakacs, J.K.
Marshall, S.S.		

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUSTICE MEASURES) BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 June 2022.)

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:00):** I thank the Clerk and Serjeant for checking whether or not I was already on the record on this bill, because it is a bill I feel passionately about. I think that it is very important for the administration of good justice in South Australia that these measures be passed, and we should pass them today.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:00):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....25  
Noes.....16  
Majority .....9

## AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Fulbrook, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.P.
Hughes, E.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.	Malinauskas, P.B.

Michaels, A.  
Pearce, R.K.  
Savvas, O.M.  
Wortley, D.J.

Mullighan, S.C.  
Piccolo, A.  
Stinson, J.M.

Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)  
Picton, C.J.  
Thompson, E.L.

## NOES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Cowdrey, M.J.  
Hurn, A.M.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Batty, J.A.  
Ellis, F.J.  
McBride, P.N.  
Pratt, P.K.  
Teague, J.B.

Brock, G.G.  
Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)  
Pederick, A.S.  
Speirs, D.J.  
Telfer, S.J.

## PAIRS

Szakacs, J.K.  
Marshall, S.S.

Patterson, S.J.R.

Koutsantonis, A.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**ABORIGINAL REPRESENTATIVE BODY BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October 2022.)

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:05):** I move:

That the debate be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....25  
Noes.....16  
Majority .....9

## AYES

Andrews, S.E.  
Boyer, B.I.  
Clancy, N.P.  
Fulbrook, J.P.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Michaels, A.  
Pearce, R.K.  
Savvas, O.M.  
Wortley, D.J.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brown, M.E.  
Close, S.E.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Hutchesson, C.L.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Piccolo, A.  
Stinson, J.M.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Champion, N.D.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hood, L.P.  
Malinauskas, P.B.  
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)  
Picton, C.J.  
Thompson, E.L.

## NOES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Cowdrey, M.J.  
Hurn, A.M.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Batty, J.A.  
Ellis, F.J.  
McBride, P.N.  
Pratt, P.K.  
Teague, J.B.

Brock, G.G.  
Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)  
Pederick, A.S.  
Speirs, D.J.  
Telfer, S.J.

## PAIRS

Koutsantonis, A.  
Patterson, S.J.R.

Marshall, S.S.

Szakacs, J.K.

Motion thus carried; debate postponed.

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MINISTERIAL DIARIES) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October 2022.)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:09):** I stand to support the Freedom of Information (Ministerial Diaries) Amendment Bill that was introduced by the Hon. Robert Simms MLC in the Legislative Council on 1 June this year. The bill's objectives are to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991, specifically to legislate the proactive disclosure of ministerial diaries.

The Freedom of Information Act 1991 gives citizens the legal right to request access to documents held by state government agencies, ministers, local councils or state universities. The act also enables requests by citizens to amend documents which are deemed to be incomplete, incorrect, out of date or misleading; furthermore, the act enables applicants to seek a review of the decision made by an agency.

Each agency has FOI staff responsible for processing applications in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 1991 and has 30 days to deal with an application. If that application is not dealt with in 30 days, then there is an opportunity for an internal review, which means that the FOI officer in that ministerial office—or if it is a government department you are dealing with—must then intervene and have a look at it and, if it was perceived that documents were incomplete, to have a second look at it.

If it has not been delivered within that 30 days, it is deemed as being refused. Consequently, the internal review has 14 days in which to respond as to what has happened and whether that determination was within the Freedom of Information Act laws. Failing that, if there is still no outcome after that, there is an automatic ability to apply for an Ombudsman review.

The Ombudsman will then take over and ask for those particular documents and decide what the applicant is entitled to and what the act protects the office or the public sector or the minister's office from disclosing for various reasons that are explained in the act itself. Examples of documents held by government agencies include welfare, criminal records, minutes and agendas, policy and cabinet documents and briefings, and correspondence is also available.

Under the act, copies of ministerial diaries can be disclosed via FOI applications showing meetings, events and functions attended by the minister that relate to the minister's responsibilities. Exempt and restricted documents cover a broad scope, such as information that relates to electoral records, personal affairs and internal working documents that do not require disclosure. The level of information disclosed often varies, as different FOI officers use varying echelons of discretion.

The provision of such information is in the public interest but perhaps more so of political interest. Previously, ministers appointed by the Marshall government received FOI requests for disclosure of many diary records from both Labor and crossbench members of parliament. The bill that was introduced by Hon. Robert Simms MLC would require a minister, within seven days at the end of each calendar month, to make publicly available a copy of a minister's diary for the previous calendar month that sets out meetings, events and functions attended by the minister that relate to the minister's responsibilities by publishing it on a website determined by the minister responsible for the administration of this act.

The proposal enhances transparency, including potentially providing a clear overview to the parliament of policy and funding decisions of ministers derived from meetings with stakeholders, as well as more easily identifying any conflicts of interest. This is important, of course, because we are in the middle of questioning in this place about the outcomes of the Auditor-General's Report in what

he describes as a process that was delivered outside of government. There is no public disclosure about that process at all. Of course, if that process were within government, documents would be available through the FOI system. Under this act, some of those documents would also be proactively disclosed.

I think we are at a turning point where we are littered with information. Information is available virtually on any situation except what happens under the Malinauskas government. We have seen nothing but barriers. Remember, the first act of this government was not to support the introduction of sessional orders that required questions in this place that were put on notice to be answered within 30 days—their very first act. That gives you some idea of the priority of the Malinauskas government when it comes to accountability and openness.

Despite their behaviour in opposition, demanding and receiving information that they were entitled to, we are seeing the ratchet ramped up now, where even documents requested by the Auditor-General for him to do his job are denied under the guise of cabinet solidarity and cabinet-in-confidence. Cabinet documents that were requested by the Auditor-General were always provided by the Marshall Liberal government because we are interested in transparency. We are interested in good government. Consequently, that convention of cabinet documents being requested by the Auditor-General was provided.

That has come to an end now under this government, and it is not for the benefit of the people of South Australia: it is for the benefit of the Labor Party and the unions that support them. They are the only people who benefit from this change of policy under this new government. This is why I support this bill. We should have nothing to fear about transparency, nothing to fear about being open with the public.

I spoke earlier about how accessible our democratic system is in South Australia to all South Australians. There are many examples in this house of where people have come from to join their colleagues as members of parliament, and I think that the same should apply. It does not matter what status you have as a member of society. If there is a particular issue you are interested in that is part of the government process, it should be available to the public.

The public are the employers, if you like, of members in this place. They are the ones who we rock up to every four years for a job interview, if you like, or a review of our work. If we are running for parliament for the first time, it is a bit like applying for a job, often a new job perhaps outside our field of expertise. There are many things that people will judge you on in order to vote for you, and openness and transparency is one of those issues that is very important to people in South Australia.

I know that because of the feedback I had from my electorate about changes to the ICAC Act. People were very concerned about those changes. They had a lot of difficulty understanding why it had broad support—unanimous support, basically—throughout the parliament. This type of transparency is important, and that is why I support the bill.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:19):** I, too, would like to make a small contribution to what is I consider, as a loyal opposition, a very important part of the process to scrutinise the government's behaviour, their actions and the way they go about doing their work. It is important that this Freedom of Information Act be used as a tool of transparency and to give the public the legal right to request access to those documents.

Many of us here in this place who have lodged FOIs, or have had FOIs lodged on them, would understand the nature of what it means to have a high level of transparency. Particularly, we understand that it is to gain information and that transparency of not only government agencies and the ministers but of local councils and universities. It is about putting people's minds at ease.

We know that there is a level of mischief when people are not given that level of understanding or transparency when it comes to the process, and it has been very clear over a long period of time that we are now starting to see those cracks appear in this newish government's foundations with the lack of transparency. It also enables people to amend documents that are deemed to be incomplete, incorrect, out of date or misleading. Each agency has FOI staff responsible for processing applications in accordance with the act and then a 30-day period to act on that application.



Under the act, copies of ministerial diaries can be disclosed by the FOI application. Applications are applicable to meetings, events and functions attended by ministers relating to their responsibilities. However, a broad scope of documents can be exempt and restricted from application. We understand that some information, some documents, are cabinet-in-confidence or are withheld for commercial reasons.

Information relating to electoral records, personal affairs, internal working documents does not require disclosure, and that level of information disclosed often varies at different FOI offices. So there is a level of interpretation by an individual as to whether documents are relevant to be disclosed or not, but it is all about the variance and that interpretation that is being brought into question.

The amendment requires that ministers should take a much more proactive step to make their diaries available to the public. I have had to make my diaries public over a long period of time. That is a responsibility that comes with giving that level of transparency, and this proposal champions again that word 'transparency'. I want to talk about the current government's lack of transparency, but I will talk about that a little later.

These transparency measures are already in place in New South Wales, Queensland and the ACT and include the possibility of providing clearer overview to the public and the parliament of policy and those funding decisions. We know, currently, that there are meetings with stakeholders identifying conflicts of interest around who is meeting with government ministers and who is making the decisions in policy within government.

I want to touch on the current Labor government's record on secrecy. The government's secrecy has been publicly amplified as an enemy of the people. Since the beginning of this government's term, they have tried time and again to keep many areas of concern under wraps and in the dark.

Let's see what has happened seven months later. On day one, we learned that South Australia's new Premier is actually a dark age dictator. Those opposite voted to scrap vital transparency measures requiring them to provide timely answers to questions on notice, and we note that the former Labor government—

**Mr BROWN:** Sorry, just a point of order, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order.

**Mr BROWN:** The member is reflecting on a vote of the house.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** He is out of his seat, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! He is indeed out of his seat, but he may well repeat the point of order when he returns to his seat. Member for Chaffey.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Thank you, sir. What I would like to say is the—

**Mr BROWN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I see the member for Frome. He calls attention to a point of order. I will hear him under 134.

**Mr BROWN:** Mr Speaker, the member is reflecting on a vote of the house.

**The SPEAKER:** Florey, I should say. That may be; I will listen carefully. Member for Chaffey, you well know the standing orders.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Thank you, sir. Point of clarification, sir: the member for Frome is sitting right here.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I think I have already observed that.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I think it is important. We are talking about transparency here. We are talking about diaries through FOI. I am trying to uncover some of this secrecy, yet the member for Florey, squeaker down the back, is getting up with a concern.

**Mr BROWN:** Mr Speaker, point of order.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** What I have to say is—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order, member for Chaffey.

**Mr BROWN:** I would ask the member to withdraw that invective directed at me.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I understand that the standard is a subjective one, member for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I must say, I did not hear clearly. However, it may be that the member for Chaffey, in order to resolve the issue expeditiously, were to withdraw and resume his remarks.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Sir, there was nothing malicious in anything I have said to date. I am sure the member for Florey understands what the comment was and what the reference was to.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Florey, I will hear you as to what it is that you consider to be offensive. I observe, member for Chaffey, that the standard is a subjective one. In consequence of that, it is not necessarily the case that needs to be proved up objectively that something was offensive to an ordinary person in the position of the member for Florey. Member for Florey, what was it that you considered offensive?

**Mr BROWN:** Speaker, the minister—the former minister, I forgot that he had to resign in disgrace—referred to me as a squeaker. I ask him to withdraw that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That may be, member for Florey, but it does not give an opportunity for you also to reflect on another member in the house. Member for Chaffey, the member has taken offence. I invite you to withdraw.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I withdraw, but I now ask the member for Florey to withdraw his comment.

**The SPEAKER:** Very well.

**Mr BROWN:** Sir, I withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** Very well. There has been a withdrawal on both sides. Member for Chaffey.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Thank you, sir. Why did Labor scrub all their election commitments from their website? Is that something that is there again as part of a dark age dictatorship? What I must say is that now what we are seeing is public servants being gagged, we are seeing government breathing down their necks, we are seeing that Green Industries SA was closeted in secrecy.

The Conservation Council was given hush money to keep answers around metropolitan coastline under wraps, and the member for Hartley yesterday informed us that the Auditor-General's ability to conduct his duty is being hindered by this government. There was \$2 million given to RecFish SA. We have seen their behaviour under a former government and how they did not represent recreational fishers, yet they have now received funding. That is just outrageous and I think there is some transparency needed on that.

What we are seeing now is that they were leaking to the now government and that they were undermining the Minister's Recreational Fishing Advisory Council at every turn. There is more to come, I can assure you, and that will probably come through an FOI. I think it is important that we do have a level of transparency. I support the member for Heysen's great contribution to this bill.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:29):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....25  
Noes.....17  
Majority .....8

#### AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E.	Champion, N.D.
Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Fulbrook, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.P.
Hughes, E.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.	Malinauskas, P.B.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.	Thompson, E.L.
Wortley, D.J.		

#### NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Bell, T.S.
Brock, G.G.	Cowdrey, M.J.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)	Hurn, A.M.	McBride, P.N.
Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.	Pratt, P.K.
Speirs, D.J.	Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.
Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.	

#### PAIRS

Szakacs, J.K.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Koutsantonis, A.
Marshall, S.S.		

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

#### *Motions*

#### **BUCKLAND PARK INTERSECTION**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (11:33):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the extraordinary inconvenience placed on motorists thanks to the installation of the traffic lights on Port Wakefield Road at Buckland Park;
- (b) notes that the Buckland Park intersection boasts the only set of traffic lights between Port Adelaide and Port Augusta;
- (c) recognises that the traffic lights undermine the good work by successive governments in improving traffic flow along the north-south corridor; and
- (d) requests an immediate upgrade to the Buckland Park intersection to reverse this short-sighted decision and return traffic to a free flow model.

It is wonderful to kickstart private members' motions today with a motion that is particularly important to the people of Narungga. The set of traffic lights that has been installed has been quite the cause of concern in my electorate. That is not to undermine the wonderful work being done to improve housing stock in the state.

We all recognise the dire shortage of houses that we have in electorates right across South Australia. Surely, this work by a private investor to provide more opportunities for more housing stock at Buckland Park is welcome to help remediate that problem to some degree, but I

have to say that the installation of traffic lights at the entrance to that new development is causing a great deal of concern.

In the motion, I touch on the work done by successive governments when it comes to improving traffic flow and that has been really welcomed by our community. I only have to reminisce that, a few years ago, for me personally, it was a door-to-door trip of just over two hours from my home in Kadina to where we stayed in Adelaide. That trip has got down a lot closer to 90 minutes now with the installation of the Northern Connector and that is, by and large, thanks to the removal of traffic lights and having to stop regularly along that way.

It has been really welcomed, particularly by truck drivers and farmers who have to go to Port Adelaide to either collect or drop off grain or materials. It has been a wonderful innovation and governments should be congratulated on expending public funds on an initiative that has been so welcomed by our community. But, as I said, it is a cause of great frustration in the community and a great deal of confusion too, it must be said, when, despite the wonderful work that has been done by governments, there suddenly pops up a set of traffic lights in the midst of that work.

I have constituents who could not for the life of them figure out why, after all that wonderful work removing traffic lights to improve the flow and shorten the travel time, suddenly there was another set of traffic lights being put up. It did not make sense to them. It does not make sense to me, and it has caused a great deal of disappointment. I really do share that disappointment with my constituents and hopefully we can get something fixed in a rather short time.

As a frequent user of that road, as I started to see the works being done on that site at Buckland Park, I began to investigate what might be happening out there and what the plan might be for that site. It became apparent quite quickly to me that it would be a concern for the people of Narungga and I took action as soon as I could. There are some things that come through the door as a member of parliament where you do not know what the mood of the community might be and it requires a great deal of consultation, but for this particular matter it became quite apparent quite quickly that it would be a cause for considerable concern in the community.

On 4 March 2021, I first spoke in this house about the installation of the traffic lights and the concern it had caused for the people of Narungga. That followed a letter on 5 February 2021 to the then Minister for Transport and Infrastructure advocating that, in the interests of traffic flow and noting the construction of those lights, they not be turned on until such a time as there was a significant enough population that was living at Buckland Park to justify them being turned on.

I advocated in that letter that that was the only way we could determine whether it would be necessary in the immediate term for those lights to be turned on. If we waited to see what the traffic flow was like before we turned them on, we could have a better understanding of what might be needed out there. Unfortunately, that letter fell on deaf ears. It was not agreed to by the then government and by the then minister and those lights went ahead and were built and turned on as was planned.

However, we did receive in the reply to that letter some confirmation from the then minister about the plans that would follow at Buckland Park. They included, upon the sale of approximately 9,000 allotments, that a grade separation would be developed there to speed up traffic. That is the number of allotments that has been adjudicated as giving rise to the requirement for a grade separation to return traffic flow to what it once was. We were told, as constituents in Narungga, that we ought to wait until such a time as that many allotments were sold and then our problems would be solved and things would go away.

I would contend that we need a more immediate fix than that. We need to get stuck into solving that problem now so that our constituents can continue to travel from Yorke Peninsula to Adelaide and back without this inconvenience. I quote from the letter dated 5 March from Minister Wingard:

The construction of the Grade separated overpass at this location is dependent on the progress of the development and population growth in future years—

and that—

DIT is investigating the installation of advance warning signs on Port Wakefield Road to provide drivers (especially heavy vehicle operators) enough notice that there will be a change of lights at the intersection.

Following that correspondence, the number of constituents coming to me to complain and to voice their concerns about the issue did not abate. We continue to get a large number of people visiting the electorate office and bailing me up in the street with their concerns.

I wrote to the minister in July 2021 voicing those concerns once again and advocating for a warning sign. We wanted a sign that provided warning for people driving along that road that the lights were about to change, that there was an impending yellow light coming up and that they should begin slowing down and get ready to stop.

Unfortunately, what happened was that we had those warning lights installed—although some might contend that they are probably not far enough away from the actual intersection—but they now flash in perpetuity. Those lights are flashing 24/7, warning of upcoming traffic lights, which means they are doing absolutely nothing. It is like the person studying for an exam who highlights the whole page of paper: it does not draw attention to any one thing.

The proper course of action for the department would have been to make sure that those lights flash when the light is about to change, to provide a warning that the light is about to change so that the truck drivers with fully laden trucks can begin the process of slowing down. Precious few of us in this chamber would fully appreciate—especially not me—the difficulty of bringing a fully loaded truck to a stop. It is not an easy process, and it is my contention that the warning lights that we have now installed are not doing that job. They are not providing enough warning and could do with that change.

I have had contact with truck drivers from around the electorate who have had the privilege of travelling around our great country and who have seen those lights working in that way in other states, so surely there is no reason that it cannot work here in South Australia. I wrote again to the new minister after the election, bringing that to his attention, and I am awaiting a response from him. I have had a couple of conversations with him and I am hoping that we can bring about that change to provide more warning, particularly for those truck drivers, to make sure that they are warned of an impending light change not an impending intersection. That is the key thing for our constituents.

That is what I am working on now. It is something that I have been desperately trying to bring to the attention of the decision-makers over a prolonged period, and this motion is the next iteration of that action. I think the key word in this motion is that we desire 'immediate' action. It is imperative that we get stuck into fixing this problem right now. It cannot wait. We should not have to wait for 9,000 allotments to be sold. We should be able to get stuck into providing a solution for the people not just of my electorate but of the northern part of this wonderful state.

This motion is about bringing about immediate action from the government. I reckon if I had \$1 for every constituent who had approached me requesting a change for this electorate, I would be able to fund the improvements myself. That should be enough evidence for the government to take immediate action. There is clearly a desire within the community. There are clearly safety concerns.

Perversely, those lights that have been put up in that place are, in the view of some, providing a more dangerous situation than otherwise might have been there. When those lights change suddenly and you have a fully loaded truck, it is very difficult to stop, and skidding through that intersection could, perversely, provide a more dangerous situation than otherwise might have been there.

As I said, this motion is the latest iteration in a prolonged series of works that I have undertaken to try to secure a solution at Buckland Park intersection. It is not to degrade the wonderful work being done to provide a greater level of housing stock in the state, but we certainly need to return that traffic to a free-flowing model. The wonderful work done by successive governments on the Northern Connector and at Port Wakefield was really welcomed by my community, and I am sure if we can fix this problem at Buckland Park it will be welcomed as well.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:43):** I rise to speak on the motion by the member for Narungga:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the extraordinary inconvenience placed on motorists thanks to the installation of the traffic lights on Port Wakefield Road at Buckland Park;
- (b) notes that the Buckland Park intersection boasts the only set of traffic lights between Port Adelaide and Port Augusta;
- (c) recognises that the traffic lights undermine the good work by successive governments in improving traffic flow along the North South Corridor; and
- (d) requests an immediate upgrade to the Buckland Park intersection to reverse this short-sighted decision and return traffic to a free flow model.

It is to be noted that there is some work being done; the projections are that 33,000 residents will be at Buckland Park by 2036.

Obviously over time there have been concerns about it being on the Gawler River flood plain. It is an area where my past generations lived and worked over many years before coming down to Coomandook. In fact, back in the late 1840s, after my family left the initial farm at Plympton, which they had settled in 1840, they went out to Gawler River and then subsequently to Angle Vale. We had land along Heaslip Road and part of that is now the RAAF Base Edinburgh.

In regard to this motion, in 2010 the Walker Corporation was given approval for the construction of what was slated as a \$2 billion satellite town called Riverlea, just north of Buckland Park. The name Buckland Park comes from an old homestead in the region. Once complete, Riverlea is expected to become home to over 30,000 residents, with another 10,000 added to that number in the years following. Around 12,000 homes will be built to accommodate the population, with 10,000 new jobs likely to be created within the satellite town and surrounding precincts.

The entrance to Riverlea is via Riverlea Boulevard, which is directly opposite Angle Vale Road as you travel along Port Wakefield Road. In February 2021, traffic lights were installed on Port Wakefield Road at the abovementioned intersection to give access to Riverlea. The speed limit was reduced from 110 km/h to 90 km/h on approach to the intersection. It is understood a four-way signalised intersection was a condition of the Walker Corporation's development approval.

As has already been explained by the member for Narungga, motorists used to be able to travel from Port Adelaide to Port Augusta without encountering any traffic lights. The installation of traffic lights at the Buckland Park intersection has now interrupted that free-flowing movement of traffic along Port Wakefield Road and this goes against the purpose of the north-south corridor to be a nonstop major route for north and southbound traffic. It is a major inconvenience for motorists and heavy freight vehicles in particular: heavy freight travelling at about 100 km/h and other vehicles travelling at about 110 km/h are suddenly forced to stop.

Traffic lights do not belong on major freight routes, which is why the government should be prioritising an upgrade to the Buckland Park intersection so that Port Wakefield Road can return to being a free-flowing traffic route. In fact, the current Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, said the following in parliament on 7 July 2022 in reference to Port Wakefield Road, and I quote, 'It does look ridiculous to have a set of traffic lights on that section of road.'

With this development coming onstream in the last couple of decades, it has been an issue for quite a few people, and the flood threat has been referred to in the media multiple times. We are told by the developers that flood threat is mitigated. I know it is not directly related to this, but it is interesting to look at what is happening with the River Murray at the moment in flood and in a high water situation. I can tell you, high water is far better than what we saw 16 years ago, when we were in severe drought and could not get water to the mouth of the mighty River Murray.

It is something to be aware of. When we see flooding happening interstate at places such as Lismore with the high rainfall, it is certainly something to take into account. I hope that the mitigation methods put in place at Buckland Park do activate appropriately for that settlement of Riverlea.

In relation to the transport options heading out of Port Adelaide to Port Augusta and all points in between, one thing that freight route has is the advantage of taking two-trailer road trains all the way through until they get to Port Augusta, where they can then hook up the third one to go to Alice Springs and Darwin. It is a great asset to have those big units that can come straight out of the port, whether they are taking produce north or they have brought export commodities in. It could be grain,

it could be a whole range of commodities, but it is certainly a really efficient way of getting freight to Yorke Peninsula, the Mid North and the Upper North with those options of having two-trailer road trains.

There is certainly an issue with having to pull up or back off when you see those yellow lights flashing continuously, as members said, knowing those lights are there. It is not that simple to pull up with that much weight. You might have close to a 70-tonne rig by the time you have the freight onboard. It would be far better to have the grade separation in place.

It is said that getting to 9,000 residents is part of the deal, and that will take place. It will be an expensive process, but what does need to happen—and it needs to happen sooner rather than later—is freeing up the that route for freight as well as for people going about their day-to-day business, whether that is connecting through to Yorke Peninsula, the Mid North, the Upper North or Far North. That is the way you get efficiencies for people on their much-needed trips into Adelaide or for that much-needed freight going either way.

On this side of the house, we believe there should be immediate action taken to free up that freight route so that people have the best access they can have, whether they are heading north or whether, a lot of the time, they are bringing that much-needed export capability into Port Adelaide.

The ability to take two-trailer road trains straight in is something to be treasured. Obviously, as I have mentioned here before, you cannot do that on the South Eastern Freeway, for obvious reasons. You can take B-doubles, but there is plenty of freight now that goes around the northern freight route, around the Sturt Highway and around the Halfway House turnoff to come south through to Sedan and Mannum and then to Murray Bridge, where we can get the bigger combinations, whether they be road trains or the AB-doubles, the B-triples and B-quads.

This is a very commendable motion from the member for Narungga. I can imagine how many times he has been lobbied on this. I hope he is saving all those dollars, if he gets them, for every constituent who comes to him, to assist in the remediation of this problem. I urge the government to have a serious look at this. It is about creating somewhere for people to live very close to the urban environment, but we have to make it convenient for the rest of regional South Australia not just to go about their business but to go about their life as well. I commend the motion.

**Ms PRATT (Frome) (11:53):** I rise to speak to this motion and thank the member for bringing it to the house and for his continued pursuit of this issue. I certainly share his frustration on behalf of the many constituents of Frome who are also affected by this; in fact, before you put your toe into the seat of Narungga you will have driven through the electorate of Frome, once crossing the Gawler River.

I would like to take you back in time—we will do a bit of time travel—back to the dark days of 2010. This morning in the house the opposition have needed to reflect on those dark days of the Labor legacy, the former Premier and of course the infamous 'media Mike' Rann, a legacy of an era of government that had no regard for regional SA or anything that was of benefit to regional South Australia north of Gepps Cross.

This was a time of a profligate Labor government focused only on making city-centric deals—for example, selling off the Glenside mental health hospital. We remember the St Clair and Cheltenham racecourse open space debacle, and here we are discussing, as it turns out, a deal with Walker Corporation for a development that would occur 12 years into the future.

Fast-forward, and we are now witnessing a welcome housing boom in the area of the Adelaide Plains. Just a few metres down the road from this intersection, as one crosses the Gawler River and approaches the township of Two Wells, we are seeing this town grow at a speedy rate, with over 3,000 families set to live in and around the township just down the road from Riverlea.

Property developers Hickinbotham's, in partnership with Xavier College, have worked closely with the Adelaide Plains Council to deliver affordable housing on larger blocks within this fabulous country town of Two Wells. The community here is brimming with opportunity and development, and we are seeing large numbers of student enrolments increasing with families relocating. This only adds to the traffic on the road.

As prospective families scout out new housing developments across the Northern Adelaide Plains, they are scrupulously checking the capacity for infrastructure opportunities and impediments. I would argue that locals from Lewiston to Mallala would agree that this intersection at Riverlea is an impediment. Roughly \$564 million was invested in the Northern Expressway and those who use it welcome it, but its purpose was to create a free-flowing traffic experience, I guess, yet Labor gifted us this congestion maker and it certainly defies logic.

You can drive from Wingfield to Waikerie in the fabulous electorate of Chaffey and you will not hit a traffic light until you get across the border to Mildura. You can drive from Brompton to the Barossa. You can drive from Croydon to Clare. But you cannot drive from Port Adelaide to Port Augusta. The mind boggles at the lack of logic that has forced upon us an intersection that, to reflect on previous members' comments, is an impediment and a safety issue.

In recognising that the new satellite town of Riverlea will expand roughly to about 12,000 homes, we should expect that there will be at least one vehicle for each home, and I think it is probably fair to guess that there would be two. It is not hard to imagine the volume of traffic we are going to see just attached to the Riverlea housing estate, but that does not factor in the people who are using it now.

The member for Narungga, the member for Flinders and certainly the member for Frome are using this gateway frequently. We have a future housing boom in Riverlea. We have families already relocating or establishing themselves in the Two Wells district. We have touched on the important freight route that this is and the volume of traffic that travels through it. Of course, the Marshall Liberal government happily invested heavily in the dual overpass at Port Wakefield, so we understood as a government the importance of investing in free-flowing traffic thoroughfares for our truckies and our freight route.

I made a commitment to get my MR (medium rigid) licence just so that I could drive the school bus. The member for Narungga reflected on the lag time required for road trains to slow down, and as a former school bus driver I certainly know about the care you need to take on the roads with those loads, so I cannot imagine the stress they feel when lights are constantly flashing and not giving them an opportunity to reflect on the changing lights at the intersection.

Certainly, in my electorate of Frome, this has been raised as a frustration for particular communities around Mallala, Korunye, Redbanks, those who live at Two Wells who are using it and all the way up the highway and along the coastal towns of Port Parham, Webb Beach, Middle Beach, Thompson Beach, Dublin, Lower Light and Windsor—and that is just the electorate of Frome. I would argue and politely suggest that residents in the neighbouring electorates of Taylor, Playford and Light might like to get in touch with their local Labor members and have a similar conversation and a 'please explain'.

For my own residents of Frome—and they are the ones I represent fervently on this issue—the frustration they feel, the safety issues they have raised, their concern about a growing population and of course their frustration at the lack of logic all come back to the member's motion, in which he is calling for immediate action from this current Labor government. I certainly concur with my colleagues that attention needs to be given to this intersection. With those closing remarks, I commend the motion.

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (12:01):** I rise to speak in support of this motion from the member for Narungga and highlight that there is a significant portion of our state which, if they are travelling into Adelaide, they have to traverse this intersection. Port Wakefield Road, in particular, is a significant and predominant north-south freight route for our state as it makes its way into Port Adelaide. I do note that the traffic lights put into this intersection are now the only set of traffic lights that exists between Port Adelaide and Port Augusta.

The productivity of our state really hinges on having appropriate and effective freight routes right across. In the discussion that has been had I certainly note the points that have been made about the increasing domestic population and domestic use of this road, and that this intersection is not one that should be underestimated. We do need to make sure that motorists in their domestic vehicles are kept safe in the most effective way.



The point I want to make sure we truly understand in this place when we are debating this motion—and the minister and his department when they are looking at this intersection, in particular—is the need for a clear, uninterrupted freight route for our significant freight movements, the day-to-day and week-to-week freight movements with significant tonnage.

There is also the seasonal freight, which, in a season like we have this year in South Australia, is going to be significant. Indeed, the productive lands of the seat Narungga are always at high levels of production, and this is reflected in the tonnages that come from the member for Narungga's seat into Port Adelaide. There is a significant part of the state that does vary more seasonally, and our agricultural production does.

In seasons like we have had this year—fingers crossed, if the produce gets into the bins and into the trucks—there is going to be a significant amount of truck movement through that intersection and all the way to Port Adelaide. Port Adelaide is the most significant export facility that we have in the state, and the vast majority of the tonnage that is exported goes out of that port. With the significant season and the significant tonnage that is coming down to Port Adelaide, there are going to be extra interactions between domestic vehicles and heavy vehicles.

I do lament that there are not too many in this place who have had the unique experience of driving a heavy vehicle. Not too many, I am sure, would have their HC licence, not too many would have their road train licence, but I do encourage members on both sides to take the opportunity, if they get it, to go for a ride in a road train in particular, to realise the incredible skill which our operators have to develop and deal with in interactions with vehicles all the way along.

To have vehicles of 45, 55, 65, 75 tonne, it takes a significant period of time to stop that vehicle and also to get it going again. If we have an intersection where there are vehicles coming to a complete stop—as I said, up to 75-tonne road trains coming to a complete stop—firstly, there is the wear and tear on the vehicles themselves, and secondly is the danger of having a significant number of domestic vehicles interacting with those road trains and not understanding the lead-up time that is needed for a stop.

As someone who has driven heavy vehicles quite a lot, I am always surprised at how little concern people driving vehicles have in their interactions and how often vehicles cut in front of braking trucks, not knowing that there is a significant braking period that is needed. You cannot stop in a short period of time when you have a 75-tonne vehicle that you are in charge of.

This is why this intersection and the nonsensical nature of it has really caught the ire of not just those from the regions but especially those who are driving these heavy vehicles. That is why the member for Narungga, the member for Frome and myself as the member for Flinders—and I am sure the members for both Stuart and Giles—have had plenty of contact with members of our community to really just ask why is this intersection in place. Why, when we had a perfectly well-flowing thoroughfare for our vehicles and our trucks, did we decide to put traffic lights in the middle of it?

I understand and I certainly explain to my people that it is because of the development that has happened. In reflection of the motion that the member for Narungga has put, I think the time is now for us to recognise that this development will be happening. These houses will be built, these residences will be in place, this intersection will be and does need to be upgraded, so why not get moving on it now?

We know that there is a threshold for a 9,000 allotment sale for the grade separation to be put in place; we have heard that here in this place. We know that the land there is available, we know that the plans have been put together for this grade separation, so why not do it now? Agricultural communities in South Australia are getting more and more productive. There are more and more tonnes that are going to be coming down this road and the freight movements of general freight are going to increase more and more. That means that these heavy vehicles will have to traverse this thoroughfare and this intersection in increasing numbers throughout the years.

I am in full support of this motion in recognition of that and in recognition that the most effective freight route is one that is uninterrupted and one where heavy vehicles in particular are not having to come to a stop and are not having to accelerate after coming to a stop and where the extra

wear and tear, fuel load and safety challenges will be negated by having an investment in this intersection. Once again, I commend the motion from the member for Narungga and especially reflect on paragraph (d), which is that the house:

- (d) requests an immediate upgrade to the Buckland Park intersection to reverse this short-sighted decision and return traffic to a free flow model.

Traffic lights in this place really do undermine the good work that successive governments have done in improving the north-south corridor. Proper investment into productive infrastructure such as this grade separation can be well justified by those making decisions—the minister and his department—and I think it would be well supported by those who use this road, not just those of us who use it often but those who use it less frequently, like those opposite in metropolitan seats. I commend the motion.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (12:09):** I rise to support the motion and congratulate the member for Narungga on bringing this to the house. Picking up on some of the points that the member for Flinders raised, there are allotments there that are for sale. There is a housing shortage. There is demand. We are hearing a slowdown is happening because of interest rate rises, but we are certainly not seeing that here in South Australia. You can understand the urgency of having lights there initially, when that was basically a civil construction site, so that trucks could enter and leave safely, but now that we are seeing the development progressing it is time for some spend on infrastructure.

I am very pleased to be able to stand here as the person who was the shadow minister for transport when we announced the Port Wakefield bypass and bridge solution to the bottlenecks we saw at peak periods of holidays and other times at that intersection off to Yorke Peninsula. As someone who lives in the inner southern suburbs, less than two kilometres from the centre of Victoria Square—I did not always live there, of course; Buckland Park was where I used to ride motorbikes as a kid when I was growing up in Salisbury—the experience you have is that those who live in different parts of Adelaide can get around quite easily. To get to our regions easily by the north-south corridor, which unfortunately is being now delayed by this government, it is important that we remove those barriers and make a daytrip into our regions as easy as possible.

I know that people who spend most of their time driving in the suburbs might get a little bit nervous on country roads. I can understand how people would feel nervous or confused on a road such as the Northern Expressway, having all of a sudden a set of lights popping up out of nowhere when they have travelled all the way from even the Minister for Transport's electorate of West Torrens on the north-south corridor.

It is the first set of lights that they come across on the freeway, and now of course they are operated much more per hour because they are activated by people at the lights. There are people who are living there and using that development much more than just the traffic that was there for the civil construction, so I agree with the immediacy that the member for Narungga has emphasised in his motion.

There is no doubt that many South Australians have discovered the wonders and the beauty of regional South Australia and take opportunities to go out to the regions for weekends or even daytrips. A day trip to Yorke Peninsula would have been unheard of probably a generation ago, but now it is very easily achieved with the road system. Barriers like this might put some people off from taking that daytrip if they have a bad experience at that intersection.

Having a grade separation and managing that intersection in a safe manner, like we did with the overpass at Port Wakefield, will make the journey safer for people who are not necessarily used to country driving. There are no surprises. I think accidents happen when there are surprises. We know that most accidents are caused by human error, but you can minimise the chance of human error happening by removing or minimising the risk.

Now is the time to put the infrastructure in. There is no development around that corner; there is no doubt there will be in a decade's time in response to the population growth that is happening in that area. Of course, if that happens it is a much bigger job, and there may be requirements for compulsory acquisition of land in order to do that. We are seeing that happening with the north-south corridor, and we are seeing that happening with intersection upgrades in my

electorate of Unley where there have been compulsory acquisitions of land because there is simply not the physical room to improve those intersections without acquiring more land.

It makes a lot of sense, while you have the access and while the encumbrances of development are not there, to move forward on this project. Unless the government is predicting that we are going to see zero population growth, that demand for housing is going to drop off here in South Australia and that development is going to fail, I could perhaps then understand their not committing to an immediate solution for that intersection, but we know that is not the case.

During the Marshall government in particular—when people realised that there were things happening here in South Australia—people were returning to South Australia, people were coming to South Australia and we actually reversed the brain drain. We saw more people coming to South Australia than leaving, and we want that to continue because generates more opportunities for our young people, and we also want those who are of retirement age to stay here and retire in South Australia, and when they do that of course they spend a lot more leisure time discovering our state, and access roads in and out of the metropolitan area should make it very easy for them to do that.

The safer the roads are, the more city people use them and the more money will be spent supporting regional communities in South Australia, and we need those regional communities to grow. If we look at differences in the size of regional communities in South Australia compared with the size of regional towns and cities in other states, in Tasmania, for example, you have probably around 300,000 people living in Hobart, but the next largest city, Launceston, has about 90,000 people. Here in South Australia you have 1.3 million people living in Adelaide, with the next largest city, Mount Gambier, at 25,000 people.

Having larger regional cities will mean there will be more services in the region, there will be more reason for people to go there to experience those cities and there will be more job opportunities and more reasons to stay. There is a bit of a carrot or a bit of a chicken-and-egg situation, but vibrancy in regional South Australia relies on easy access to regional South Australia, and this is just one piece of the puzzle. The member for Narungga has recognised how important it is for this work to be done, and done immediately, for the benefit of those regions north of Adelaide that really are significant contributors to the South Australian economy.

There is no doubt that with the investments that the Marshall government initiated in vegetable protein—we know lots of vegetable protein is produced north of Adelaide—we now have that opportunity for the processing and manufacturing of vegetable protein products for export in South Australia. We will see again, as the member for Flinders said, more freight on the roads, more activity between the metropolitan area, Port Adelaide and the regions as that industry grows, and that will spark growth in other industries.

As you can see, it does not take me very long to list the reasons why now is the time for this intersection to have grade separation so that it is done, it does not inhibit tourism, it does not inhibit the industrial growth of the regions, the agricultural growth of the regions and the industrialisation of agriculture happening in the regions. Of course, I am sure there will be other speakers who will speak about similar projects that should be conducted in their own electorates.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:19):** I rise to lend my support to this motion. I commend the member for Narungga for bringing it to the house. I intend to speak very briefly this morning and to perhaps highlight a couple of elements that have been contributed already in the debate. I commend the member for Narungga for highlighting the need to get on and implement the grade separation at the Riverlea development.

I want to perhaps pick up on a couple of particular aspects of the motion. I do not know at paragraph (b) if the location might properly be described as 'boasting a set of traffic lights'; they are certainly there. I hope that, as the member for Narungga is on his travels and recording history at that location, and documenting the interests of his local community in seeing his good work in accelerating the progress to grade separation, there might be some historical record kept of what I hope is a temporary anomaly at that location.

I think the message that this parliament will be sending today to all South Australians is that when local members speak up about what their community is experiencing, they are then contributing to an appreciation across the parliament, throughout the community, of the importance of where this leads us.

I want to make it very clear that I am for the growth of our regions, our regional towns and regional industries, and I am for making sure that we are doing all we can to invest not only in making it easier for the residential developments to have access to the city but to have a much greater ambition than the evolution of what, without more, can be the provision of dormitories for access to jobs and activities that go on in Adelaide. I think we ought to have a regional-centred approach that says what we want to be doing is finding opportunities for work and innovation and life and the fabric of community that is to be found in the regions, and it is so important that we have infrastructure that makes that possible.

I want to highlight the contributions from the member for Hammond and the member for Flinders in particular, and also the member for Frome, in reflecting on the challenges for heavy freight in navigating that particular part of the road for the hopefully short period of time that this set of traffic lights is there because I am constantly humbled and impressed by the can-do and flexible attitude of those who have the challenge to drive a heavy vehicle along that road. They have to bring the produce in and take heavy equipment out.

Let's not forget the imposition that is placed on those heavy vehicle operators over this time. They can easily be forgotten. We can talk a lot about the development that is occurring, and that is really important with lots of new homes and that is wonderful, but keep in mind the work that those highly skilled operators of heavy vehicles do daily as they are navigating their way around our large state. Improved infrastructure makes their job a great deal easier. When the imposition of a set of traffic lights is forcing a complete stop along a stretch that really ought to be uninterrupted, then there are all sorts of risks and difficulties attendant upon that.

Let's be sure to see that the grade separation is implemented as a matter now of urgent priority. We know that grade separation is a condition of development that must be on its way once we reach the threshold of houses, but much like any area in which there is a transformation of use we need to understand that the developer is doing their bit to keep up pace, that the government is making sure that is pressed on with and that, in the interests of all road users and the state as a whole, we get to a point where we have that proper status of the road with a grade separation installed.

All strength to the member for Narungga as he continues to prosecute that case on behalf of his local members. I thank him for bringing this motion to the house. I commend it and look forward to supporting its passage.

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:25):** It gives me great pleasure to stand and speak in favour of this motion from the member for Narungga. I understand many of his concerns when he raises this piece of infrastructure and how it might be affecting his seat of Narungga and the constituents within it, and not just the seat of Narungga but every seat beyond this point heading north: Stuart, Frome, Giles, Flinders and the like.

We as regional members—as the member for Narungga is and as many who have spoken on this topic are—understand the tyranny of distance, road quality and road safety. This may be a really important piece of infrastructure for road safety. As soon as I see something like this, though, the first thing I ask, and I ask this parliament, I ask this side of politics and I ask the other side of politics is: when you travel up and down the Pacific Highway how many stoplights do you see in a three or four-lane piece of infrastructure highway when you are travelling at 110 km/h and there are a number of towns and intersections to encompass that Pacific Highway?

They do not put stoplights there: they put massive roundabouts there so it keeps the flow of traffic, for example. I am not sure whether the member for Narungga is happy about a roundabout, but I can tell you that if they stuck stoplights in every intersection of the Pacific Highway there would be traffic banked back to Melbourne going to Brisbane. That is what it does to traffic and to traffic flow.

It also then comes back to efficiency of transport. As mentioned by those who have spoken already about the regional areas, transport and tyranny of distance are based on time and energy and it has a huge cost. As everyone would know, rising energy costs are going out of control. It is adding to the cost of living, it is adding to the cost of food and the like and then it is actually affecting the most vulnerable in our society.

Why would I bring up something like this when we are talking about stoplights at an intersection heading north of Adelaide? Because it is all encompassing for this state to recognise that it is not just one piece of infrastructure that is the problem. I could name many elements of our road infrastructure and rules and regulations that impede efficiency of movement of transport.

I mention the placement of guardrails, which are there from a safety aspect but which are put so close to a road that traffic users cannot get off the road in times of crisis, like a flat tyre. So now their vehicle is stranded on the side of the road on the edge or inside the lane of transport because the guardrails will not let them get off. That is another piece of infrastructure that adds to cost and adds to the issue of safety.

Then there is the cost of guardrails and perhaps the cost of the stoplights, which the member for Narungga has seen impede his traffic flow up towards Narungga. It is more cost, an additional cost that could have gone into something even better, like repairing our roads and fixing the potholes that we are finding in our roads, in today's infrastructure that is falling apart in what was probably a mild early winter, a wet late winter and now has turned out to be a very, very wet spring.

I do not know whether anyone has travelled on regional roads lately, but my understanding is that the potholes are extending all the way from Mount Gambier right through to Ceduna. I do not know where maintenance sits on this, but I think the workers are flat out. The expenditure is huge for those maintaining these roads, but it tells you that the roads are tired, they are old and they need replacing. Again, why does this come up as a topic? Because it is about the priority of expenses and it is about the priority of expenditure on our roads. I think we must make sure that we keep our traffic flowing and that these roads can be navigated carefully and safely.

Coming back to speed restrictions and so forth and one of the things that we also hear about when we do up our roads, we put shoulders on roads and lifted the speed limit on eight roads under the Marshall government. A lot of these roads needed shoulders to be put in place. The shoulders have been done. Prior to these shoulders being in place, the speed limit was 100 km/h.

I am hoping that this new Malinauskas government does not revert to those sorts of tactics by reducing speed limits when the roads become that bad. I hope that they will find the means, the financial ability, to finance these roads back to the state they find them in now at 110 km/h and we do not have to see any more reductions. Why do I bring up these reductions? Because it is all about the speed and efficiency of transport around our regions. As has been highlighted by the member for Narungga, we want efficient, flowing transport to get where we need to be on a regular basis right across this state's network.

Coming back to the shoulders and how they were added to these roads, they have been added to more than just the eight. No doubt, there are others. Certainly, in MacKillop we have roads that need greater shoulder work. First of all, when the shoulders are done, we see the impediment of speed restrictions because the work needs to be carried out. The restrictions are then left in place because we need to see the new surface harden and wear in in a slower fashion than at the normal speed limit that could be applied to these roads. It will be 80 km/h for a number of months after the repairs have been done.

That may be all well intended to look after that new surface, but it impedes the flow of traffic. It frustrates motorists having to do 80 km/h for 10, 20 or 30 kilometres in some places. Again, we as local members got letters from frustrated motorists that road repairs took a long time to carry out and were over huge expanses because of the backlog and the massive upgrades that took place over the last four years of the Marshall government. I am hoping these repairs continue on through the Malinauskas Labor government.

Feedback about these shoulders is now that the new shoulders being added to the old road surfaces are causing another problem, and that is that the old road surfaces are of such an age that

the new shoulders are not gelling and mixing as well as they could. What we have done is extended the width of the road. We now find that the left-hand sides of vehicles and heavy transport vehicles are driving down this join line, and the joins are fracturing, breaking, cracking up and creating more potholes than ever before. It is the legacy of old surfaces needing a new shoulder.

These potholes cause hazards. They need to be repaired regularly. I know that the maintenance crews, for example the Fulton Hogan business, are stretched. It stretches their means. In our region of the Limestone Coast, we have seen Victorian crews come into South Australia to try to back up our South Australian crews because they cannot keep up with this maintenance.

In the gist of transport and efficiencies, I am all for spending money on it, making sure it is effective and making sure it works. I do not like seeing these impediments in our transport network that slow us down, make it harder and are an extra burden to business. Another thing that has come to my mind is that the Marshall government had these ideas of creating a bypass around Adelaide and a northern entrance into Adelaide for heavy transport. It comes back to this point about Narungga with stoplights heading north of Adelaide and the impediments that these sorts of stoppages cause for heavy transport.

It was well noted by the heavy transport industry that, if they can come from Melbourne or the Limestone Coast and avoid the city, avoiding all the stoplights, not only would they really appreciate a bypass that would go out past Monarto and onto the Sturt Highway entrance from the Riverland into Adelaide but they would actually be happy to pay a toll to bypass Adelaide and get onto a freeway that would take them around it. It is because of the cost of being bottlenecked up in peak-hour traffic in Adelaide, the stoplights and the stop-starting.

People need to recognise that we are talking about motions of energy, trucks 40 to 60 tonnes stopping and starting, and paying a truck driver I imagine anything from \$20, \$30, \$40 or \$50 an hour to sit in a truck and perhaps waste time compared to other alternatives. These sorts of issues have been highlighted here in the north of Adelaide when we think about the Northern Expressway, the north-south corridor and free-flowing traffic. We do not want to see this state impeded by infrastructure that just gets in the way.

I hope those on the other side—they are new in this new Malinauskas government—recognise that, yes, safety is a concern but it needs to be balanced with efficiency. In solving what the member for Narungga has raised here, I hope that common sense prevails. I fully support all those who have spoken in support of this motion. I congratulate the member for Narungga on his motion and I wish him all the best.

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:35):** I move amendments to the motion as follows:

Delete (c)

Within (d):

Delete the word 'immediate'

Delete the words 'reverse this short-sighted decision and'

With those amendments, I would just like to make some brief comments. There is a developer deed between the Riverlea developers and this state. This sets out what road improvements will be done, whose financial responsibility they are and the implementation triggers. Traffic modifications under the developer deed include traffic light installation, which is complete and which was the developer's responsibility. The next step is further intersection improvements. The trigger has not yet been met, which again is the developer's responsibility.

In relation to an overpass and signal removal on Port Wakefield Road, current traffic volumes do not justify a grade-separated solution. This is a very expensive solution; however, I am advised that it is something the state government will be looking at and, as a result, will be closely monitoring traffic volumes. I appreciate that this may not be the response the member wants to hear, but the member for Narungga would recognise it is very difficult to try to fix all the problems we have inherited from the previous Marshall Liberal government.

I do want to thank the member for Narungga for bringing this motion to the house, and I know the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport encourages him to keep up that advocacy through local

and federal members of parliament as well because this is an issue that is important for our freight industry and the local community. I once again acknowledge the member for Narungga's advocacy on behalf of his electorate.

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (12:37):** I thank all members for their contributions to the debate—another lengthy one but, as has been articulated by a number of speakers, an important one for a great many people who live in our wonderful state.

I will respectfully offer that I do intend to oppose the amendments put forward by the government, well intentioned as they may be. The basis for that is that, with regard to the deletion of paragraph (c), that was an attempt by me to acknowledge the wonderful work done not only by the Labor government but by our previous Liberal government.

The Northern Connector, as I articulated previously, is a wonderful addition to our road network and has had a tremendous benefit for the people of Yorke Peninsula in accessing metropolitan services in a far quicker time, just like the development at Port Wakefield currently being undertaken is having a similar impact on travel times as well.

The intent behind acknowledging the good work of successive governments is perhaps also to highlight the inconsistency of government action. It is very difficult for my constituents to understand why at Port Wakefield we will be installing an overpass to improve traffic flow and at Buckland Park putting up stoplights. You cannot reconcile those two things. They are not too far apart in distance, but they are two completely different solutions. It is hard for my constituents and I to understand the rationale behind those things.

While there has been some excellent work done by successive governments, the point of that particular part of the motion was to highlight the inconsistency and try to bring attention to the fact that there should be similar works done at Buckland Park as are being done on other parts of our road network.

The other important part would be that the government proposes to delete the immediacy of this motion, and that is another part that I strongly object to. My constituents, and the constituents north of Adelaide, should not be forced to wait until 9,000 blocks may or may not get sold at Buckland Park to see an improvement in their road network. We object to the inconvenience that has been placed upon us. We would like to see that solution solved sooner rather than later and, as such, oppose the effort to remove the immediacy from the motion.

However, if this house does see fit to remove those parts of the motion, then hopefully the minister—and I have been liaising with him directly—will make those improvements that I mentioned in my opening speech to the warning lights. I recall as a younger person coming to Adelaide and having lights that operated in that very fashion at Waterloo Corner, so if I remember correctly I think there is precedent within South Australia for those lights. I am hoping that we can come up with a commonsense outcome, even in the event that I cannot convince the majority of the benefits of immediate action, which will improve the safety at that intersection in the immediate term.

With the greatest of respect to the government, I will be opposing their amendments. I do thank all the members for their contributions on the motion. It is wonderful to see another well-represented motion on an issue that is of significant importance to my electorate.

The house divided on the amendments:

Ayes .....25  
 Noes.....17  
 Majority .....8

AYES

Andrews, S.E.  
 Boyer, B.I.  
 Clancy, N.P.  
 Fulbrook, J.P.  
 Hughes, E.J.

Bettison, Z.L.  
 Brown, M.E.  
 Close, S.E.  
 Hildyard, K.A.  
 Hutchesson, C.L.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
 Champion, N.D.  
 Cook, N.F.  
 Hood, L.P.  
 Malinauskas, P.B.

Michaels, A.  
Pearce, R.K.  
Savvas, O.M.  
Wortley, D.J.

Mullighan, S.C.  
Piccolo, A.  
Stinson, J.M.

Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)  
Picton, C.J.  
Thompson, E.L.

#### NOES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Brock, G.G.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Speirs, D.J.  
Telfer, S.J.

Batty, J.A.  
Cowdrey, M.J.  
Hurn, A.M.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Bell, T.S.  
Ellis, F.J. (teller)  
McBride, P.N.  
Pratt, P.K.  
Teague, J.B.

#### PAIRS

Szakacs, J.K.  
Marshall, S.S.

Patterson, S.J.R.

Koutsantonis, A.

Amendments carried; motion as amended carried.

#### REMEMBRANCE DAY

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:45):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that Remembrance Day is observed on 11 November;
- (b) acknowledges that Remembrance Day has been observed since the end of the First World War to remember and pay tribute to those who have fought and sacrificed their lives to keep us free;
- (c) expresses its profound gratitude to all South Australians who have served, and continue to serve, in our armed forces; and
- (d) acknowledges the important role of the RSL and other organisations who support veterans and the families of those who did not return.

After four years of warfare and the deaths of millions of civilians and military, the guns on the Western Front finally fell silent at 11am on 11 November 1918. This marked the end of the First World War, and since then countries, including Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States, have been using 11 November as the annual day to commemorate those who lost their lives in battle.

The day was originally called Armistice Day, due to the Germans calling for an armistice in order to secure a peace settlement. It remained Armistice Day until the end of World War II, when the United Kingdom proposed to change the name to Remembrance Day. This was done so that the day could be used to honour those killed in both wars.

There have been numerous other wars since the two world wars, and in Australia we have used 11 November to commemorate the lives lost in all wars and conflicts since 1918. Whilst the day has been around since 1918, it was not until 1997 that Governor-General Sir William Deane formally declared 11 November to be Remembrance Day and urged all Australians to observe one minute's silence at 11am on 11 November each year.

The first sign of the First World War coming to an end was in October 1918, when an armistice between the Ottoman Empire and the Allies put a stop to the fighting in the Middle East. This was shortly followed by an armistice being signed between the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Italy. Meanwhile, over in the west the German Army was quickly collapsing, and on 10 November the Germans on the battle front were instructed by the government to sign the armistice with the Allies. This followed news that Kaiser Wilhelm II, German's last reigning monarch, had abdicated.



At 5am on 11 November the armistice was agreed on and word was sent to the allied commanders that hostilities would be stopped on the entire front, beginning at 11 o'clock on 11 November. The signing of the armistice resulted in the complete demilitarisation of the German Army, the evacuation of German soldiers out of France and Belgium, and the immediate release of allied prisoners of war and interned civilians. Numerous armistices were signed in 1918; however, it was the armistice of the 11<sup>th</sup> of the 11<sup>th</sup> that left a lasting global legacy, as it symbolised the war on the Western Front ending after four long years.

In regard to what we have contributed as Australians over the years, over 1½ million Australian men and women have served in eight major wars and conflicts since the start of the First World War in 1914. Some of this service has been here at home, but, as we know, a lot of it has been overseas. Over 100,000 have died during battle since that time and many others have died as a result of injuries sustained from battle.

In the First World War, 416,809 Australians enlisted out of a population of less than five million. Of that number, 34,959 were South Australians. Sadly, 61,665 Australians died during World War I, with more than 156,000 wounded, gassed or taken prisoner. The number of Australians who served in World War II was 993,000, more than double the number who were involved in World War I, and the number of South Australians who served was 54,660. It was fortunate to a degree that the number of casualties from World War II was considerably less for Australians, totalling 39,656, although one life lost is one life too many.

During the course of the Second World War, over 30,000 Australians were taken prisoner. Each Remembrance Day, we take the opportunity to reflect on wars that have shaped the world and commemorate those who tragically lost their lives protecting our nation. Serving in Australia's armed forces is a serious commitment, and we thank those South Australians who are current members and those who have served in the past.

We must also acknowledge the important work of the many ex-service organisations that provide support to our veterans and their families. Transitioning from military to civilian life can be a difficult period for veterans and their families, so it is crucial that they have access to quality support services to help them through this phase.

In particular, we express our gratitude to the Returned and Services League for the work they do year round for our veterans and for the dedication they put into conducting Remembrance Day services. I also want to acknowledge all the other organisations—the many tens of organisations in South Australia and hundreds of organisations across Australia—that assist our veterans. There are not just physical injuries that happen in battle. There is also obviously the toll taken on the mental health of veterans who have served on the many battlefields over the last century or so.

I really take my hat off and salute all the people who have served or are serving, whether it be here with forces at home or whether it be with the Citizen Military Forces, which my father was in in World War II because his brother was on Sunderland flying boats as a navigator flying out of England across the channel. Dad had to stay home to look after the farm. As I have said in this place before, I had a great-uncle who served on the Somme and three uncles who served, whether it was Tobruk or on the *Shropshire* or, as I indicated, Uncle Os, who served on Sunderland flying boats looking for submarines in the English Channel.

I have had a relative serve in the Air Force at Butterworth in Malaysia, and my own brother served for 23 years, including peacekeeping service in Rwanda. He was on the second tour that went into Rwanda, and it was a pretty ugly place. He was upgraded to active service, I think it was 13 years later. He also served in one of the Iraqi wars, on the 2005-06 six-month rotation, as a warrant officer.

Never can anyone do as much as those people who freely put up their hands to fight for our nation so that others like us can live in freedom. It is the ultimate commitment that someone can make. They know that they may give up their lives—and many have, as I indicated—to keep us free and keep us safe. I commend our forces, wherever they have served.

I went to a transfer of authority at Edinburgh air base the other day. It was great to see what our active service men and women can do. I noted a significant number of our forces come out of

the reserves as well; I think it is about 30 per cent. They are to be truly commended for their service, and I truly commend their employers, or the self-employed amongst them, for the service that they give. They all integrate as one military force protecting our state and our nation.

We certainly see some challenges over time with making sure that we have enough equipment to assist our armed forces. There has been a long debate around the submarines for a long time. The Collins class has been a very able submarine. Some people have tried to talk them down, but with the ongoing refits I know they have had very commendable reports when they have served in exercises with the United States Navy, for instance.

We have replacement vehicles coming in for the Army, high-speed, essentially rubber-tyred, tanks. There is an issue that there may not be enough, but I will work on that moving forward. It must be noted that the Bushmasters that are made in Australia are a very good vehicle, and 90 of those have been committed to Ukraine in the conflict that Russia instigated.

It is pleasing to see that we are able to support the country of Ukraine. My thoughts are with them, not just on a personal level for their citizens and what is happening to them but support for the military there. It has also become extremely tough, as we have seen in the last few days. It is more than extremely tough because of the blockade to get grain out of Ukraine ports. They would be getting millions of tonnes of grain in as we speak and they had the last harvest held over. It is a very fertile country producing grains and it is a real issue for them at the moment, but we are doing what we can to support them.

On reflection, back in 2010 I was fortunate to go to London for a parliamentary conference and I spent four days after that in Belgium and France touring the battlefields, touring those war graves. The scale of mass destruction that would have happened over 100 years ago on those battlefields of Europe really hits you in the face when you note that there are at least 3,500 cemeteries in France and Belgium. As I have mentioned here before, it is amazing that on a lot of the battlefields, at Tyne Cot and other places, we were literally, as Allies, fighting uphill battles. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

#### *Petitions*

### **YELLOWTAIL KINGFISH**

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey):** Presented a petition signed by 201 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to abolish commercial net fishing of yellowtail kingfish and impose a three fish per day commercial trip limit.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Local Council By-Laws—

Corporation of the Town of Walkerville—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Local Government Land

No. 3—Roads

No. 4—Moveable Signs

No. 5—Dogs

District Council of Elliston—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

- No. 2—Local Government Land
- No. 3—Roads
- No. 4—Moveable Signs
- No. 5—Dogs
- No. 6—Caravans & Camping
- No. 7—Cats

*Parliamentary Committees*

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:01):** I bring up the 16<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

**Mr FULBROOK:** I bring up the 17<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of students from Adelaide Botanic High School, visiting parliament, friends of the parliament. I also acknowledge Mr and Mrs Moll, guests of the member for Mawson, frequent visitors to South Australia, but I understand this is their first trip back from Spain since COVID. Welcome. They have been investors in South Australian wine for more than 30 years. I also acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Mr James March, the CEO of Barossa Australia, guests of the member for Schubert.

*Question Time*

**ENERGY PRICES**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04):** My question is to the Premier. What energy policies does the Premier have to bring down energy bills over the next two years? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** In recent days, *The Advertiser* reported that Davoren Park mother of three Jess Nash is worried her power bill could rise by \$2,800 over the next two years as a result of Labor's federal budget. Jess has, and I quote:

...already turned off the lights and unplugged her freezer to cut energy consumption and is unsure how she will cover another increase to her power bill.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:05):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I saw that report. It is amongst countless thousands, probably millions, of stories similar around the nation from households, particularly in low socio-economic communities but really any household across the state, but also particularly business and particularly small businesses, where we know that in most instances the cost of energy represents the second biggest cost outside of labour.

The prospect of such a large increase in power prices and also gas prices is more than disconcerting. It acts as a real threat to someone's standard of living or even the viability of their business. The one thing I will comment on before going into the specifics of the Leader of the Opposition's question is that I don't think it was the federal budget that delivered the 56 per cent increase in power prices. It was the federal budget that illuminated the Australian public with the prospect of that power price rise. What of course has caused it, which was also covered—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** What of course caused the power price, as was referred to in the same publication the Leader of the Opposition refers to, *The Advertiser*, is what has really been a decade, if not longer, of failed energy policy in this country, which of course has been coupled with a grotesque failure of policy in respect of trying to address the decarbonisation of our nation, which apparently everybody is committed to. The difference of course is that we know that one side of politics has been far more committed to the politics of division around decarbonisation rather than actually showing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey knows better.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Florey! The Premier has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is called to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Chaffey, you are warned. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** So much as a mention of failure of energy policy and the politics of decarbonisation and we see the chamber light up with snide remarks coming from—

*The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —the opposition.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is called to order.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** But the consequences of that policy inaction are now playing out before our eyes, and the consequences are very, very real. Here in South Australia we have been doing our level best to pursue decarbonisation of our state, particularly the energy sector, in such a way that has a clear mind to a solemn obligation we all have around climate but at the same time trying to ameliorate the worst impacts of policy failure in terms of the prices that South Australians have to pay.

What we know thus far is that the impact of those price increases is set to be more substantial in the Eastern States than is the case here in South Australia in no small part because of the leadership that South Australia has played in the pursuit of renewables. Of course we would like to see renewables deliver greater cost reductions than we have experienced thus far, but in no small part that is a function of the way the market is set up, which is why we do have a policy to address that.

The way we have structured our hydrogen power or our Hydrogen Jobs Plan is specifically orientated towards seeing more investment in renewables in such a way that actually delivers lower prices to the wholesale market. That is the way we structured the policy, and that is something that we are more than happy to have examined and explored by the opposition, amongst anybody else, in due course.

*Mrs Hurn interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Schubert!

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the leader, I recognise the presence in the gallery today of delegates from the SDA, friends of a number of members of parliament, particularly the member for Newland.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Unley!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Florey! The Treasurer is called to order. The member for Wright!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier is called to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader has the call.

*Question Time***ENERGY PRICES**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. Will the government's hydrogen power plant lower household energy bills and, if so, when? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** In February 2021, the then Leader of the Opposition was recorded as saying, and I quote:

You will not hear me in this election campaign running around to households and saying, 'I'm going to deliver lower electricity prices' because most of the time they think that is BS anyway.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:11):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question because I know that members of the gallery, including hardworking DC workers, care about lower power prices in the state of South Australia.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** The remarks that the Leader of the Opposition refers to in his question I made at a mining and energy conference that was held in the lead-up to the election. I was making the point that the electorate is tired of seeing broken promises when it comes to commitments to reduction in power prices because, of course, what they endured—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —over the course of the four years that the Liberal Party was in charge of South Australia was none other than a broken promise—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —when it comes to reduction in power prices—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —and all those records are there for people to dissect—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —and, of course, the former member for Stuart—

*Ms Pratt interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Frome!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —was caught out repeatedly in that regard—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Florey!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —about not honouring the commitment that was made by the member for Dunstan and the member for Stuart at the 2018 election campaign. Nonetheless, having made a—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey and the Treasurer will cease interjecting. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Having formed the view that the electorate was sick of the broken promises they saw from those opposite, I was candid, as I am now, about the fact that the principal objective of our Hydrogen Jobs Plan is to create jobs in South Australia around the hydrogen industry. We see a massive opportunity in South Australia to produce hydrogen for both domestic consumption and export in a way that leads the world. That is why we have committed \$593 million of taxpayers' funds towards building the world's largest hydrogen electrolyser and power plant.

It is also true that one of the objectives—albeit not the principal one—of our Hydrogen Jobs Plan is to also have a positive impact in terms of reduction in power prices by offering a firming service from Hydrogen Power SA to renewable investors and generators to unlock the \$20 billion pipeline of renewable energy that we know is there to be delivered—

*The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Unley!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —but also to see those renewable generators providing continuity of service in a way that can't currently be done through a firming offering particularly on the wholesale market. That's why the policy has been crafted in the way that it has. I know this is a policy that those opposite have sought to undermine every single step of the way—every single step of the way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morialta is warned. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** I would like to advise the people of South Australia in this important forum that there will be an opportunity for the opposition to cast its vote on their views about hydrogen in the form of a hydrogen act or hydrogen bill that we will be introducing into the parliament next year, which is what we have committed to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Morialta! Member for Frome! Member for Unley! Member for Colton!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —and stated publicly.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey, you are on one warning.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Those opposite can't work out whether they are for or against the women's and children's legislation. They will have the same opportunity when it comes to a hydrogen bill next year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### **NATIONAL ENERGY CRISIS TASKFORCE**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. Will the recommendations of his Energy Crisis Taskforce be published and, if so, when does he expect this to happen?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:15):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. As was outlined in our ministerial statement yesterday, for those who were here, we have established a cabinet committee, specifically to deal with the national energy crisis that we now see dominating not just headlines but the consideration of policymakers around the country. That work is being underpinned by the task force made up of key officials leading the policy effort that the government has asked them to consume. The recommendations of the national energy taskforce will be going to the cabinet committee, so that will be part of the ordinary cabinet process.

### **WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:16):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house on the response to the Malinauskas Labor government's plan for the new Women's and Children's Hospital?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:16):** Thank you very much to the member for Light for his question. I certainly can inform the house in relation to the response to the new Women's and Children's Hospital. I am happy to give information to anyone who wasn't here yesterday that it certainly has passed the upper house in relation to our legislation, which is fantastic news.

Since we announced this plan a few weeks ago, there has been wholesale support from the clinical community for our plan for a bigger and better Women's and Children's Hospital, to build it for the long term, to make sure that we have the facilities at that hospital, that it's not going to be full by the day that it opens, as opposed to the previous plan.

What we have heard from clinicians both inside the hospital and those outside the hospital, those who have been lobbying on this issue for a long time, is that finally we've got the opportunity to build a world-class facility for women and children here in South Australia. Clearly, this is because we are going to be able to build a hospital that has more beds—some 70 more beds—than the previous hospital was able to do.

We are going to be able to build a hospital that has the capacity to expand in the future as well as expand the Royal Adelaide Hospital and we are going to be able to connect those services and design the hospital properly in a way that was never possible on that RAH west site that was previously considered for the past nine years. We have been overwhelmed with support. I certainly want to thank those members of the crossbench who have been supportive of this proposal, particularly SA-Best and Sarah Game for their support. I noted the comments from Sarah Game today, who said on the radio and I quote:

In this instance—and Chris Picton and I don't often agree—I just felt the Government had done their best. There were lots of factors to consider but I think Chris summed it up really well. There have been lots of delays and

ultimately for me the health of women and children come first. I was contacted by lots of different clinicians and there was unanimous support for the Government's decision and that this hospital needed to go ahead.

I absolutely thank her for her comments. It differs considerably from the comments that we heard from the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Black—I know he doesn't like being called that—who said on 28 September:

At the end of the day I'm standing by that decision—

which was to build it on the RAH west site—

because I was sitting on the infrastructure committee that got the independent advice that said that this site was the best site.

Clearly, we had the Leader of the Opposition going out saying that to build it on the smaller site that was not acceptable. But there has been more reaction in the community, and I'm happy to inform the community and the house of one letter that was published in *The Advertiser* recently which I think is worth repeating.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** You might like who wrote this letter. I quote:

EVERYONE loves a hospital, especially a brand-new Women's and Children's Hospital. The hapless—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Colton! Member for Schubert!

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I continue—

former Marshall government wanted to build a new [women's and kids' hospital] close to a basketball stadium that was not required. It wanted to rezone 70ha of revered parklands.

This prompted 100 protest signatures in *The Advertiser*, many names that read like a roll call of the Liberal Party (or the Adelaide Club).

Politically, Labor has won this. They own Adelaide right now. I believe the seats they won in March would rather have hospitals over heritage. If they can get prolific letter writer Warren Jones, they have won.

And who, sir—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta!

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** —wrote that letter? The Treasurer asked me who wrote that letter. That was written by none other than Michael Pratt, the former member for Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I think he will be known well, certainly by some people on that side of the house. This is a hospital that has significant support. They don't know where they are at on this project—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Wright!

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** —on that side of the house, but we are getting on and building a new hospital that we need for the health of women and kids in the future.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members to my right! The leader has the call.



**SPORTING AND INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** My question is to the Premier. Has any minister declared a conflict of interest during the sports and infrastructure grants process?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:20):** As has been outlined in this house on a frequent basis, it is my and the cabinet's expectation that all due process is followed when it comes to cabinet deliberations and I have every confidence that's taken place.

**SPORTING AND INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21):** My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm whether any minister delegated responsibility to approve sports and infrastructure grants and, if so, which minister was it and was a conflict of interest declared? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Despite many questions in public and in this house, no conflicts of interest have been disclosed, nor explanations of any actions taken, yet on Monday the Auditor-General gave evidence to the Economic and Finance Committee that, and I quote, 'There were some instances where ministers had delegated the responsibility in approving grants.'

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:21):** As I have made perfectly clear—and I am more than happy to go over this with the Leader of the Opposition in any way that he likes—there are important processes that need to be followed when it comes to the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. As a government, we have made it very clear that we have every intention to honour all of the election commitments that we have made.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** I know that's an approach—

**Mr Tarzia:** Just tell us. It will go away.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hartley!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —that may be foreign to members of the opposition, but here in this government we are being very—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hartley!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —methodical about the way we are going about this. Something that I know the opposition is familiar with, one of the reasons why we have established—

**Mr Tarzia:** Just tell us. You used to ask us.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley is warned. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** One of the reasons why the government has established the Premier's Delivery Unit is to make sure we go through each of those election commitments—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Frome! Member for Colton! The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** The reason we established—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hartley is on two warnings.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —the PDU is to make sure we can go through all of the large number of election commitments, of which there are hundreds, to ensure that we are going back and checking and making sure that we are delivering them, and that includes the delivering of election commitments that go to sporting communities. I note that it is a policy not too dissimilar—

**Mr Tarzia:** Imagine if he just delivered. What would he do?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hartley, you are on two warnings.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —to the Women's and Children's Hospital.

**Mr Whetstone:** There's nothing to hide.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey, you are now on two warnings.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** I note that this is a policy the now opposition can't work out whether they support or oppose. There were a vast number of sporting club commitments that were made by the former Labor opposition that were subsequently copied by the Marshall Liberal government in the lead-up to the election. Now they are saying that they weren't real commitments from the Liberal Party; they were only commitments that were subject to an unknown process. Our commitments to the people of South Australia we see as being genuine, but also needing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —to be delivered upon, and that's why we are making sure that we are getting them rolled out, including through the state budget process, a process that is established under the law—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta, you are warned for a second time.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —subject to the Auditor-General's inquiries, and must conform with cabinet process, and that's exactly what we have done.

*The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Morialta, you are on two warnings.

#### HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:24):** My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer advise the house how the Malinauskas Labor government is assisting low-income earners enter the property market?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:24):** As the member for Torrens knows, and many of us are aware, it is increasingly difficult for many South Australians to enter the housing market, particularly those on low and fixed incomes. The government acknowledges what is now a housing crisis, not just here but across the entire nation, and we are doing our bit in a number of ways to address it and make it easier for people to enter the housing market.

One of the ways that we are doing this is through HomeStart, the government-owned home loan lender that has helped thousands of South Australians into home ownership since its inception, I think in 1989. It creates innovative, low deposit, home loan products to support those South Australians who are faced with barriers to home ownership and who can't get finance from the big four banks in particular.

One of HomeStart's loan products is the Advantage Loan. The Advantage Loan is an additional loan product that homebuyers can add to another HomeStart home loan to cover the costs associated with entering into a loan. The HomeStart Advantage Loan is combined with a HomeStart graduate or low deposit loan to boost the borrowing power for homebuyers, enabling them to get into a property sooner and without increasing their monthly repayments.

I am pleased to report that since 13 October this year the maximum size of a HomeStart Advantage Loan has increased from \$50,000 to \$70,000—again, this loan product supplementing

another HomeStart loan. This boost gives eligible HomeStart applicants more options to choose from when looking for a property and is yet another way in which HomeStart enables people to enter the housing market.

This change is income targeted, specifically targeted at people on low and fixed incomes. Of course, borrowers of this loan product will also benefit from the HomeStart safeguard guarantee, which maintains home loan repayments at the same level for a year to give homebuyers certainty so they don't have to worry about interest rate rises, courtesy of changes in the RBA cash rate.

HomeStart estimates that the additional buying power for eligible participants could increase the number of suburbs in reach for eligible applicants, from 158 to 178. The good thing is that repayments on the Advantage Loan aren't required until the substantive home loan has been paid in full. The Advantage Loan is one of many product innovations that HomeStart is now rolling out, and has been rolling out in recent months, to help South Australians and give them a leg up into the property market.

In August this year, the government announced that HomeStart would drop the minimum deposit requirement for its Graduate Loan to 2 per cent, wiping many months, if not years, off home deposit savings plans. Since this announcement, applications have surged by 54 per cent for this loan product. There are hundreds of households who have been able to take out a loan due to this change. The good thing is that with all HomeStart's low deposit loan products there is no lenders mortgage insurance, saving borrowers what can often be well in excess of \$10,000 of additional fees.

The effort from HomeStart comes on top of the government's other policies, which we are implementing to increase access to housing affordability, including building more public housing stock and providing more units—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Florey!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —for people suffering homelessness. We look forward to continuing to work to make housing within reach of more South Australians in the future.

#### REGIONAL ROADS

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:28):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Roads. What advice has the minister received regarding risks to roads in the Riverland and Mid-Murray region from anticipated high river flows?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:29):** First-up, my concerns are with the wellbeing of everybody on the River Murray with the impending river flow rising, etc. and also with the extra water that's going to come down. We all understand that and we all need to be very aware of that.

There are lots of roads in regional South Australia and, with all due respect, I can't be on every road out there to inspect them, but certainly I will take some advice from the department. If the member has any concerns whatsoever, as I indicated yesterday, what we need to do, instead of bringing them into the chamber, is to bring them to the attention of the department if there are any issues they identify out there. We are in a challenging period of time, with the river coming down from the River Murray, for the wellbeing of those communities out there. I know the member for Chaffey wants to talk to me about some other issues, which we will pick up later on.

Can I also ask, if you find anything out there, any issues: please report it to the department through the Traffic Management Centre on 1800 018 313 or to any member in this house. I have indicated before that my office is very open to have any discussions about any issues out there. If at any time at all they want the advice of the Department for Infrastructure (DIT), I am happy to arrange that with the senior management of DIT to explain to members what is happening out there. If we can bring it to the attention earlier, rather than waiting to bring it into the chamber, we can safeguard those people and all the roads out there and also any other issues out there that may be compounding.

**REGIONAL ROADS**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:30):** My question again is to the Minister for Regional Roads. What measures are being taken to improve the resilience of the regional road network to future weather events?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:31):** As I said to you a minute ago, I am having a briefing with the CEO of the department. A lot of the infrastructure out there is under the Minister for Transport, Minister Koutsantonis. I am arranging a meeting with the department to get a better understanding about all the roads out there, specifically in the River Murray area.

**REGIONAL ROADS**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:31):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Roads. Can the minister advise which roads between Cadell and Mannum have been closed or will be closed due to the rising level of the River Murray?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:31):** I don't know if the member for Hammond is understanding the answers that I'm giving.

**Mr Pederick:** Yes, I'm understanding: I understand you don't know the answers.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I have just indicated to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —the member for Hammond and other members in this house—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hammond, you are called to order. Member for Unley!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Do you want to be childish about it, or do you want to listen to the answers?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call. Order!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** As I indicated, I am arranging a meeting with the department. There are a lot of challenges out there at the moment, and the local members in all the regions out there should be reporting any concerns they may have, any identified issues—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —to the department or to the relevant minister. I am happy to get some information—

*The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —and bring it back to the member as soon as I have had the meeting with the department.

**HAHNDORF TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Roads. Can the minister advise what the updated costings are for the Hahndorf Township Improvements and Access Upgrade project following the announcement that the government is scrapping the heavy vehicle bypass?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:32):** The Minister for Energy and Transport and Infrastructure is currently attending a meeting of ministers interstate, which would be a legitimate reason for missing parliament, for example—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —not standing in a Birdcage sipping St Henri—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey! Member for Frome!

**Mr BROWN:** —so I will take this question on behalf of the minister. As the minister has previously reported to the parliament, there has been a change of scope.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** If only there was a Minister for Regional Roads who could take the question.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Well, I'm pleased to hear the member for Morialta firmly declare that Hahndorf is a regional area of South Australia, when we have previously been mocked for saying that Mount Barker is part of regional South Australia—so Mount Barker is not regional, that's urban, but Hahndorf is. I have driven the freeway a few times. I'm trying to remember the order of those towns as you depart from Adelaide.

Perhaps the member for Morialta's geography is at variance with the other 46 of us, but there we go. At least he is getting a chance to participate in question time for a change, which is welcome news, no doubt, to the backbenchers kept out of front bench positions by the member for Morialta.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Flinders! Member for Chaffey!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I'm more than happy to provide the member for Hammond, who of course has a keen interest in road affairs—we just had him asking about Riverland regions, and thank goodness someone is standing up for the Riverland during times of impending flood crisis, so thank you, member for Hammond—with the specific details that he has asked for because I know that he asked in a genuine manner.

**Mr Whetstone:** You were never any good at roads, Stephen.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey, you are on three warnings.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is called to order.

*The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson is called to order.

#### **LOBETHAL FREIGHT ACCESS UPGRADE**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:35):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Roads. Can the minister inform the house what the government is doing to improve the condition of the Lobethal freight access route, specifically along Terlinga Road between Tungkillo and Mount Torrens?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:35):** As I said a bit earlier, there are lots of roads out there in the regions and I'm travelling as much as I can to understand them. I'm having a briefing with the department head in the next couple of days. I'm happy to have a discussion with the member for Hammond—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Flinders is warned.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I'm happy to have an open discussion, and my office has always been open to all members on the other side to have a discussion about anything at all, whether it's local government, veterans affairs or regional roads. Also, as I said earlier, if these members have an issue, please come and see my office. I will arrange a meeting directly with you with the senior management of the Department for Transport. The other thing, as I said a bit earlier, is that I get very frustrated when people wait to bring it into the chamber to understand some of the things. We have lots of challenges—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is warned. The minister has the call. The minister has concluded his answer.

### HEALTHY WORKPLACES SERVICE

**Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:36):** My question is to the Minister for Small and Family Business. How is the state government supporting business owners to create healthy workplaces?

**The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:36):** I want to thank the member for Elder for her interest in mentally healthy workplaces, particularly as the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention, which is a critical role. The Malinauskas government is committed to improving the health of all South Australians, with a focus on wellbeing and early prevention, particularly in the area of mental health. I want to acknowledge my cabinet colleague and friend the Minister for Health and Wellbeing for his fantastic work in this space.

We do know that mental health is a key concern for South Australians, and we know that this also includes small business owners and their teams. Over the last 2½ months, we have undertaken extensive consultation through the Office for Small and Family Business. We know that about two-thirds of small business owners have identified that their mental health has been significantly impacted by the last couple of years of fires, floods and the COVID pandemic. Two-thirds have said their mental health has been impacted.

There has also been other consultation recently with 250 workplaces about proactive steps that can be taken to build a positive and safe workplace culture. Business owners recognise the connection between happy, healthy employees and productive workplaces, but often they actually don't know the practical steps to undertake to improve their workplaces and make them more mentally healthy. So we have now launched the Healthy Workplaces Service to do just that.

It's designed to boost the mental and physical health of employees. It provides free information, resources and support to all South Australian businesses to help them build safe and healthy workplaces. The Healthy Workplaces Service can support businesses large or small to create health and wellbeing programs, address specific health and wellbeing issues and link businesses into resources and supports that promote healthy workplaces. Any businesses that are interested can sign up to [healthyworkplaces.sa.gov.au](https://healthyworkplaces.sa.gov.au).

I want to acknowledge multiple government agencies that have been involved in rolling out this program, including Wellbeing SA; the Department for Industry, Innovation and Science; and, in particular, the Office for Small and Family Business; SafeWork SA; ReturnToWorkSA; and the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

It was a pleasure last week to attend with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing the Biggest Mentally Healthy Business Breakfast that was put on by Business SA where we announced this new service. I want to acknowledge the CEO of Business SA, Andrew Kay, and his team for staging such an important event last week. I also want to acknowledge the MC that morning, Mark Soderstrom, who himself has been a vocal advocate for mental health. He shared his own challenges during the breakfast and it was a very useful and important conversation to have.

It's also important that we note the federal government last week announced \$15 million to allow the free mental health and financial counselling support for small business owners to continue. This will allow Beyond Blue's NewAccess for Small Business Owners program to continue and also

the Small Business Debt Helpline, operated by Financial Counselling Australia, to continue. Business owners can find a link to that on the Office of Small and Family Business website as well, which is [business.sa.gov.au](http://business.sa.gov.au).

Mental health and wellbeing is a priority for this government. We are going to continue to work side by side with South Australians to improve mental health. It's particularly important for small business owners for themselves and their teams to build resilience around this and to build awareness around this and have those very important conversations. We can all make a difference, including in our small business community.

### EDEN VALLEY ROAD

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Roads. What action is the government taking to address the condition of Eden Valley Road, specifically between Eden Valley and Springton? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond and the member for Flinders are both warned for a second time.

Leave granted.

**Mrs HURN:** The condition of the road is so appalling that it's causing particular challenges for farmers and locals alike. I just remind the minister of the photos that I shared with him and his strong and kind commitment to see it addressed in a timely manner.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:41):** Thank you to the member for that question, and I did get those photographs. I must admit—and that's the way to go. If, for argument's sake, any member on the other side has an issue with the road infrastructure, as the member for Schubert has indicated, you put a photograph with that road and the condition of the road and it does assist the people who have to make the decision.

The member for Hammond can say you can put an issue in and describe the issue, but you do not understand what the issues are until you actually see it. The member for Hammond will see some of the issues. The member for Schubert has done the right thing. She has put a photograph in and we are working on that. One of the things that I am finding out is that there are some roads that are falling apart.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** But those roads haven't started falling apart in the last six months. These roads were supposed to be done over the last four years, but they haven't been done because there's a wide range of issues out there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** In actual fact, four years out there these roads haven't been fixed, but for the member for Schubert—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is on three warnings.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Badcoe! The Premier is called to order. The member for Morialta!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Can I get some clarity here? I wasn't a minister in the previous government. You were.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Treasurer is called to order. The Premier is called to order. Minister, please be seated. Members to my left and right, the level of interjection has reached a point where it's impossible to hear the minister. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** To the member for Schubert, yes, I am working on that, but I do thank you very much for those photographs. One of the things to the member for Schubert is that I will be trying to get out there and have a look at those roads. But, as I said, at the end of the day, these roads haven't just fallen apart in the last couple of weeks. There have been many, many years over the years and we can blame the things on some people but we are—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The exchange between the member for Schubert and the Treasurer needs to cease. The member for Schubert is called to order.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** To the member for Schubert, I will have a chat to you later on, but we are working through that.

### FIFA WOMEN'S WORLD CUP

**Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:44):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister inform the house about how the government will work to create a local legacy from the FIFA Women's World Cup?

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:44):** I thank the member for this question.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is called to order.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** We know that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Hartley!

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —for far too long girls and women have not always had opportunities to—

*The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is called to order.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —equally and actively participate in their chosen sport. But this is beginning to change. But we still have a long way to go. There has never—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is on three warnings.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —been a more important time to nurture and grow female participation in sport, especially as we lead up to the 2023 Women's World Cup being held in Australia and New Zealand, an event that gives us the opportunity to deeply advance gender equality in sport and everywhere else. Because, when we see women and girls being celebrated for being strong, skilful and physical, perceptions about the role of women in our community change. I am so proud to be part of a government that is serious about backing women in sport and one that will harness our role as a host city of the FIFA Women's World Cup to advance the position of girls and women in our sporting community. With the eyes of the world—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Florey is warned. The minister has the call.



**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** With the eyes of the world on our state, the hosting of 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup games will provide a significant opportunity to provide a lasting legacy to shift perceptions, advance toward gender equality, grow the game and encourage young women and young men to pursue playing football, including at the highest level. I am very proud that our government is providing \$1 million over the next two years to grow participation in football in partnership with Football SA, develop women's leadership and deliver—

*The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mawson!

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —programs in clubs and communities aimed at preventing violence against women and children. The previous government's initial decision not to participate in the FIFA Women's World Cup bid sent a terrible, terrible message about their regard for women's sport—

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hartley!

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —and was a severe blow to those hoping to see the event here in Adelaide. It was only after our team, then in opposition, campaigned with the community, who collected thousands of petition signatures—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —that the then government even agreed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey!

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —to be involved in the bid. With now only eight months until the World Cup, our government is committed to absolutely not letting this historic moment pass us by. Alongside our support for local legacy activities, our government is further supporting women and girls in sport through re-establishing our Women in Sport Taskforce to make sure that we continue to break down any barriers to girls and women participating in the way they choose in the sport they love. I wish the Matildas well in their fight in the 2023 Women's World Cup and can't wait for our state to play host to England, Brazil, China, Morocco and South Korea and two further playoff winning teams—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Heysen and member for Hurtle Vale!

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD:** —and see the lasting legacy that hosting this incredible competition will leave for the girls and women of our state.

#### **MARINE RESCUE FUND**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:47):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister provide an update on my proposal for a marine rescue fund where there is no dedicated marine rescue facility, such as Port MacDonnell?

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:48):** I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question and particularly his advocacy on behalf of his local community. This is an issue that the member for Mount Gambier has raised with me. We have actually met about this matter. I know that he has raised this to the whole of the Malinauskas cabinet because, in fact, unlike the former government, we have been attending country cabinets. Our first country cabinet this year was in Mount Gambier and I have met with the member for Mount Gambier—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey!

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** —on a number of occasions in my travels to Mount Gambier as well.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** This particular matter that the member advocates—

*The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson is warned.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, please be seated. Member for Chaffey! The member for Chaffey will leave the chamber under 137A for the remainder of question time. He was on three warnings. He probably got to five.

*The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister.

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** I am not sure if the members heard that over the interjections, but this Malinauskas government has returned country cabinets to the rightful place they should be. The member for Mount Gambier has raised this matter on behalf of his local community, particularly arising from circumstances where local fishers—

*The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

*The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hurtle Vale! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** —responded in an emergency call to other locals in the South-East region. In doing so, there was unfortunate damage done to one of those vessels.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Frome is called to order.

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** The goodwill—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** Was he ejected or he is just leaving?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, you will not reflect on the member for Dunstan. You have the call.

*Mrs Hurn interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is called to order.

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** This particular scenario was a good news story and it was a good outcome—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Schubert is warned. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing knows better. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** I know the other side are offended, but this is what a good independent member for the regions does: they ask questions, they advocate on behalf of their region. This particular set of circumstances was a good outcome. There was a life saved—

*The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta!

**The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS:** —but, unfortunately, in doing so there was damage done to this private fishing vessel. When I met with the member for Mount Gambier not too long ago, and also in a further conversation, it seems as though the insurance around this—the private insurance held by that fishing vessel—has yet to pay out. It would be easy for me to stand here and have a go at insurance companies. They certainly have done plenty to deserve that, but if I can temper my remarks and say that the very least we can expect from private insurers is that they meet their obligations.

We are seeing now, as the market is squeezed and underwriting becomes more expensive, insurers starting to cut corners. The truth is that I would expect, and I am sure that the community would expect, that if a fishing vessel responds to the aid of another vessel in an emergency and there is damage that occurs, that insurance company to whom the private owner has paid a significant premium will pay up. The member's advocacy is particularly around a fund of sorts that would compensate fishers or other vessels who do respond in times of emergency.

The truth is, member for Mount Gambier, I can't say or promise and nor can I support a fund particularly funded out of the Community Emergency Services Fund, into which the collections of the emergency services levy are paid to create this fund. There are a number of reasons, one of which is that the legal constraints around disbursement from the Community Emergency Services Fund is limited. However, I can give the member for Mount Gambier my assurance—as I can speak on behalf of other ministers who have an interest in this matter—that we will continue to work across agencies and across sectors to ensure the South-East has the best emergency response and the best community safety.

#### REGIONAL ROADS

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Roads. Can the minister provide an update on the construction of three new overtaking lanes between Lochiel and Crystal Brook and whether there are any SA Water pipes that need to be relocated?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:53):** Thank you to the member for that question. Yes, the member for Flinders and the member for Narungga travel on that road. There are a lot of those roads, and there is a lot of work being carried out on the Augusta Highway from the duplication from Port Wakefield to Lochiel, and that work is travelling quite well. The reason for the overtaking lanes not being completed is because we all understand and have seen the torrential rain that has been happening in the last few months in particular, and there continues to be that large moisture in there.

As the member for Hammond and others in here would understand, I would hope, if you are putting bitumen down on moist areas of ground you will not do a proper job on that, and then in a few weeks' time you will have to bring that up. That happened on the Wallaroo-Kadina intersection some years ago, near Alford. Bitumen was put down when moisture was in there, and about three months later it had to come up. The issue is that the ground has moisture in it. They are waiting for the ground to get the moisture out so they can stabilise the issue. As with the other issue about any SA Water pipelines, I will take that on notice because I haven't gathered any information on that. But, again, if the two members on the other side have any concerns whatsoever, please ring 1800—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —018 313.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I see the member for Badcoe. The member for Badcoe has the call.

**COOBER PEDY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:54):** My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister please inform the house of his recent visit to Coober Pedy and progress he has made in relation to the governance challenges that that community is facing?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Hartley!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:55):** I thank the member for Badcoe for the question. Last week, I had the pleasure of visiting Coober Pedy. The purpose of my visit—my second in the last three months—was to fulfill a commitment I made to the community of Coober Pedy when I visited there previously in August to return to Coober Pedy on a regular basis and provide progress on our work to address the key challenges they face, challenges that have caused the council to be put into administration.

We have talked in this chamber before about the fact that the previous government and the minister at the time, Minister Knoll, put the council into administration. He had to do that. When I was last in Coober Pedy I promised to return and personally provide an update on the progress this government is trying to make.

I promised to return even though there may have been little or nothing to report. The reason I did this is because it is important that communities are not forgotten no matter how small, remote or isolated those communities are, something my predecessor should have known and indeed may have benefited from. For the visit, I also invited the CEO of the Local Government Association and the CEO of the Local Government Finance Authority to attend with me. I was very pleased—

*The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is on three warnings.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —that they took up my offer because it is important that these organisations, whose role is to support all councils across all of the state, to know and understand the circumstances in which people live in Coober Pedy and to consider the kind of support they might offer the council administration to continue to operate on behalf of residents of the township.

During a community barbecue held at the Italian Club in Coober Pedy last Wednesday evening, which pleasingly was attended by over 100 or so people, I provided an update on activities to date. I informed the community, as members present here will know, that the Local Government (Defaulting Council) Amendment Act 2022 has now passed through the parliament. This means that the administration of the District Council of Coober Pedy has now been extended for a maximum period of four years until the next periodic local government elections.

However, in understanding that the community's desire is to have an elected member body returned, like every other council in South Australia, I strongly hope that by working together we can get the council into a position—particularly a financial position—where it is possible sooner than later to return this to elected members.

I also informed those present that we have commenced the process to appoint a new administrator. Some 10 days ago, expressions of interest were called through advertisements in *The Advertiser*, the *Australian* and, of course, the *Coober Pedy Regional Times*. The advertisements broadly describe what we would like to see in a new administrator—someone who can work with the community and who has the local government knowledge and experience that are necessary to continue the work undertaken so far to turn this council around.

The advertisements call for a single person, or for more than one person, to indicate their interest in being the council's administrator. We cast the net as widely as possible, and we will keep an open mind on what arrangements can deliver the best results for the Coober Pedy community. However, I am also mindful about the cost, particularly given the council's continuing financial constraints. I committed to return to Coober Pedy when the new administrator starts in the role to help introduce them, or him, or her to the community of Coober Pedy.

Equally as important, I informed the community that the Coober Pedy Taskforce has been formed. This group includes senior representations from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Treasury and Finance, Energy and Mining, Environment and Water and Infrastructure and Transport. This group will focus on the decisions that need to be made regarding water and power delivery in Coober Pedy. It is critical that is resolved. Until the options are clear with regard to essential services the council does not have a clear pathway to financial sustainability. That is why the task force will focus on this issue.

### AUGUSTA HIGHWAY

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:59):** My question is the Minister for Regional Roads. Can the minister provide an update on the Augusta Highway duplication from Port Wakefield to Lochiel?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:59):** I just thought I gave you an update on that. Overtaking lanes?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** People who travel that road will see the great progress that is being made by the contractors on that: it is absolutely brilliant. There are lots of issues with regard to the compaction and stability of the ground around those areas. I was a bit surprised—unless people here understand, if you are going to build a road you're going to have to have stability. You can't just build it on the top. The road is still continuing to be made—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —in the Port Wakefield township itself. The work is nearing completion and there will be an opening of the township section in the near future. The member for Narungga has indicated his support, and I've had meetings with the member for Narungga about some certain issues within the township itself. The duplication of the highway from Port Wakefield to Lochiel is progressing very, very well and it is because of the continued cooperation between the state government and the federal government to make certain that we have that opportunity.

It is not an easy task to do and, as the member for Hammond would understand, you cannot make a road overnight. There are lots and lots of issues on that road, but the water and the amount of moisture that is coming into ground at the moment is compacting the issues and frustrating the contractors.

### DISABILITY MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Human Services. How is the Malinauskas Labor government giving people with lived experience of disability a greater voice in decisions that affect their lives?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (15:01):** Thank you very much to the member for Adelaide, who is very active in the community ensuring that her community has a voice. I thank her for the question. In the lead-up to the state election, Labor promised to create a number of ministerial advisory councils. This would allow for direct access to myself as the minister to provide input into government policy.

In May this year, I announced plans to establish three ministerial advisory councils for youth, LGBTIQ+ and also for disability. These councils will provide a voice for people with lived experience to discuss and inform government policy. After an open nomination and application process with more than 70 nominations, the members of the new Disability Ministerial Advisory Committee have now been announced.

I want to thank every person who applied. Simply putting your hand up to be involved shows a commitment to making a better community, particularly for people with disability. The 12 members of this committee will be:

- Amanda Shiell, a strategic consultant;
- Belinda Lambert, a lawyer and advocate for the deaf community;
- Belle Owen, project lead at JFA Purple Orange;
- Ellen Fraser-Barbour, research and policy lead at JFA Purple Orange;
- Jarad McLoughlin, an advisory group member of People with Disability Australia;
- Katherine Annear, a fierce advocate and consultant—particularly in the autistic community;
- Kwan Leung Chia, a rural doctor experienced in disability health both in Australia and overseas;
- Kym Langton, a member of the SA Council on Intellectual Disability reference group;
- Michael Taggart, the inclusion project officer at the City of Salisbury;
- Sisaleo Philavong, a member of both the LGA Disability Advisory Group and the DHS Disability Engagement Group; and
- Sylvia Maso, a parent and carer.

This group will bring depth and diversity to disability policy discussions, and I look forward to attending the first meeting with them later this year. The 12 people come with amazingly diverse backgrounds and bring a massive array of experiences, including allied health, the Crown Solicitor's Office, peak bodies, research, legislation, media, national leadership, as well as lived experience and being parents and carers. Our state will be well served by these people and our policy agenda will forever be better.

While there are a number of existing committees relating to disability, most are for peak bodies, employers or service providers. As the Minister for Human Services, I wanted to ensure that everyday South Australians were given a voice.

I formally announced our plans for the Disability Advisory Council when we launched our Pavely app on 24 May. For those who haven't used that yet, Pavely is a social planning app which makes it quick and easy for people with accessibility needs, or those closest to them, to find new places to visit, to go to, things to see and do. I encourage every member in this place to download the Pavely app and have a look at the places in their community and the accessibility benefits or, indeed, the issues that people face. The advisory council and Pavely are just two initiatives that are seeking to build a much better community for people with disability.

**The SPEAKER:** The question before the Chair is that the house notes—

**Mr PEDERICK:** Excuse me, sir, the timer hadn't gone when I rose to my feet.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, it certainly has now, member for Hammond. You are on two warnings. There were a number of gestures in question time that were concerning to me and I have now turned to grievances. You will be seated.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **COUNTRY SHOWS**

**Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:05):** I happily rise today to speak on the fantastic existence of the South Australian country shows and to celebrate the contribution they make back into all our regional electorates. Nationally, agricultural shows and field days bring rural and urban communities together to showcase Australia's finest food and fibre. These events play a crucial role in supporting on-farm innovation and efficiencies within agricultural industries.

Nationwide, country shows contribute more than a billion dollars to our economy annually. They attract more than six million attendees through the gates and, most importantly, they are supported by about 50,000 volunteers across the country, which is extraordinary. There are 35 country shows so far as part of the South Australian spring country shows season. Our country

shows attract volunteers, as I mentioned, but I make special mention of a lovely couple I come across week in and week out, year in, year out. They are affectionately known as the M&Ms, but of course I refer locally to Marg and Mike Smith.

Patrons like the M&Ms rock up not just for the event; in the example of the recent Clare Show, the next day they were back on the field picking up, sadly, some of the rubbish that had been left behind. We know that shows like this bring out the best in all of us. It is also an opportunity for an entire township to focus on the single event and to make sure that young and old get involved.

As I mentioned, it certainly stimulates the local economy. We know that businesses' programs are printed and we have a real flavour of the show coming back into the town where it is being hosted. Sadly, in recently years COVID has denied towns a chance to celebrate these significant local events. With increased operating costs and an increase in insurance premiums, especially when insurance premiums have gone up where eventing horses have been involved, what locals have raised with me over the last two years as shows have been cancelled is the sacrifice people make to put them on and the disappointment when they are cancelled.

I want to make special mention of all the organising committees associated with the rural horticultural and agricultural shows across South Australia. They are all led by presidents, and the executive teams have their own annual general meetings and are accountable for the moneys earned and the outgoing revenue, but it is their time and dedication, I think, their commitment to putting on a fun event, something the young kids and their families can look forward to that we are most grateful for.

In recognising everyone who lives in a local town and who has been a part of donating their time to be on an organising committee, I extend my thanks. We know that for many volunteers the case is that once you volunteer the first time you tend to stick around, and many of the organising committee members I referred to have taken on this role for many decades and, as a result, have seen their efforts recognised in Queen's Birthday honours celebrations in past years.

If you are driving around looking for a town to visit in the month of November, I recommend the following opportunities: you can travel down south to the Millicent agricultural show; you can head up to the Hills and visit Uraidla; Bordertown, again on the way to the South-East, will be hosting its spring festival; and Parndana over on the island. Close to my heart, at the end of my show season for spring, is the Eudunda Show on 13 November. It is the last show of the year for me in the electorate of Frome.

I reflect on all the shows I have been participating in over the last couple of months. It is something that would be foreign to a lot of the Labor city members, that is, the importance of booking your site and setting up your tent. We have all done it. The volunteers wrap around us. It is a day to check out the dog trials, to buy some local produce, to meet up with volunteers and to celebrate an entire community coming together for one cause, and one positive cause.

I certainly want to wish all the primary producers well, and I hope that, in the face of this very inclement weather they have been having, their spring and summer seasons of country shows remain strong and sustainable as they have done over the last few years.

#### **WELLBEING BUSHFIRE GRANTS AND COMMUNITY GROUPS**

**The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (15:11):** Members, as you know, my community and others across the state suffered the devastating impact of summer bushfires in late 2019. The recovery process has been long. It is challenging at times. It requires all in our community to work together, and I have been delighted to see that a number of groups working together have received grants under the Strengthening Community Wellbeing after Bushfires program.

The Woodside Commerce Association, working in concert with Love Woodside, received \$13,680 to assist with updating the Woody Trails BMX park and for related purposes. Love Woodside is a large, active community volunteer group that seeks to build a vibrant and resilient Woodside community. It includes many volunteers, including from the Woodside Commerce Association, the Onkaparinga Lions club, the Onkaparinga Rotary club and, of course, many other allied groups, participants and volunteers. Its members are dedicated to improving both Woodside and the wider

Adelaide Hills region. I must say, having observed the work of all the people involved, it is remarkable, valuable and deeply appreciated by me.

A grant of \$15,200 was given to the Willows Children's Centre in Mount Barker to assist the Connection and Yarning Women's and Children's Group to support Aboriginal women and children in the Adelaide Hills. The group provides a cultural playground for children, seeks to support Aboriginal people to connect with culture and land and also supports the wider community. This project is of particular significance, given the widespread destruction to significant trees, sacred plants and animals caused by the Cudlee Creek bushfires.

The Mount Barker District Council received a \$13,265 grant to deliver the Brukunga Community Hub's 'Hall to Hub' project. The grant will be used to build an accessible community garden at the Brukunga Hall for the purposes of increasing community connection and wellbeing. Members will know that Brukunga was particularly impacted by the Cudlee Creek bushfire. It will also be used to deliver a Mental Health Aware workshop and to build local capacity to respond to mental health and wellbeing needs. These are very significant initiatives. They must continue in my community, and I am very grateful that the government continues to support the recovery in the process.

It must be said that the impact of bushfires on a community lingers for many years. The recovery process, as I indicated at the outset, can only be successfully navigated if the whole community participates in that process. It is a long journey, a tough journey. There are people who are able to recover more speedily than others. Some have access to wider family support. Some, of course, before the bushfires, had their own difficulties and challenges that were only compounded by the impact of bushfire.

I can say, though, that both local councils within Kavel have been working incredibly hard to support their communities, and I am very grateful to all local councils who have done much more than could reasonably have been expected of them to assist the community. It is an important level of government. I know, of course, that both councils are going through their election process now.

I also want to say this about our local CFS: of course they were there as volunteers to assist our community in the course of the Cudlee Creek bushfire—they have done much more than that. They are so well integrated in our community that on their shoulders they have carried, in part, some of the recovery effort. But it must also be observed that CFS members face particular pressures and strains, and we are very mindful of their mental health. I must say that I will keep that well in mind in this place and will always be advocating for additional support for my CFS community.

### **MENTALLY FIT EYRE PENINSULA**

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:15):** I rise today to speak on the challenge of mental health awareness and the good work that is being done in my electorate of Flinders by the hardworking team at Mentally Fit Eyre Peninsula. Mentally Fit EP was created by community members in 2014 to change negative communication about mental illness and advance skills in mental health to support others in the community.

Under the umbrella of West Coast Youth and Community Support, the program was envisioned and driven by two special people in particular: Jo Clark and Kirsty Traeger. Kirsty was someone I knew from when we were young who had experienced her own challenges with mental health. This drove her to help others with similar experiences in our community. Less than a month after travelling to Adelaide to accept the South Australian Event of the Year Award for Port Lincoln's 2015 Mental Health Week activities, passionate mental health campaigner Kirsty Traeger tragically died in a car crash.

While this tragic event could have potentially meant the end of the vision that Kirsty began, her family, friends and the Eyre Peninsula community instead made sure that her legacy continued. With the passion of Jo Clark added to by other community members, such as Lain Montgomerie, Emma Gale, and Kirsty's husband, Michael Traeger, Mentally Fit EP continues to do amazing things in the Eyre Peninsula community.

Mentally Fit EP began in 2014 with a collective vision to flip mental illness on its head, to create conversation about mental health and to stop focusing on the negative. The program



empowers people to take charge of their lives by educating, reducing stigma and upskilling community members, which is done through workshops, community groups, guest speaking roles, courses, events and campaigns. It aims to reach the community of Eyre Peninsula across a distance of 170,000 square kilometres and nearly 59,000 people.

I thought it was especially important for me to recognise both the historic and the current work of Mentally Fit EP this week, which has marked the end of Mental Health Awareness Month here in South Australia. I was privileged to be at the Mentally Fit EP gala ball last weekend, which is the most significant fundraiser event for the organisation. I was very pleased to be joined in my electorate by the member for Elder for the evening at the event, which was well attended and supported by the Eyre Peninsula community.

The event was MC'd by Marc Ryan, known as The Beautiful Bogan, who is an entertaining comedian with a passion for normalising the conversation around mental health and letting men, in particular, know they are not alone in their struggle. The guest speaker was former AFL and current SANFL star Dan Menzel, who shared with the audience about the struggles of life as a professional footballer, the physical and mental pain caused by needing four knee reconstructions and the need for resilience and support to overcome setbacks and adversity in all areas of life.

The Mentally Fit EP gala ball is one of the most significant fundraiser events for the organisation, with generous donations from supporters being auctioned on the night to equally generous bidders in the crowd. The funds raised on the night are added to other community-raised funds, but the program is largely delivered through the generous funding of the Community Banks in Cummins and Port Lincoln, which have pumped hundreds of thousands of dollars into the initiative. Just imagine what a community-driven and supported organisation like this could do with some state government support.

Congratulations to Lain Montgomerie, Emma Gale and the whole Mentally Fit EP team for a well-run, very special event that reminded us all about the importance of mental health awareness and action. Wellbeing and mental health are major concerns for regional South Australian communities like mine, with accessibility to services also being diminished.

Unfortunately, we continue to see regional communities like mine impacted by increasing levels of suicide, with young people tragically making up a significant proportion of these numbers. We all know someone who has made the tragic decision to take their own life and the families, friends and communities that are impacted. Regional communities, in particular, have connections all throughout them.

I want to finish with this message of encouragement to anyone who is struggling in our community: do not go it alone. Please reach out for help. There are people and organisations across our state, like Mentally Fit EP, Lifeline, Kids Helpline and the like, who are able to help you get through your darkest days.

### **LIGHT ELECTORATE**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:20):** Today, I would like to touch on a couple of issues involving young people in my community. At the outset, I would like to indicate my huge pride in the young people in my electorate. Often, young people get a bad run in both the media and in community discussions. Certainly, the young people in my electorate are people we can be proud of and there are a couple of examples I would like to provide.

First of all, in one of my council areas, the Town of Gawler, we have two young people running for local council, namely, Ethan White and Isaac Solomon. These two young men are even younger than I was when I first entered local government at the age of 21 in 1981. I think that these two young men will be an asset to the Town of Gawler should they be elected next week when the elections are held for local government.

Sadly, though, their candidacy has received some feedback that I think is both unfair and inaccurate. Their lack of experience has been brought up as an issue. Some people have made the comment, "What would they know about being on a council?" etc. What I can say is that these two young men have done enormous amounts of work in the community. They have led a number of youth groups, etc., and have been involved in community leadership much more than a lot of adults

have been in their time. I think these two people should be judged not by what they have not done but by what they have done so far. I think they will be a valuable addition to the Town of Gawler.

In addition, only last week I was invited to be a guest teacher at Northern Adelaide Senior College for a lesson. I had to give a talk about the pros and cons of social reforms. My job was to speak about the political process and the political issues and the different ways of looking at an issue. I spoke with these young people. It was a Stage 2 Legal Studies class. I must say that I was incredibly proud of this group. They were quite attentive and asked a lot of questions, so they were actually thinking about the issues I raised. We had quite a good discussion.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** Did they agree with you on the issues?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The purpose of my discussion was not to say, 'This is the way you need to think,' but, 'These are the issues you need to think about.' That is what a good teacher does and so I did that. As I said, my aim was not to predispose them to a particular view but to say, 'These are the issues you need to think about.' Very few social issues are black and white. There is a lot of grey and different views, and one has to be respectful of that and they were. I think I did a reasonable job in what I did. I am not sure I am made to be a teacher, but certainly the way these young people thought about the issues, asked questions and were very attentive was really good.

We often hear about things that young people do or do not think about. It is interesting that on International Youth Day on 12 August this year I ran a survey amongst five colleges in my electorate. The five colleges were Northern Adelaide Senior College, Mark Oliphant College, Gawler & District College, Trinity College and Xavier College, both government and non-government schools across my electorate and region.

The purpose of the survey was to find out what young people actually think about in my community. I have been told what they think about, but I thought I would actually ask them. It was interesting to note that, when you ask them about what they think about certain issues and you break up the issues into personal issues, if you like, community issues and also international issues, in terms of personal issues the main concern for them was cost of living. These are the things that young people are concerned about—cost-of-living issues—and that does not surprise me. A lot of them work and also try to have a car, etc.

On community issues, the biggest issue for them was the urban built form—in other words, the communities they are living in, in terms of infrastructure and the appearance of their communities. On global issues, the biggest issues were about climate change, but also concerns about safety and conflicts in the world today.

When you think about it, these young people do not think too differently from adults and the issues that worry adults these days. It is great to see that young people think about issues that affect the committee generally rather than just themselves. I am very proud of the young people in my electorate.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (15:25):** It gives me great pleasure today to be able to stand up and reflect on some of the people in my community who have provided exceptional service through their contributions to local government in recent years. We have the local government elections before us at the moment, and it gives us an opportunity to reflect and provide support to particular people who are standing for election. But, of course, with local government elections also comes the transition between old candidates and new candidates, and people make decisions not to recontest.

I want to reflect on the contributions and the local government careers of a couple of people who have served the council areas that cross over with my electorate. Firstly, I want to pay tribute to the role of Tim Gard, a councillor for Coastal Ward in the City of Marion. Tim was elected in 2014 and was re-elected in 2018. A Marino resident, he had a particular focus on those coastal suburbs of Marino, Hallett Cove and Seacliff Park that make up the southern part of the City of Marion. In fact, Tim replaced the vacancy on council that I created when I left the City of Marion council to enter our state's parliament.

It has been great to work with Tim. He has had a real level of tenacity in terms of fighting for the local community over an extended period of time, whether it is local park upgrades or more significant projects around the development of Glenthorne National Park and, while it is a state government initiated project, there was a lot of commitment and interest from the City of Marion and Tim and his co-councillor Ian Crossland.

Tim also had a real focus on what he refers to as civic pride, lifting the quality of streetscaping, footpaths, local parks, community centres and such community infrastructure. I think particularly the Hallett Cove foreshore upgrade, which began during my time on council, was significantly enhanced by both Tim and Ian working in collaboration with the community to create the Hallett Cove War Memorial, which is such a focal point for ANZAC Day commemorations down at Hallett Cove Beach and the broader foreshore upgrade. It has really created a sense of place and a heart for the Hallett Cove community.

I want to thank Tim for his contribution over the last eight years and to wish him all the best as he leaves the council. I also want to thank his wife, Jane, for supporting him as well. I wish them both all the best. I know that Jane has recently retired as they go forward to look at different pursuits.

I also want to pay tribute today to the very lengthy service of a member of Holdfast Bay council, and that is Rosemary Clancy. Rosemary was elected to the City of Brighton council back in 1991, some 31 years ago, and was Mayor of the Brighton council before transitioning to the City of Holdfast Bay when it was created following the 1997 amalgamations. Rosemary's contribution to the community has been nothing short of phenomenal over the last three decades. She is someone whose state and federal politics I do not share, but at a local level there were no party political politics when it came to Rosemary's contribution.

She was someone who looked clear eyed at every issue. She had a big vision for the community, both the Brighton area that she represented and the broader Holdfast Bay region. She continually built relationships with community members, elected officials at state and federal levels and other councillors, always putting her community first.

With projects like the Kauri Community and Sports Centre and the disability access strategy—in fact, the Brighton jetty, destroyed by a storm in the early nineties, was rebuilt under Rosemary's watch as mayor—she has always put the right decision, the strategic decision, the big picture vision before listening to the squeaky wheel. It is something I have respected so much. I will miss sitting down with Rosemary for coffee and talking about issues that will impact the City of Holdfast Bay for the better. I want to thank Rosemary for a phenomenal contribution over 31 years—1991 to 2022—and wish her and Tony all the best for the future.

#### **ADELAIDE ELECTORATE**

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:30):** The Malinauskas Labor government is a government that delivers on its election commitments. We are getting on with the job and getting things done, and it is no exception in my community of Adelaide. I have four huge community projects underway at the moment. They are four really important election commitments and promises I made to my community, and I am really excited that we are getting on with the job and moving them forward.

One of them is building a new Adelaide Aquatic Centre in North Adelaide. Last week, I had the pleasure of sitting down with some of the architecture team from JPE Design Studio and Warren and Mahoney to discuss the project. We looked at various other designs from across Australia and internationally when it comes to new aquatic centres. It is really exciting to see them taking on the brief and coming up with some amazing ideas to deliver a brand-new Adelaide Aquatic Centre.

The difference this time around is that the current pool actually started as an outdoor swimming pool and then in 1985 we put a roof over it. It is really exciting that we can actually deliver a built-for-purpose Adelaide Aquatic Centre that is going to be beautifully designed. It is going to be so much more energy efficient and will keep our community healthy, connected and safe in the water for generations to come.

Another project I am really proud to be delivering for my community is returning a community hub to the former Walkerville YMCA site at 39 Smith Street. Last week, I sat down with the Town of Walkerville to get an update on the community consultation we did for this site. We had a fantastic

response from the community about what they would like to see. I am really excited that I have committed \$5 million to upgrade the existing building and to also look at the old brewery out the back.

What we are really excited about is potentially returning green space there, perhaps a community garden. I know people gave feedback about perhaps having a dog park as well. I really want to thank the Walkerville community for putting in their thoughts and ideas on this exciting project that is going to bring back a community hub with all the community, sport and recreation services that go with that to the wonderful Walkerville community.

In Prospect, I am delivering a pocket park on the corner of Main North Road and Da Costa Avenue, just opposite the giant Scotsman at Scotty's Corner. A couple of weeks ago, we held our first consultation with the community at the site. It was wonderful to see so many locals come along to share their ideas. Again, dog parks often come up as a popular idea for these types of parks, as we are huge dog lovers in our community. I think I know probably just as many names of dogs in our local area as I do the local residents. They are such an important part of our community.

It is fantastic to be able to return this disused, old, dirt block that previously had dilapidated buildings on it to open green space for our community to enjoy. Again, I would like to thank the Prospect, Medindie and Medindie Gardens communities for coming along and sharing their feedback on that election commitment.

Lastly, we are upgrading a lovely playground in Collinswood Nailsworth called RL Pash Park. During the election campaign, I spoke to a lot of people in the community about this park. It is a lovely green space, a really important hub for the community, but it is in need of an upgrade. We have kicked off consultation for that upgrade, and the community has until Sunday 20 November to provide feedback. I encourage them to go on the City of Prospect website—they will be the ones delivering that project—to make sure they provide their feedback.

There is a common thread through all of the commitments I made during the election campaign, and that is about creating a stronger and more connected community. It is about places where people can come together as a community to get to know their neighbours and, importantly, stay healthy, fit and active. I am really looking forward to seeing the consultation continue on these four important community projects and, importantly, seeing them delivered in this term of government.

### *Bills*

## **NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

### *Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:35):** I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the bill to pass through all remaining stages without delay.

**The SPEAKER:** An absolute majority is required; it is not present. Ring the bells.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The SPEAKER:** An absolute majority present, I accept the motion.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:37):** I will not take long, but I indicate the opposition does not support this motion, and I will explain why. The suspension of standing orders should be available to the parliament to undertake on those occasions when, through exceptional need, importance and particularly urgency of a matter, the possibility of complying with not only the conventions but to suspend standing orders, the standing orders themselves, is not available. Therefore, it behoves the government, if they wish to suspend standing orders, to make a case to do so.

That said, we understand from media commentary and from the comment in question time today from the minister that the government wishes to pass this legislation through the house today

or perhaps today and tomorrow. To be clear to the house on what this motion is about, it is not about whether or not this bill could be dealt with this week; it is whether or not this bill can be dealt with today.

The normal course of events would see the bill received from the Legislative Council and then read and the bill laid on the table for a day. The standing orders require that. If the government then wanted to proceed with debate tomorrow, there would be nothing in the standing orders preventing them to do so. There would be a convention preventing them from doing so.

When I was first leader of the house, on our first day we indicated to the Labor Party that we wanted the Supply Bill dealt with in the second week of parliament after the Address in Reply had been dealt with. The leader of the house, then the manager of opposition business, can I say aggressively and robustly put forward a point of view that a supply bill—which, of course, is a very normal bill that everyone in the house will be familiar with; it has only a few lines—has to lie on the table for 10 days to comply with the convention.

The last parliament did on occasion move bills through more quickly not only because of COVID but mostly because of COVID where there were bills that needed to be dealt with with urgency. There were a couple of bills where the government and the opposition were in such robust and hungry and confident agreement on the matter that no concerns were raised about suspension of standing orders. Indeed, in those circumstances standing orders were suspended with the support and concurrence of both parties.

The bill that is being proposed today is one that sees quite significant powers being conveyed to the government and a fairly significant change not just to the community's expectations or indeed the law's expectations but to the Labor Party's expectations of what constitutes heritage protection. We well remember the Deputy Premier's fervent and robust advocacy in relation to heritage matters prior to the election, so there is a significant change in government policy, a significant change in law and a significant change in powers available to a government to be conveyed by this bill.

For those reasons, it is not unusual for the parliament to consider these matters and have them lie on the table for at least a day as the standing orders require and for 10 days as the convention requires, which is good practice for a bill that has complexity to enable it to be considered and for all the matters relating to that bill to be considered in depth.

There are occasions when bills are of such urgency that governments seek to suspend standing orders. There is usually a reason—a time-related reason—why matters must be dealt with quickly. That seems absent in relation to this matter.

We are talking about a proposal that would enable the government to change the building of the Women's and Children's Hospital from the project that was advocated by the previous government, which would have seen works completed by 2026-27 but starting soon, if not already by now, to a new policy that this government proposes that sees no work taking place this week, or this month, or this year, but allegedly early work is starting at some stage next year for the project to be completed sometime next decade.

The key thing missing and why we propose to oppose the suspension of standing orders is that far from failing to make a case as to why this matter has to be dealt with this week, which it can be under standing orders, or today as this motion requires, the government has not yet made a case why this motion needs to be dealt with, or this bill needs to be dealt with this year. Therefore our presumption is that, at the very least, having the opportunity to read the bill, consider it and take feedback from relevant stakeholders and look into the details to ensure that there are no unintended consequences, that is the process of good parliamentary procedure from a government that is confident in its material.

If it is not so confident in its material as that, then so be it, but it seems to me that the only reason the government want to progress this quickly is that they are concerned about political campaigns in the member for Adelaide's electorate. That is not a good enough reason to suspend standing orders, but we recognise that the government has the numbers, and we recognise that they are going to push this through. We recognise that, whatever the merits of the bill, they are going to ask the parliament to deal with it in a very unusually quick time, and therefore that is what is likely to

happen. Nevertheless, we do not see why this should be dealt with today and take precedence over other business, and indeed be dealt with not in the usual manner, and therefore I oppose the motion.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:43):** I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his comments. I indicate that the government does regard this as a very urgent piece of legislation. Obviously, this was introduced into the other place a few weeks ago. It has been well ventilated, including publicly. It has been debated in the other place. We therefore want to progress this as urgently as possible because we know this has been a long-delayed project, and we want to make sure that certainty is locked in to have this project now go ahead on the new site.

We indicated early in the day to the opposition that it was our desire to complete the debate of this bill tonight. The opposition indicated their concerns to us in that regard. We then indicated to my shadow minister just before this debate started that our intention was to start some work on the bill and to go to 6 o'clock. Hopefully that gives the opposition some comfort; so this will not be completed today, but we would like to get started on this important debate in the house and continue it tomorrow and, if required, after that as well.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....27  
Noes.....15  
Majority .....12

#### AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E.
Champion, N.D.	Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F.	Fulbrook, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.
Hood, L.P.	Hughes, E.J.	Hutchesson, C.L.
Malinauskas, P.B.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)	Pearce, R.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.

#### NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)	Hurn, A.M.	Marshall, S.S.
McBride, P.N.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Pratt, P.K.	Speirs, D.J.	Tarzia, V.A.
Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.

Motion thus carried.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:49):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will facilitate the development of the new Women's and Children's Hospital, a world-class facility that will provide quality health care to South Australians for decades to come. The current site of the Women's and Children's Hospital has been serving the state as a hospital for over 140 years; however, the age of the buildings and constraints of the site necessitate a new facility for the future.

This is a project that has been discussed for the past nine years; however, not one sod has been turned on the site. The previous government promised to build the hospital to open in 2024; however, that time frame continued to expand. The reason for the delays under successive governments was that the site that was earmarked, the triangle of land west of the Royal Adelaide

Hospital, was too small. Too many compromises would need to be made, too many complexities were involved in the construction and not enough forward planning for the future was possible.

One of the major concerns of clinicians was the suboptimal clinical layout that was anticipated, with hot floor services spread across separate floors. The other major concern was future capacity. The previous hospital design, west of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, would contain just one additional paediatric overnight bed compared with the current hospital. Upon coming to government in March, our government was immediately briefed on the status of the project and was concerned to learn that the cost continued to go up, the time frames were continuing to push out and that the clinical concerns could not be fully addressed on that site.

Even more importantly, the plans as they stood would not allow for either the Women's and Children's Hospital or the Royal Adelaide Hospital to expand in the future. Former State Coordinator-General Jim Hallion was appointed to lead an independent expert group that included the Women's and Children's Health Network board chair, Mr Jim Birch. The review examined sites across the biomedical precinct for the new hospital. The review concluded that the previous site had many drawbacks and that the highest ranking site was the site of the barracks.

Importantly, this was not only the highest ranking score overall but the highest ranking clinical score; therefore, the government had taken the decision to build a new hospital on this new site, a decision taken to secure the long-term future of the hospital for the next century. The previous plans for the hospital only had one additional overnight paediatric bed and only six additional beds overall. The revised plans on the new site allow for 56 additional beds in the hospital and capacity for 20 more.

The previous plans allowed no room for either the Women's and Children's Hospital or the Royal Adelaide Hospital to expand, whereas the revised plan will allow expansions of both hospitals. The previous plans would have disrupted the Royal Adelaide Hospital during construction, whereas this plan does not. The previous plan would have had critical care services across separate floors of the hospital, whereas the new plan will allow for hot floor services to be combined across one floor.

The previous plans would have relied upon the Royal Adelaide Hospital for sterilisation, pathology, catering and helipad services, whereas the new plan will have those services inside the Women's and Children's Hospital. The previous plans would have had the hospital bounded by roads and railways, whereas the new site will open up into the Parklands, with 30,000 square metres of inaccessible Parklands to be rehabilitated as part of the project, including new playgrounds for families to use.

To be clear, our government could have easily committed to the same site as the previous government. It would have been politically expedient and the cost, time frame and functionality problems could have been attributed to the previous government. However, we decided that we needed to think for the long term and prioritise health. For decades to come, South Australians would have paid the price for building on the previous site.

A critical element of the project will be the construction of a four-bed women's intensive care unit inside the new hospital. This means that critically ill women can remain in the same hospital as their newborn baby. Dr Laura Willington, the medical head of Women's Anaesthesia Unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital said about the plans:

It means we will be able to take care of high-risk women in the hospital that we couldn't before because we don't have (adult) intensive care [services].

This legislation is being introduced to ensure that the project can go ahead as expeditiously as possible. The hospital will be constructed on what is detailed in the legislation as the 'project site'. For the project site, the legislation facilitates ownership of the project site, planning consent and development approval and makes a determination with respect to heritage to enable the hospital to be constructed.

In addition to construction of the facility itself, building of the hospital will also require space for staging of equipment during construction, the realignment of Gaol Road, other roadworks and pedestrian and bike paths and augmentation of utility services, such as water, telecommunications, sewerage, stormwater, electricity and gas.

Legislation establishes safeguards and limitations on various components of the site and its surroundings. It defines a project site within which the hospital will be constructed and support zones which may need to be utilised to facilitate construction but with clear limits about what can occur in those zones. From a state heritage perspective, all state heritage places within the project site are taken to have been removed from the South Australian Heritage Register. This does not apply to any sites outside the project site, nor does it amend heritage legislation in any other way.

The intention of the support zones is explicitly for developing the facilities and amenities in connection to the project, and the purposes are defined in the legislation. This will permit access for vehicles and other construction equipment; the construction, realignment or altering of roads, paths, bridges, temporary buildings necessary to serve construction; structures; installation or relocation of utility services; establishment of a temporary construction staging area; and fences or barriers to ensure the safety of members of the public. These are all reasonable, necessary activities to be associated with constructing a facility of this size.

In addition to support zones falling within the defined area and only being specific items listed in the legislation, the bill imposes a positive and ongoing obligation for those utilised areas to be made good once their use is complete. This is an important commitment to remediate any Parklands that are impacted during development. This connects with the government's commitment to expand accessible open space Parklands as part of this development.

From a planning perspective, the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 still applies to the development as modified. A planning application will still have to be made, albeit the development will be taken to be classified by the Planning and Design Code as a deemed-to-satisfy development. Critically, of course, building rules consent and final development approval will still also be required, which will ensure the quality, safety and integrity of the facility that has been constructed.

The legislation will also provide powers in relation to the establishment of another section of Parklands for the use of the South Australian Police Mounted Operations Unit, otherwise known as the police horses. South Australia Police are undertaking a project in relation to determining the best approach to moving operations from the barracks site to new facilities.

While a number of options are being considered in relation to the mounted operations, the bill will allow for a Parklands site to be identified and to be utilised by the police horses and their operations. This will allow this option as an expeditious approach in assisting SAPOL to vacate site and enabling the construction of the hospital to start as quickly as possible.

After listening to clinicians and seriously considering the healthcare needs of future generations, building this new hospital under this legislation will deliver the best health outcomes for South Australian women, children and babies into the future. This is a project which will enable more care for children, more care for women, more expansion capacity for two hospitals, better clinical connection to services and more usable Parklands space connected to the hospital, and this bill will enable those works to occur. I commend the bill to the parliament and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

##### 1—Short title

The short title is the *New Women's and Children's Hospital Act 2022*.

##### 2—Commencement

The measure will commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

##### 3—Interpretation

Definitions are included for the purposes of the measure.

##### 4—Effect of Act

The measure has effect despite any other Act or law of the State. It applies to land notwithstanding the provisions of the *Real Property Act 1886*.



## Part 2—The project site

## 5—Project site

The *project site* is defined in this clause.

## 6—Vesting of project site

The Minister is authorised to vest (by plan or plans to be deposited in the GRO) the whole or any part of the project site in the Minister in an estate in fee simple (and the land so vested vests free from all dedications, encumbrances, estates and interests other than those indicated by the Minister in the plan or plans).

## Part 3—The support zones

## 7—Support zones

*Support zones* and *support services and facilities* are defined.

Specified powers are conferred on the Minister for the purposes of the provision of support services and facilities in support zones in connection with the development on the project site. Provision is also made in relation to the exercise of those powers.

## Part 4—Carrying out the project

## 8—Development assessment etc

Certain requirements under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* apply to a development proposed to be undertaken on the project site or the support zones. Such development is taken to be classified by the Planning and Design Code as deemed to satisfy development and the State Planning Commission is taken to be the relevant authority for all purposes under that Act.

Except as is specified in the provision or as may be prescribed by the regulations, no assessment, decision, consent, approval, authorisation, certificate, licence, permit or permission, or consultation, notification or other procedural step, is required under a law of the State in connection with any action taken under the measure or the performance of functions under the measure.

## 9—Roads

The Minister is authorised to open or close any roads in connection with the development on the project site (both temporarily and on an ongoing basis).

## Part 5—Miscellaneous

## 10—Relocation of certain SA Police facilities

The Minister is authorised to vest (by notice in the Gazette) a prescribed area (being an area of land delineated in a plan or plans to be deposited in the GRO) within the Adelaide Park Lands in the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Police Act 1998* for the purposes of the SA Police Mounted Operations Unit.

Section 8 of the measure is applied in relation to any development proposed to be undertaken on the prescribed area as if it were development proposed to be undertaken on the project site.

No compensation is payable by the Crown (including the relevant Ministers) in connection with the operation of the section.

## 11—Minister may make provision in relation to land or structures

The Minister is authorised to make provision (by instrument deposited in the GRO) relating to the status, vesting or management of land or structures or the delineation of land as the Minister thinks fit.

## 12—Duties of Registrar-General

The Registrar-General may be required to take certain steps for or in connection with action taken under the Act.

## 13—Other actions etc necessary to give effect to Act

The Minister responsible for the administration of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* is authorised to make certain alterations to instruments under that Act at the request of the Minister responsible for the measure. Provision is also made in relation to the removal of State Heritage Places and Areas within the project site from the South Australian Heritage Register.

## 14—Certain fees etc. not payable

Fees and charges are not payable to the Adelaide City Council in respect of the exercise of functions under the measure.

## 15—Regulations

A regulation-making power is provided for.

## Schedule 1—Project site and support zones

The Schedule sets out a map of the project site and support zones.

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:59):** I rise to make a contribution in relation to this bill, and I very much would like to put on the table the opposition's strong support when it comes to the new Women's and Children's Hospital. There is simply no equivocating on this side of the chamber that our position is full steam ahead with the establishment of a new women's and kids'. We absolutely believe that is what South Australians deserve. In fact, it was the former Liberal government that had plans to ensure that a new Women's and Children's Hospital would be established, and right now we should be seeing shovels in the ground, ready for the start of construction at the end of the year for the establishment and the ultimate completion of a hospital by 2026-27. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Auditor-General's Report***AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**

In committee.

(Continued from 1 November 2022.)

**The CHAIR:** I declare the examination of the Report of the Auditor-General 2021-22 open. I remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions must be asked by members on their feet and responses provided by members on their feet. All questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2021-22 Report and agency statements for the year ending 2021-22, as published on the Auditor-General's website.

I welcome the Deputy Premier, and minister for a whole range of things, and also the leader. I call for questions. Leader, the floor is yours.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you. I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Part C, both page 111 and page 114 of the same report. This is the section that includes reference to the prescribed burning program under SA government grant subsidies and transfers. In Part C: Agency Audit Reports, on page 111 the report notes that there was a \$7 million increase in the community emergency services funding. Can the Deputy Premier please clarify what programs the \$7 million was allocated towards?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Can I just say, while the advisers are clarifying the answer to the question, that I have a number of staff here, public servants. If the leader would care to say in between questions if there are any departments that are not being asked questions, they can go back to their work. If he could also just give me some advice on order of departments, that would be useful.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Most questions will be directed to the Department for Environment and Water. I think we can send the EPA back to do better things.

*The Hon. S.E. Close interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Pardon?

**The CHAIR:** Industry and innovation.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Those other parts of your portfolio, yes. I have nothing for them at all. I am not the shadow minister for those.

*The Hon. S.E. Close interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** No, it is just me.

**The CHAIR:** We have the big guns in.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I should say that Green Industries can return to doing better things as well.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The money has been applied to prescribed burning on public land on Kangaroo Island and also the Mount Lofty Ranges.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Could the minister provide any clarity as to the status of the department's prescribed burn program, including the budget allocation for the 2022-23 financial year, as referred to in this report on both page 114 and page 111? Specifically, the 2022-23 budget papers refer to a reduction of \$772,000 in the program. Can the minister clarify whether this is in fact a reduction to prescribed burning in the Mount Lofty Ranges and on Kangaroo Island?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** There is no reduction in the amount of money being allocated to the prescribed burning program. There was a diminution in the capital fund allocated, which is about the establishment of fire tracks and so on. As the opposition leader may well be aware, there is currently a program to determine the track management response at the western end of Kangaroo Island. We expect that the funds will be sufficient to undertake the works required but, if not, we will be seeking assistance with that through either the midyear budget or the budget process. In terms of prescribed burning, the amount allocated is the same year on year, as is the target of hectares to be undertaken in prescribed burning.

As the leader will be well aware, having been the minister for the previous four years, at no point in those last four years was that target reached in hectares. I was at some pains to be clear in the media interview questioning that this is not a matter of political responsibility. The challenge in prescribed burning is significantly associated with the weather conditions at any given time and also occasionally with concerns about smoke taint in nearby vineyards, both of which are legitimate reasons for curtailing some of the prescribed burning that is able to be done.

When comments were being elicited at the budget period, my hope and expectation were that this year would be a good year for prescribed burning and that we would be able to get closer to, if not actually hit, the target for the first time in some time. However, it has been a very, very wet spring, as people would be very well aware, and so again the weather pattern has caused a serious challenge for us in being able to hit the target.

We are obviously at the end of the season. We are not at the end of the financial year, but there are concerns that, yet again, we are not going to be able to hit the target, as has happened in the previous few years. It is not a financial challenge; it is an on-the-ground logistical challenge.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I appreciate the Deputy Premier's clarification and understand and respect the constraints within which the program must operate, particularly in the current climate, and I mean the climate as in the weather rather than financial. However, the budget papers do show that \$772,000 reduction. Can I clarify this for complete clarity. Is that a reduction in capital expenditure with regard to one-off purchases or activities, such as the clearing of fire tracks, and not a reduction in staffing and operational expenditure?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I am absolutely happy to answer this question, but I would note that we are talking about budget papers rather than the AG's Report, which does not address this issue.

**The CHAIR:** Sorry, I did miss that.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** But I will confirm, because we have nothing to hide, that it is the investing figure that has the slight diminution as opposed to the prescribed burns program.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** During the Economic and Finance Committee meeting on 10 June 2022, it was confirmed that there had been a \$1 million reduction in the funding which had been allocated to the Department for Environment and Water for the purposes of the prescribed burn program. Is this funding cut on top of the \$772,000 reduction in the annual program, or is it an approximation as provided by the public servant questioned, Ms Karen Prideaux, Business Manager of the Community Emergency Services Fund in the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission?

**The CHAIR:** Leader, can you just remind me which page?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There are broad references to the prescribed burning program on page 111 and on page 14.

**The CHAIR:** Page 111 and 14.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** So they deal with the 2021 or 2022 financial years?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** They deal with both.

**The CHAIR:** Well, 2022 I assume finished on 30 June 2022, so you are looking at—that is what the Auditor-General does, looks back, and I can say that with some authority because I used to work there once. So, as to the questions you are asking, I cannot see the reference that you are talking to in terms of 2021-22.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** If you go to page 14—

**The CHAIR:** Page 114?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes, there is a 2022 and 2021. You can see the \$3 million less than 2021. That is looking back, if that is your requirement: looking back.

**The CHAIR:** Which \$3 million are you referring to? Can you just go down the page and point it out for me, please?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** So, if we start at the bottom of the page, we have \$28,420,000 under Total.

**The CHAIR:** Sorry, on page 114?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Page 14.

**The CHAIR:** Page 14, sorry. I am on the wrong page; I thought it was 114. Bear with me for a second, I do apologise. Which report number is it?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** It is in the financial statements.

**The CHAIR:** Perhaps the advisers can assist me. So, in the prescribed burning program, there is 2022, which appears to have gone down from 2021, so you are asking about the 2022 period, I assume.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I am comparing and contrasting, I suppose.

**The CHAIR:** You can compare 2021 and 2022 as much as you like, I am happy with that, but you cannot ask about a future budget because the Auditor-General has not actually looked in the future budget yet.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The 2022 year is listed there.

**The CHAIR:** That is right. It is correct; 2022—

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** For the year ending there, so I am asking about the change between the two.

**The CHAIR:** Between 2021 and 2022?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** So you are asking for the minister to report on the April, May, June period under this government.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The budget occurred during that time. Look, I did not have this trouble with the Premier yesterday. We can pack up now if we want and I will call the departments to another special meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee. It is what I had to do last time during estimates. There is an easy way to do this or a painful way to do this. I do not really care either way, but it just wastes everyone's time if we dick around like this.

**The CHAIR:** First of all, I do not appreciate your language. I suggest you retain your language in the parliamentary sense. Secondly, you can choose what you can do, but the standing orders make it very clear, and I read them out, that this relates to the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General reports on the previous year's events and previous years to that. The Auditor-General does not, generally, report on future events. I am happy for you to refer it to whichever committee you wish; that is your decision, and if you wish to cease this process, that is your decision as well. I am happy to do that. The ball is in your court.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I have asked this question and the Deputy Premier has not indicated whether she will answer it or not. Perhaps she will.

**The CHAIR:** There are two things: one is I actually uphold the actual proceedings. Secondly, the Deputy Premier has made it quite clear. She has said this is a budget matter for the future, or words to that effect, rather than the report, so I think she is indicating that you are asking a question about stuff that has not happened yet, which is not the Auditor-General's purview. I am happy to be corrected if somebody thinks I am wrong. There is question time, there is Budget and Finance, there are a whole range and plethora of other committees and processes to undertake what you wish to do. This is not the right time, unfortunately.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I will move on to page 24 of the agency statement, which refers to grants, subsidies and other grants. There is a grant there listed 'other grants', the total being \$3.922 million, some of which fell within the current government's time in office. Does this grant amount, the \$3.922 million, include the contract with the Conservation Council of South Australia for \$250,00 per year previously, and widely referred to as the hush money scandal?

**The CHAIR:** We will take the commentary out and just deal with the facts of the question. Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I do not know why I make you so angry. Leader, are you asking if the nearly \$4 million includes the previous amount of money allocated to the Conservation Council or the additional money that was promised—

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes.

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** No, that was from the budget year commencing 2022-23.

**The CHAIR:** Post 1 July?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** That is right.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** So no funding was provided to them by the government in that period of time?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** No additional money over the money that had already been contracted by the previous government.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Does that figure include funding to the Conservation Council provided by any government?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** My advisers believe that to be case, yes.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I move to page 112 and also page 24, working between the two parts of the report, in relation to the grants provided in the area of heritage, so heritage grants. The Auditor-General's Report references \$6 million, which was allocated by the previous government towards heritage conservation grants. Can the minister confirm whether the \$1 million of grant funding, which had been previously allocated in previous government's budgets for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 financial years, still exists to assist owners of heritage places to restore and preserve their needs, or has that program concluded as is listed here for the \$7.063 million in 2022?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I believe the previous minister, now leader, announced in the lead-up to the election campaign a third round, and that third round was honoured.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Moving on to page 16, which includes the statement around the grant from local government, in this case the City of Marion, towards the playground at Glenthorne National Park, 'where the capital component is recognised during the construction of the asset'. What

is the status of infrastructure works in relation to that nature play area at Glenthorne National Park as it relates to the component of the grant provided by the City of Marion? My question is: what has the funding from the City of Marion paid for?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** The nature-based playground is scheduled to be completed by the end of this year still, and there are some additional elements that are not the playground itself that have been requested by the City of Marion that the department is funding and that will be constructed around March to May next year.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** They were requested by the City of Marion?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** That is what my advisers tell me, yes.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Can you give some examples of what those might be?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** We will take that on notice so that you can get a detailed list.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Has the disability access changing room, which was to be included as part of that nature playground, been removed from the scope of the works, or is that one of the items that the City of Marion has requested?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** My adviser is not aware of the details, so I will take that on notice also.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I refer to page 11 at 1.4, budget performance. The original 2022 budget for total investing expenditure was \$143.45 million and the actual 2022 total investing expenditure was \$48.758 million; there is a difference of \$94.69 million. What is the explanation for that disparity of \$94 million?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I think largely the explanation sits in the document itself, but this is about a carryover of project money so there are some higher actuals which relate to the South Australian Riverland Floodplains Integrated Infrastructure Program and the Park 25 program, but there are also some lower actuals, which are around the Sustaining Riverland Environments Program.

There is a carryover and reprofile of the commonwealth-funded and cabinet-approved projects, including the Sustaining Riverland Environments Program, as well as the KI Asset Reinstatement and Site Clearance Program. The leader will recall challenges in delivering those programs on time under his time also.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Will the \$94 million be carried over to ensure that projects to which the funds were originally allocated are delivered in full, or are they likely to be scaled back or have their scope changed due to increased costs?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** Sorry for that extensive conversation between commonwealth and state money. The challenge in answering this question is that we are talking about a carryover request that sits within the Mid-Year Budget Review, and obviously I cannot be speaking about the Mid-Year Budget Review prior to its publication.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I will move to the Native Vegetation Council item on page 14, which covers the Native Vegetation Branch within the department. Has the department briefed the minister in relation to a significant clearance of native vegetation which occurred at 104 Mount Lofty Summit Road, Crafers?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I do not think the advisers I have here are aware of that level of detail, so I will take that on notice.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Does the minister consider that appropriate resources are being applied by the Native Vegetation Branch to ensure appropriate adherence to and enforcement of the Native Vegetation Act?

**The CHAIR:** Leader, you may wish to rephrase that question to make sure that it falls within the period under consideration by the Auditor-General.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Does the minister consider that appropriate resources were being applied by the Native Vegetation Branch over recent years, both during the time I was the minister and even prior to that, to ensure appropriate adherence to and enforcement of the Native Vegetation Act?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I think that the legislation is being complied with by the department. I think that any environment minister would accept any additional amount of money in order to undertake all the activities that are the responsibility of the department, including compliance for native vegetation, that the council does an excellent job and that the department is fully legally compliant.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Moving on to page 5, which has a section on the impact of COVID-19 on the Board of the State Botanic Gardens. Have events at the Botanic Gardens, including events in Botanic Park and school visits, returned to pre-COVID scheduling, noting that this has been having an impact on the financial performance of the gardens over the prior two years? Can the minister confirm there are no ongoing health restrictions or social distancing requirements at the gardens?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I do not believe that there are any health restrictions currently affecting the gardens, but of course we have been seeing in the news just lately that there appears to be another uptick in the virus, so it will be a brave person who predicts the pathway of this pandemic. At present, there are no restrictions I am aware of that would restrict organisations and schools from visiting and enjoying the gardens.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Have events over recent months returned to pre-pandemic levels?

**The CHAIR:** Events over recent months which are post July 1 are not within the purview of this review or examination.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Until 20 March to 30 June?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE:** I cannot expect my advisers to know the detail of that here, so I am happy to take on notice whether they returned to pre-pandemic levels leading up to 30 June.

**The CHAIR:** Is anybody else asking any questions in this examination? No, so we will change ministers and advisers. I remind both members of the government and the opposition that the committee is in normal session. Any questions have to be asked by members on their feet and responded to by ministers on their feet, and all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2021-22 Report and agency statements for the year ending 2021-22 as published on the Auditor-General's website. I just remind members that any questions that deal with matters post 1 July 2022 will not be entertained by the Chair.

**Mrs HURN:** Minister, I have just a couple of questions in relation to job plans for medical officers. There are a couple of references in Part C, and page 158 is one of those, 'Controls opinion findings', where it says:

No job plans for some senior medical practitioners and consultants. Those that were provided did not meet the requirements of the Enterprise Agreement.

There is another reference on page 163 as well. Do or could job plans make clear the needs of the LHN in terms of ward rounds and timely discharges?

**The CHAIR:** I remind you that the minister is only required to report up to 30 June 2022.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** Thank you, sir, your chairing—

**Mrs HURN:** Potentially it is—

**The CHAIR:** No, it is very clear that this is an Auditor-General's examination. There is question time, there is the Budget and Finance Committee and there are a whole range of other forums where members of the opposition can ask questions. This is quite clear, and that is why we only have 30 minutes.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** Thank you, sir. Your chairing is firm but fair. The member raised the question in relation to job planning, which is an area of ongoing work. Certainly, upon coming

into the role relatively recently, there is, I think, a higher degree of variability in terms of where job planning is in place across the health system.

There has been some work done, particularly since the last enterprise bargaining agreement, with salaried medical officers to work on a job plan policy. There was a draft policy that has been developed. There has been, I think it is fair to say, some concerns from the Salaried Medical Officers Association in relation to that policy. There is now ongoing work being done between the Department for Health and Wellbeing and SASMOA in relation to that policy across the board.

I think there is certainly a willingness, from my discussions with SASMOA, to make sure that we improve job planning across the system because from their perspective it is important to demonstrate and to have as part of those plans some of the non-clinical elements that need to be part of those consultants' workloads, whether it be research training or their other non-clinical roles.

Obviously, from the department's and I am sure from the Auditor-General's perspective, there are other elements where it is important to have the job planning in place. I certainly would agree that this is an area for improvement. There is work underway. There are continual discussions, both at a local health network level, to improve job planning, and at a statewide level in terms of having a policy in place.

**Mrs HURN:** I have a secondary question in relation to the job planning. The report makes reference that CALHN is working with senior medical practitioners and specialists on this, and I am after clarification as to whether the ward rounds and the timely discharges are something that would be included in that.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** Certainly, as the Auditor-General makes note of—bearing in mind your ruling, sir, in relation to keeping this direct to the 2021-22 financial year, which I think predates some of the issues the member is trying to raise in relation to a recent direction that has been put in place by the Chief Executive of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network—in relation to CALHN in particular, CALHN has advised that they will:

- work with Medical Leads to ensure that a job plan is completed for their senior medical practitioners and specialists and that it is less than three-years old
- incorporate a declaration of completion of a job plan into the Scope of Practice document, including a link to SA Health's directive. This will oblige senior medical practitioners and specialists to have this discussion every three years at a minimum as a part of the credentialing review cycle.

CALHN will also investigate options to record the existence of a job plan in the employee's payroll record, enabling reporting and monitoring.

Certainly, if I am incorrect, I will correct the record, but my understanding is that job planning outlines clinical and non-clinical time that would be part of the consultant's work, which would vary depending upon which consulting area that person is working in and their specialty.

**Mrs HURN:** You do not need to turn the page; I refer you to page 164, in relation to mandatory vaccinations. I refer specifically to the targeted catch-up of vaccinations referred to in the CALHN response. Given the report deals to the end of June, the catch-up was scheduled to be completed by the end of September at the latest. Noting the Chair's persistent ruling and outlining of what our requirements are, can you just explain or outline how many vaccinations were outstanding in relation to diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis and how many staff are required to be vaccinated for that?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I thank the member for the question. As she says, there is a requirement to receive the diphtheria and tetanus booster every 10 years. As the Auditor-General notes, from the 2021-22 year, they have identified a significant number of employees who are overdue for that booster. CALHN advised that it would:

- provide targeted catch-up dTpa immunisations to outstanding designated staff across CALHN and SCSS in the next three months
- build a report that will monitor at three-monthly intervals the staff who are due for a dTpa booster
- implement an escalation process for staff who remain non-compliant.



I am certainly happy to take on notice to provide more information in relation to the rollout of that catch-up program and the work that CALHN has committed to doing in relation to that issue that has been identified by the Auditor-General.

**Mrs HURN:** Thank you, minister, for taking that one on notice. Moving on to page 227 in relation to noncompliance with the healthcare workers' COVID-19 vaccination directive, there is an analysis in relation to CALHN, which identifies that 864 staff have not been fully immunised.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** SALHN.

**Mrs HURN:** Yes, SALHN. Did I say CALHN?

**Ms Pratt:** Yes.

**Mrs HURN:** It very clearly outlines SALHN. Has any progress been made in relation to the 864 staff becoming fully immunised? If you would not mind, could you outline how many of those staff—and I understand, Chair, the point you are going to make—how many of those 864, would have had medical exemptions?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I do note, as the Auditor-General does, that for employees who had worked from 1 November 2021 to 1 May 2022 it did identify a number of employees who had not met the full requirements of those vaccination requirements. I am happy to follow up in terms of additional action, noting, of course, that SALHN had committed to the Auditor-General to take action in relation to that from July onwards. I also note that there will be changes happening soon in relation to the vaccination requirements across the health workforce.

Essentially, what is currently in place, under the amendments to the Public Health Act, is that there is still a direction in place for public hospital employees in relation to COVID-19 vaccination requirements. We have been consulting with SA Health staff in relation to a new policy that will be in place for SA Health in relation to vaccination across the board for staff who work in particularly clinical areas. The policy will outline those staff who do require to be up to date with their vaccinations. That policy has been out for consultation and is now being refined following that consultation, to be released soon, and will replace that mandate that has been in place for some time since the direction originally under the Emergency Management Act was in place.

**Ms PRATT:** Thank you, minister, for indulging the next set of questions with a purview to regional health. I am looking at page 133, in reference to supplies and services expenses. There is a line that goes to the \$59 million increase in fees. My question is: what is the estimated annual increase in payments for a general practitioner under this fee for service with general practitioners?

**The CHAIR:** Can I just clarify the question. What was the increase or what will be the increase?

**Ms PRATT:** Where there has been a \$59 million increase in fees for service in an agreement with general practitioners, and that commenced on 1 February, my question is: what is the annual increase in payment for an individual GP in that arrangement?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I thank the member for Frome for her question. I think it might be difficult to answer that because, under the terms of the new contracts that have been rolled out—for the benefit of other members, these are contracts that have been in place with general practitioners who provide services both for inpatients and for emergency work within our healthcare system—there was a protracted negotiation under the previous government between the Rural Support Service on behalf of the government, and on behalf of all the local health networks, and with the AMA and the Rural Doctors Association, representing the GPs. Eventually, an agreement was reached in terms of new rates of pay across all those workers that have now been rolled out to general practitioners across the state.

However, it is not a one-size-fits-all, 'Here's an amount of money that each of you get.' It is a very particularised model, where it depends upon the particular circumstances of the on-call arrangements, the attendances, etc., in terms of how an individual practitioner would be paid under that agreement. There is not a particular sum that each person would receive. However, if I could extrapolate the question to how that payment would be divided, on average, across all the GPs who

are part of that agreement, then I think certainly we would be able to take that on notice and find an answer to that question.

**Ms PRATT:** Moving to page 153, in reference to new agreements between the LHNs and the AMA, the new agreement that I am referring to commenced on 1 February 2022 with an expiration in 2024. This is in reference to a number of contracts, minister. Of the 135 contracts that were eventually signed by both parties, the Barossa Hills Fleurieu LHN advised that 122 contracts were now signed by both parties and there was a remainder. My question to you is: where are the outstanding 13 GP contracts?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** As the member states, there certainly were a number of contracts out of the original set of contracts—of the 135 contracts, 122 were signed as at 1 August 2022. I think it is fair to say that of those remaining contracts, a number—if not the vast majority—have been signed since then. I will certainly take on notice in terms of what information we can reasonably provide about those remaining 13 contracts that had not been signed, and if particular progress has been made since that point in relation to the signing of those contracts.

**Ms PRATT:** Thank you, that would be very welcome. I have a follow-up question on the same line. Minister, how many of those include doctors at a hospital providing emergency department services, if you can?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I will take that on notice as part of the previous question.

**Ms PRATT:** I am moving us to page 208, retention attraction allowances, in reference to the Riverland Mallee Coorong LHN and a penalty rate of 45 per cent. Minister, has the 45 per cent retention and attraction allowance in the RMC LHN now been approved by the CE of the Department for Health and Wellbeing (DHW)?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** Thank you to the member. My adviser has advised me that our understanding is that it has been now approved by the CE of the Department for Health and Wellbeing. We will double-check that, and if there is any correction we will provide that on notice.

From my understanding, there is a process where local health networks—this applies particularly in relation to a large number of regional local health networks—will apply to the CE for approval above that rate, which of course when it comes to attraction and retention is sometimes necessary, particularly in regional areas. This was raised with me as an issue recently in terms of the meeting I had with all the regional executive directors of medical services across the state going through that process.

There is some work being undertaken at a departmental level through the workforce branch looking at incentives, attraction and retention payments generally across the board because we are in a very competitive market for medical, nursing and allied health staff across the country. But, in relation to this matter, clearly the Auditor-General raised that it was not the appropriate approval from the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network for those payments above that original rate from the CE. Our advice is that that has now been approved, but we will double-check that.

**Ms PRATT:** Minister, thank you very much for that answer. I will follow up on that same topic with three questions that I think you have the capacity to absorb into one. What would then be the average retention allowance paid under the agreement across the LHNs? How are those LHNs accurately informed about those rates that are being paid? How would SA Health avoid LHNs competing against each other and driving up the cost? It is a bit of a bundle, so I am happy to go back to an individual question.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I will see what we can do in terms of answering those questions on notice, but I think that there is a good point raised in terms of competition. Certainly, regarding the question that was raised in terms of what the local health network would be aware of, well, they are the ones requesting this so they would be aware of what they are requesting to the CE; however, you raised the point in terms of awareness across the board.

I think the point to raise in relation to these matters is that we are not just competing across regional South Australia for these doctors. We are competing across all of Australia, and we do have a significant issue on that front. This is an issue that, in particular in this section of the

Auditor-General's Report, is being raised in relation to salaried medical officers, as I understand it, and consultants, but where this is most acutely aware is in relation to locums. That is an issue right across the country and that is why we need to do a very significant piece of work not only here at a state level but at a national level in terms of workforce planning for this country.

There has been a workforce task force that has been established through health ministers around the country to address this issue because everybody is facing exactly the same issue and we are competing with each other across the board.

**Ms PRATT:** Minister, moving on to Chiron, pages 130 and 152 for reference, I will try to jump straight to the questions. I am sure that you are across it. Noting that only limited progress has been made with this issue, my first question is: does SA Health have any cybersecurity concerns in relation to the continued use of Chiron and what action has there been on the replacement of it?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I think it is fair to say when it comes to Chiron that there is a whole range of different concerns because it is a very outdated system and it does need to be replaced with the EPAS system. The previous minister rebadged it as Sunrise EMR, but essentially it is still the EPAS system.

It has been delivered to a very small number of regional sites, particularly at Port Augusta and Mount Gambier. It is almost rolled out across Adelaide. We are in the process at the moment of rolling it out to the NALHN, in particular Lyell McEwin Hospital and Modbury Hospital. Stage 1 of that happened in the last month or so. The second stage of that is due to happen by the end of the year. The next step in relation to that is at the Women's and Children's Hospital, where it needs to be rolled out, and then, clearly, we have to work in relation to regional hospitals. I can assure you that, upon coming to office a few months ago, all the local health networks across the state in regional South Australia raised this as a key issue.

So there is work that is being established, as the Auditor-General's Report notes. Digital Health SA has established a regional reform and digital foundations program board. Its work has commenced on the business case to replace the system and that is working at the moment. In particular, we are looking at some of the key sites that needs to be rolled out to.

A particular issue that has been raised across the board is in relation to the Mount Barker hospital, which is obviously a growing hospital. It is about to have its new emergency department and soon after about to have an entirely new hospital built, so having a new system in place there is a significant need but it is a need across the board. This work is being led by Wayne Champion, who is the CE of the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network, on behalf of all the other local health networks across the state, but there is a significant piece of work to roll this out.

There are sites, as I said, where it is rolled out and that may well make it easier to roll it out to other adjoining sites. For instance, Port Augusta has it in the Flinders and Upper North Local Health Network; Whyalla does not. That may well make it easier in terms of that health network being able to expand it. Likewise, the Mount Gambier hospital has it in place but Naracoorte, Millicent, etc. in that health network do not. It may well be that part of the work that comes out of that program board that has been established through Digital Health SA and the local health networks may well be to prioritise those areas where we have already a partial rollout of the system to enable that to be a quicker path to installing it.

**Mrs HURN:** Minister, moving on to page 117 in Part C towards the bottom, which service agreements for 2022 and 2023 have been finalised and signed?

**The CHAIR:** You mean up to 30 June?

**Mrs HURN:** That is the understanding of the entire committee, and I have asked this specific question about which one so he can indicate whether it is up to 30 June. I am sure he is capable of making that decision. It has been referenced. You are wasting time, frankly. It has been—

**The CHAIR:** Sorry? Actually, first of all, I do not appreciate your comment and you will withdraw that comment.

**Mrs HURN:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** No, you will withdraw it and apologise.

**Mrs HURN:** Withdraw.

**The CHAIR:** Secondly, it is up to me to decide the proceedings. If the minister wants to go beyond that, that is fine, but he is under no requirement to go beyond 30 June.

**Mrs HURN:** With respect, Chair, the questions have all been phrased in the very clear understanding of the entirety of the parliament that the Auditor-General's is up until June—

**The CHAIR:** 30 June.

**Mrs HURN:** —and I did not ask a question beyond it. There is a very clear reference as to this question, and frankly this has wasted an entire minute of our opportunity to ask the minister—who is being very helpful in providing us with useful information. So, with respect, we do not need to be constantly reminded about this Auditor-General's Report being up until 30 June. So, minister, just again—

**The CHAIR:** I note you just wasted two minutes of the committee's time too.

**Mrs HURN:** Minister, the service agreements, how many have been finalised and signed?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** Thank you to the member and thank you, through the Chair. I will take on notice in relation to the answer to that question as it pertains to the status of 30 June.

**Mrs HURN:** A series of questions in relation to page 125 of Part C: the Auditor-General's Report says that it is difficult to progress recommendations in the industrial workstream in response to the ICAC report due to industrial disputes. What industrial disputes are being referred to?

**The CHAIR:** Which page again, sorry?

**Mrs HURN:** Page 125.

**The CHAIR:** Whereabouts on 125? Sorry, I am just trying to find it.

**Mrs HURN:** The top.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you; found it.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** My advice is what the Auditor-General in this section is referring to is likely to be in relation to the issue that I raised earlier in terms of concerns that SASMOA had in relation to the draft job planning policy the department had previously.

While I am on my feet I might add to my previous answer as well in relation to the service level agreements. In relation to the service level agreements, I would just add as well that this has been an area identified by our new chief executive of health and wellbeing who has raised that this process has been traditionally starting far too late in South Australia, in her view, compared with what happens on a national basis, and her intention is to start this process much earlier.

My presumption in relation to 30 June is that it was likely that no service level agreement was signed by that date, which was probably similar to the year before and the year before and the year before that. This is clearly something the department is keen to make sure is brought in earlier into the future.

**Mrs HURN:** On the same reference, what is the process and I suppose the progress of resolving those industrial disputes? Could you elaborate the process the department is going through.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** My advice in relation to the job planning policy is that there was a workshop that was held between the department and SASMOA. Subsequent to that, SASMOA have provided their recommendations in relation to their concerns and suggestions for what the job planning policy should look like. Essentially, discussions are ongoing between SASMOA and the department in relation to finalising that policy.

**Mrs HURN:** Moving on to page 129, and there is also another reference on page 194 in relation to screening checks, what action is being taken to ensure that all workers who are required to undertake a working with children, aged-care and criminal history check complete those checks?

Also, could you potentially outline, and you may not have these figures at hand, how many people are working without them.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I will take on notice what we can in relation to the issue of the numbers. There are particular sections where this has been raised in the Auditor-General's Report but, particularly since the member has referred to the page number that references the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network, I will point to the section that outlines that NALHN has developed a procedure outlining the requirements for an employee screening check and is looking to centralise the monitoring of compliance with this procedure to its human resources team, which will help to ensure that staff do not work in a prescribed position without a current working with children check.

**Mrs HURN:** Just to clarify as well there was a second reference given, Part C, 194.8 as well, but 129 references CALHN, SALHN and NALHN as well, so if you could take all those on notice that would be helpful.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** I can do that.

**Mrs HURN:** In relation to Part C, page 125, back to the ICAC references, has the updated conflict of interest policy been released and also what action has been taken to educate the SA Health community in the appropriate implementation of the policy?

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** My advice is that the policy has been released and that SA Health, particularly the Department for Health and Wellbeing, is working on the implementation of that policy.

**The CHAIR:** That concludes the time allocated for this reference. We will now go to a new minister and a new member, the member for Frome.

I remind members, both the minister and opposition members, that this is a committee in normal session. Questions have to be asked by members on their feet and all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report 2021-22 and agency statements for the year ending 2021-22 as published on the Auditor-General's website. I remind members that questions must relate to the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General's Report is up to the financial year ended 30 June 2022.

**Ms PRATT:** Minister, I will start in reference to page 423, eligibility requirements, where the background is that audit findings included that the South Australian Housing Trust 'does not require proof of income and asset eligibility from HomeSeeker SA applicants'. Can you advise the dates that the review of the HomeSeeker policy will start and be completed?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** In terms of eligibility, applicants are required to make a statutory declaration. I think the second part of your question was regarding a review; is that right?

**Ms PRATT:** In response to the Auditor-General's finding, the Housing Trust advised that it would review. My question is: can you advise the dates that the review will start and be completed?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** The review is already underway. The authority has had a look at different methods by which we can independently verify the statements. Following this, the options will be presented to the board, and I expect that to happen in the next few weeks.

**Ms PRATT:** In that vein, will the government then commit to releasing the outcomes of the policy review once completed?

**The CHAIR:** I draw the member's attention to the fact that that is not a matter in the Auditor-General's Report. It goes beyond that. It is a report outside the Auditor-General's Report. The minister is not required to address that if she does not wish to. I can read out the requirements of the Auditor's examination, if you like.

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** I am happy to make a statement on it. We are not reviewing the entire policy as such; we are just looking at the administrative arrangement. Those recommendations will be subject to the matters of the board. I am sure the arrangements, if they do change, will be publicised.

**Ms PRATT:** I refer to page 430, underutilisation of SAHT properties. Where it was referenced that about 26 per cent of tenanted houses are underutilised, I would do some rough calculations that we are talking about approximately 41,000 people. How can the government justify the 13,000 properties—26 per cent—that are being underutilised in the current housing and cost-of-living crisis?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** I think it is fair to say that we acknowledge we are in a housing crisis, and we are doing a range of things. We have been assessing the process in which we turn around our vacant properties. I remember somewhere towards the end of last year that we had certainly 1,800 plus vacant properties in public housing, and that has created a great deal of discussion.

Certainly I recall putting a lot of pressure on in regard to that myself because we knew that we were hitting a bit of an issue in relation to housing and tenancy. The recent number—although the numbers vary every day—in fact dropped under 1,400 vacant properties in the last few weeks. I think last week I remember a number of about 1,435 or thereabouts, so it does move around, depending on people getting allocated to a property.

In terms of what you are saying, you are talking about the number of maybe empty bedrooms potentially. Is that where you were going—empty bedrooms, the numbers of tenants in properties versus the numbers of properties being utilised? Well, we cannot simply say to people, 'Look, you're in a three-bedroom property.' Maybe someone has become a single parent or their partner has passed away. There are a lot of sensitivities around the bedroom-to-person ratio within public housing.

We have been looking at bigger picture reform in relation to the investing of money into our public housing system. I have said over and over again that we have put in \$177.5 million of new money. That is the first new money into building homes in many, many years. It is fair to say as well that we do have some bits of comparative that we have looked at with respect to certain regional areas.

Regional areas might be different from metro in terms of how many one, two, three or four-bedroom homes there are. Even though they are three-bedroom homes, some of them are very, very small and not fit for purpose in terms of what we would expect out of a family home in today's day and age. We have been looking at all those things and planning and mapping out how our construction program will better meet the needs of people moving into the future.

**Ms PRATT:** Further to that then, minister, and thank you for your answer, yes, on page 431 I am really referring to that graph of the three-bedroom properties. You have gone some way to answer this question, but how will the government ensure that it replaces the underutilised three-bedroom properties with commensurate one or two-bedroom houses to ensure that more people are afforded that opportunity?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** Sadly, it does not happen overnight. We have been working over the last few months to map out where all these properties are and where the utilisation and the underutilisation do exist, as well as our building program (a) with public housing and (b) in terms of a social and affordable mix and where we can leverage the money out of the \$10 billion HAF that has been announced, as well as other money that we can leverage out of the feds through their commitments through the Housing Accord. We will certainly be addressing those issues in terms of making sure that we have the right properties in the right areas for the right purposes.

**Ms PRATT:** Minister, I refer again to page 430, the Affordable Housing Initiative and continue with that theme, noting that SAHT has created an AHl project management team. Can you elaborate on my question that in light of the current housing climate—and we know that interest rates have gone up, as well as cost of living and house prices—what is the government's plan to increase affordable housing for South Australians separate to public, social or community?

**The CHAIR:** What was the reference again, for my benefit, please?

**Ms PRATT:** It is page 430, Affordable Housing Initiative (AHl).

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** The Affordable Housing Initiative, as I understand it, does have a commitment around providing 1,000 housing outcomes with respect to that program. It is fair to say

that the two years before we came to government produced for sale around 54 houses. We certainly have started to review how that program is operating. In fact, today I went to a site out at Woodville Gardens where there were another 14 houses starting under this project.

We are continuing the program, but the difference with what is happening now is that we also have a federal government that has committed to put money into affordable housing. For the first time in a generation, we have state and federal governments putting money on the table so that we can increase housing supply. If you look at the number committed over the next five years to be started through the federal government announcement, we are working at pace to make sure that we get a good chunk of it. Their total number is about 55,000 or thereabouts.

If you look at population ratio, we normally get about 8 per cent. If we are rough with that, we should say we expect to try to drag 3½ thousand housing outcomes to commence in partnership with the feds over the next five or so years. That with our public housing builds—and we can reflect on the Treasurer's speech where he pulled together our public housing initiative from the election plus the general renewal programs that are rolling out—I understand that number to be around 1,700 housing commencements during this term of government.

If we add that onto what the feds are offering that we can deliver in partnership with community housing providers, local government and other good roosters that want to put some money in—maybe even the piping shrike could swoop down from State Admin, as described by the Treasurer, and offer us some goodies; I think he owes me one—then I reckon we can look at somewhere north of 4½ thousand to 5,000 housing commencements, which is excellent in terms of social housing and affordable housing.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** I am just going to ask one reasonably simple question in relation to page 269, which identifies the consolidation of the youth custodial services capital project. It is a very straightforward question. I think this is an important project. Is it on track, how is it going, is it going to be completed on time, when is it going to be completed and how is the budget going?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** That is a really good question, member for Morialta. I know how much you are committed to young people and their outcomes in life. I am pleased to say on track. Certainly, along with everything else, there are some budget pressures. We are expecting that this consolidated program will be due for completion in June next year.

In the budget, we did revise the costings from \$18.7 million to \$21.8 million, so there has been a small uptick in the cost, but it has been allocated and I think that is to be expected in this climate. We only need the one site and I think moving forward, that is an excellent indication of what we have been doing for young people over the last generation as such.

**Ms PRATT:** Minister, I refer you to page 273, turning over to 274, sales of goods and services. I note that there was an increase from roughly \$23 million to \$37 million and therefore an increase of approximately \$15.5 million that the Auditor-General suggests relates mostly to SIL services. My question to you is in relation to that \$15.5 million. Can you advise how much of the additional \$15.5 million has been spent on the Transition to Home service and exactly what this means for the T2H clients?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** I will not spend long, but I am happy to offer a conversation outside the chamber in regard to this because it does not relate at all to T2H: this relates to the cash-in-kind payments for the NDIS.

**Ms PRATT:** Thank you, minister, for that clarification. That is a learning curve for me as well, but I think that information would be welcome at another time. That being the case, I was not quite completed with SAHA and may invite the switch, thanks.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Frome, go ahead.

**Ms PRATT:** I will move at a faster pace. I refer to page 426 and I am heading to reporting and looking at the SAHT Board receiving no formal reporting on non-financial performance. I will give you the question and I will come back to it—I think you will know what I am referring to—rather than reading everything out. Will the minister release the information on a quarterly basis so that the SA taxpayer can assess the progress of the government's promises?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** I can answer the question. I will just make sure I get it right for you. The reporting was to the board previously, in terms of pure financial reports, and now, moving forward, we will be looking at the non-financial measures as well and reporting that quarterly to the board. That is the plan. So there is going to be a change from purely the financial reporting mechanism.

**Ms PRATT:** I refer you to page 432, maintenance. This question is in relation to maintenance and multitrade contractors (MTCs). Can the minister please explain the impact of having six contracts zones as opposed to 14? How will this work and will this disadvantage tenants who require maintenance works in any way?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** The view is that this will actually provide a more streamlined service with fewer people being involved at that level. It should only affect the customer in a positive way in terms of the change to the KPIs and the other measures that have been put in place in terms of the contract. It is fair to say that maintenance is probably one of the biggest contacts to local members' offices, so we are very aware of that, and this is coming with some anticipation. It will roll over at the beginning of the next calendar year.

In terms of now, we would expect having some really well built-in expectation, with some reward and penalties systems in place, and also more transparency for the trade contractors in terms of delivery. We would hope that this will actually be a much more streamlined and improved service.

**Ms PRATT:** There is a line that references the pricing arrangement. Can you please explain how those pricing arrangements will or may change?

**The CHAIR:** We are getting pretty close to going way beyond—

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** It is more like budget questions, but it is okay. I will give you a little bit of information for it. Previously, a lump sum would be paid to the multitrade contractor for a stovetop, for example. It would be a certain amount of money given to the multitrade contractor. They would then go out to Fred the stovetop dude and say, 'Order a stovetop and put the stovetop in.'

This contractor might have got a thousand bucks and said to the stovetop dude, 'Fred, you get \$450. That's how much we pay.' However, the multitrade contractor over here might have said, 'Hey Fred, stovetop dude, you're awesome—here's 750 bucks.' He says, 'Hang on a minute, what's going on here?' But now there is a transparent service delivery fee for that item, so the contractor (Fred the stovetop dude) will know what he is doing. He is going to know how much money he is going to get. It is a much easier, much more transparent and fairer system.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** If we can go to page 278, I will potentially spend a little bit of time talking about concessions. Perhaps if I can just describe my question first it might be of some assistance. If you are looking at page 278, you will notice a chart talking about the concessions: 211,000 people receiving the energy concession; 201,000, cost of living; 197,000, water; and 129,000, sewerage payments. My point is that there is a reasonable amount of variation there.

The Auditor-General also talks about the changes to the cost of these programs, and \$37.1 million is identified for cost-of-living concessions, particularly in 2021-22. My understanding is that there is just under \$40 million budgeted to double the cost-of-living concessions at the moment. I just want to know if there is any update as to whether it is still that 201,000 people that we are talking about? Is there any advice to suggest that that is going to increase this year?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** The latest number of households to have their Cost of Living Concession provided in advance of the end of this year already has hit 204,000. It is fair to say that what this process of doubling concessions has done as well is actually activated a number of people who had not provided information. Many offices have received phone calls and had conversations. The team have done a really wonderful job and been able to get a whole range of people back onto the system as well. So, yes, there are more people benefiting from the doubling of the Cost of Living Concession. As you know, the ones for people who are renting, etc. have already been paid. People can still apply before the end of December, so that number could still go up by more.



**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** I thank the minister for the answers. As I understand it from her answer, that is about 3,000 extra already this financial year. Is there any issue with the budget that is made available, or is that an uncapped budget allocation to the department?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** This is something that is very important, particularly in today's climate. It is an uncapped expenditure. It is what it is. We need to find that money and we will be paying that money. It is not a capped amount.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Has the department caught up with everybody who is applying for that money? For context, I understand there are a number of people who are waiting for some time for their eligibility to be confirmed by the department, including one of my constituents—and potentially many more than one of them.

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** There could be, although I think my latest advice is that for pretty much anyone who has come to our ministerial office we have our response already back. Since 1 July, there have been 65,000 phone calls made to inquire about these concessions and 28,000 new applications have been submitted, with 23,000 of those processed.

You cannot put just anybody in to answer a call and do the thing. There has been some training, we have put extra people on, we have moved people around in the department and upskilled to this certain service delivery model. Those people are on board, working extra hours, taking the calls. There is still a bit of a wait time on some of the phone calls. We apologise for that, but the right people have to do the work.

However, we are reducing the backlog. The backlog is most definitely going down. Since it peaked last month or the month before sometime, it has reduced by about 30 per cent, so we are getting there. We feel very confident that we will really whittle away and get rid of that backlog this year.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** I thank the minister for the answer. I think she said that it was 28,000 applications and that 23,000 have been processed. I stand to be corrected if that was inaccurate. As to the range of concessions, there being a variation from one concession to another, clearly there are a number of people—thousands of people, by this figure—who are identified as being worthy of at least some concessions but not others. Given the cost-of-living challenges we have described during this session, is the government considering any further extensions of cost-of-living easing in other concession areas?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** It was an election commitment that we would review concessions. In terms of the concessions folio you are seeing before you, that will all form part of this review. This review will happen once the department has been through this process and everyone has been paid their Cost of Living Concession.

We are very aware of the current pressures. We anticipated the pressures, and that is why we doubled the concession, and then we brought forward about a quarter of the concessions that were due to be paid in March. At the election, we also anticipated and we made that election commitment to review concessions. I am very happy to hear from members or members of the public if they have suggestions in regard to that. We will be undertaking that review.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** When will that review be completed?

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** As you would understand, it is quite a complex set of relief measures. Times have changed since they were put in place, and they are changing all the time. We expect that the consultation and the review could take up to 12 months, but we will be kicking that off in the new year, and you can take it that we will do it as fast as we can while doing it properly.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Page 275 talks about grants and subsidies, and I am interested particularly, given the conditions we are talking about, in what new requests the minister has received in relation to funding requests from Foodbank or other community service organisations to support them in their work at these difficult times.

**The Hon. N.F. COOK:** I can particularly talk to Foodbank, which we already fund, if my memory serves me correctly, by about \$250,000 per annum or thereabouts, in that vicinity, along with other food relief that we provide. We did have a conversation in regard to Foodbank's increased

clientele and the increased demand, which over the year is in the hundreds of thousands of meals. They also put to us the pressures they were under in terms of providing that food delivery with increased costs for them. We provided them with a one-off \$50,000 grant to improve their capacity to deliver with the increased cost of fuel and other items, so we have addressed that in terms of one of our funded food services providers. We do take all requests on merit and do the best we can with what we have.

**The CHAIR:** The time for the committee examinations has expired.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

### *Bills*

## **NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mrs HURN (Schubert) (17:37):** This is always a fascinating experience because you have your well thought-out speech and then you have to seek leave to continue your remarks, so I might start again almost from scratch because it was an important point that I was making, which is that I did want to put on the record the opposition's very clear commitment to supporting the establishment and construction of a new Women's and Children's Hospital here in South Australia. It is remarkably clear that there is no equivocation from those on this side of the chamber, that we believe that South Australians deserve a world-class Women's and Children's Hospital.

In fact, it was the former Liberal government that had plans in place to build a hospital. Under those plans, we should be seeing shovels in the ground ready for a construction process by the end of the year, with delivery of the project by 2026-27, but it was this Labor government, having come to power in March 2022, that threw those plans out and said, 'No, back to the drawing board.' That has really caused some extraordinary and very significant delays.

I suppose one of the most disappointing things about how this whole bill has been structured and perceived publicly is that the government has set this up as being a health bill, but the reality is that it is far from a health bill. It is a planning bill, pure and simple, but anyone who dares to ask a question on it the government claim is therefore against the establishment of a new Women's and Children's Hospital and that simply could not be any further from the truth; in fact, I think that that is absolute nonsense.

According to the government, if you ask a question on it you are against it. You cannot have the Parklands and you cannot have a hospital; it is one or the other. Frankly, I think that they have deliberately tried to set up this faux us v them debate, and it is pathetic politics. That is, of course, what we are used to from the Labor Party.

I have made reference to this, but the government has named the bill the New Women's and Children's Hospital Bill even though there is not a single solitary clause or amendment to a health act. It is very clearly a planning bill relating to heritage and Parklands. My colleague the member for Flinders will be making some very detailed remarks in relation to our position that we have put forward and the series of amendments that we have already seen aerated in the other place.

The other concern that the opposition has relates to the significant delay. The people of South Australia are not going to be seeing this hospital this decade, so that is why I think we are so affronted by this sense of urgency that the government tries to fabricate publicly. Many of us have been involved in briefings from the government and, when questions were asked about what action needs to happen on this site to make sure the hospital can be delivered in 2032, the answer was that we need access to do something to a bike path next year. That is not to be flippant.

Again, I reiterate that we are very supportive of the establishment of a new Women's and Children's Hospital, but this process has been particularly disappointing—that the government is using its numbers to ram this through. But it does not represent an opposition from the Liberal Party here in South Australia. We are worried about the serious cost blowouts and we are worried about the completion delay and Labor's ability to deliver this project.

If we wind the clock back, it was the Labor Party that oversaw the delivery of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital here in South Australia. It was the Labor Party that presided over the disastrous Transforming Health policy here in South Australia. Of course, it was the Labor Party in South Australia that went to the election promising South Australians that they would fix ramping in this state, yet now we know the disastrous situation that is unfolding right before our eyes, and that is that ramping is the worst it has ever been.

Put simply, it shows that the Labor Party cannot be trusted when it comes to delivering health care and health solutions here in South Australia. We certainly continue to have the people of South Australia, the patients, the women and kids who will be coming through this hospital front of mind, but I am not sure that those opposite do. In fact, if we wind the clock back many years ago to October 2013, that was when the now government first promised a Women's and Children's Hospital. That is nine years ago, and right up until the 2018 election not a single solitary thing was done in relation to forging ahead with that Women's and Children's Hospital.

**The Hon. C.J. Picton:** What about the four years after that?

**Mrs HURN:** I always prefer not to respond to interjections, but the member for Kaurana has given me an excellent opportunity because he said, 'What about the four years after that?' There is this constant reinvention of history by those opposite on the government benches that the former government failed to act on this and we just reject that completely. There was lots of money spent on preparing a site for the construction. That is work that this new government is going to have to consider before they turn a single solitary sod—soil contamination, for example. They will have to do a range of works.

But it brings me back, I suppose, to the crux of our concern with this bill and the process of this bill. That is, as the member for Morialta has already established, the sense of urgency that has been placed on this bill is false because what this bill enables is work that we are only going to be seeing starting in the later part of next year. That is the concern we have and the very reasonable amendments that the opposition has put forward in no way represent an opposition to the construction of a Women's and Children's Hospital in South Australia. It is classic Labor to generate this us versus them mentality that we are continuing to see playing out publicly in this space.

So we absolutely support the construction of a new Women's and Children's Hospital. It was the strident ambition of the former government to do so and we wait with bated breath as to whether the new Labor government can deliver this new Women's and Children's Hospital by 2032 and within the eye-watering \$3.2 billion price tag that this has attracted. One thing is certain: we support a Women's and Children's Hospital. It is the best thing for the people of South Australia, for the little kids and the mums who are wanting to use this facility. I end my remarks there.

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (17:44):** I rise to speak on this New Women's and Children's Hospital Bill 2022. Even the title itself is a bit misleading. The Liberal Party does believe that South Australian children deserve a world-class new Women's and Children's Hospital. Indeed, as has been well articulated by the member for Schubert, the previous Liberal government had plans in place and would have started construction right about now and it would have been completed by 2026-27.

Instead, we know that the Labor Party has chosen to review these plans and in fact has caused further delays. In the briefing that was received by the opposition, we were advised that no works would take place until later in 2023. To see the way that the Labor Party have been ramming this through parliament is disappointing as far as the process goes in this place, but seemingly it is the same pattern we have seen them following previously—arrogantly treating this place with disrespect.

The government has named this bill the New Women's and Children's Hospital Bill, even though there is not a single clause or a single amendment to make this a health act; it is indeed a planning act. If you were to flick your way through this bill, in no place does it actually mention health. It does not mention hospital, except in the title. There are a lot of things about development, a lot about process, a lot about planning, a lot about heritage, and a lot about zoning. There are no actual health aspects to this bill. It is a planning bill, yet we do not see the planning minister here: we see the health minister spruiking this bill as if there is some sort of choice to be made between proper process and delivering a world-class Women's and Children's Hospital.

This piece of legislation is unprecedented in our state's history and the arrogance is palpable. It gives the government of the day extraordinary powers. This bill vests specific power in the hands of the minister. It is not simply the removal of the state heritage protection value of the old police barracks, and it is our responsibility as legislators to consider the implications of this for all South Australians and the planning process of the state.

The government are asking South Australians to trust them when it comes to consultation on the project site, the planning approvals, the Planning and Design Code, the relocation of the Mounted Operations Unit into the Parklands, the demolition of the heritage-listed Thebarton barracks and, in clause 15 of the bill, the ability to modify or exclude any clause of any act. 'Trust us,' they say. 'Trust us,' the Minister for Health says. 'Trust us,' the Minister for Planning says. 'Trust us,' the Labor leader, Premier Malinauskas says. It has been deliberately rushed through to avoid scrutiny.

Once this bill is passed there is no additional requirement for scrutiny. The Labor Party have given themselves a blank canvas. In relation to consultation and these sorts of matters, I think it is very important to outline what the State Planning Commission requires of any development or changes to the code. Through changes to the Planning Act, which is now known as the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, or the PDI Act for those of us who know way too much about planning, we have a community engagement charter.

This document is quite a thorough document and it provides obligations on anybody who engages in changing zoning and the like within our planning system. It says that the following principles must be taken into account in relation to the preparation of such a document:

(a) members of the community should have reasonable, timely, meaningful and ongoing opportunities to gain access to information about proposals to introduce or change planning policies and to participate in relevant planning processes;

(b) community engagement should be weighted towards engagement at an early stage and scaled back when dealing with settled or advanced policy;

(c) information about planning issues should be in plain language, readily accessible and in a form that facilitates community participation;

(d) participation methods should seek to foster and encourage constructive dialogue, discussion and debate in relation to the development of relevant policies and strategies;

(e) participation methods should be appropriate, having regard to the significance and likely impact of relevant policies and strategies; and

(f) insofar as is reasonable, community should be provided with reasons for decisions associated with the development of planning policy, including how a community's views have been taken into account.

This is very prescriptive, very descriptive and very thorough because to go through a process like this is a significant change. There is a clear process that needs to be gone through for consultation. It is a standard that is set for every single development in South Australia.

The way this piece of legislation is constructed and we have been presented with in this place does not meet that test; therefore, we have amendments that will seek to do that in a number of ways. We are looking at having transparency. We want to have community engagement through the process. We want to make sure that a proper consultation process is followed. The Liberal Party has a series of amendments which we believe provide the right balance for providing transparency without slowing down the works.

Once again, we are keen to have a world-class new Women's and Children's Hospital in South Australia. It has always been the position of the Liberal Party to be supportive of having a new state-of-the-art build for women and kids in South Australia, but the proper process needs to be followed through. We need to make sure that we get the balance right between providing transparency and not slowing things down.

After all, if the government are going to undertake the consultation they promised they will—'Trust us,' they say—they will have to do the work anyway. Our amendments simply formalise those

arrangements. This process is as blurred and uncertain a planning process as I have seen in all my years of looking through planning policy and planning amendments. There is no certainty on the impacts on communities. There is no certainty on what precedents this sets in dealing with heritage throughout our state.

We have seen a government that is not afraid to run roughshod over existing legislation, especially important legislation like we have in the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act. It is a sad state of affairs when you have a reactive, unengaged government in an area that is so important for communities in not just Adelaide but across the whole of the metropolitan area and across the state.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:53):** I rise to contribute to the second reading debate. In the circumstances, I am glad to at least have that opportunity. The circumstances are that the government is apparently so averse to any form of scrutiny in the course of this debate that it not only rejected the calls from us in the other place to provide even a modicum of review, a committee review inquiry, into what is planned in relation to a bill that is going to provide extraordinary power to the minister but, just the very day after its passage through the other place, it has come along in here, suspended standing orders and forced the debate on to proceed this evening in what has become a bit of a pattern for this government.

Having seen a debate occur in the Legislative Council, then appearing to treat the House of Assembly as really a place where nothing more than a rubber stamp is expected for government legislation, I think all South Australians will be increasingly focused on the way in which this government is going about conducting business.

We have to be very careful not to jam things through, no matter how clearly the government wishes to politicise and define its political objectives. The reasonable scrutiny of not only the bill but also the consequences of the bill is really the very least that South Australians expect. As the shadow minister for health and wellbeing has emphasised and made clear, and the shadow minister for planning also, we on this side of the house want to see the building of the Women's and Children's Hospital. We have done important work to progress that in the course of the last years and our commitment to that build is steadfast and is maintained.

What we are disappointed about here is that we have been presented with a suddenly relocated project and a suddenly much more costly project and a suddenly much delayed project that is going to see a building possibly completed on the most heroic of ambitious timelines, not until some time into the next decade. And yet—

*The Hon. C.J. Picton interjecting:*

**Mr TEAGUE:** Well, it is true. We are told that we are not going to see this thing built until sometime in the next decade at the very earliest. In those circumstances, to be denied the opportunity to engage in a process of analysis about just how the minister might go about deigning to apply these extraordinary powers in the time that ensues is about the very least that South Australians—let alone those of us finding ourselves on this side of the house—I would think are entitled to ask.

I say to the government: just be careful because you are going to jam through some legislation that is going to put the ball completely in your court. A whole lot of discretionary power will be instantly conferred upon a minister and a complete change of the landscape as we have always known it. I just want to highlight in that regard a couple of areas in particular because, as I have said, it is not just us. The minister said I think as recently as this morning on the radio that unless this bill passes the parliament more or less today, then you will not have a hospital. You will not be able to get on with things. You will not be able to have—

**The Hon. C.J. Picton:** I'm not sure I said that.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Unless it jams through today, unless it jams through really, really fast then we will not be able to get on with the things that we are going to do—whether that is going to be the middle of next year or late next year. It is not as though we are all rushing down to the rail line with our shovels this evening, going about boring into those poor old barracks. It is not going to happen for at least several months from here, yet the aversion of the government to even that level of scrutiny really is truly astounding.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Heysen, I am sorry to interrupt your flow. I see you are warming up. Do you wish to seek leave to continue your remarks?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I will in just a moment.

**The CHAIR:** Or do you wish to finish your remarks?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I will seek leave in just a moment.

**The CHAIR:** No, sorry, you will either seek leave now to continue your remarks or we will actually call for an adjournment. What is it you wish to do?

**Mr TEAGUE:** I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Thursday 3 November 2022 at 11:00.