

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 3 November 2022

The SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan) took the chair at 11:00.

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.

Parliamentary Committees

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: REPORT 2021-22

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:02): I move:

That the 2021-22 annual report of the committee be noted.

The Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee's functions include reviewing the operation of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013, the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1984 and the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act 1981. The committee can also inquire into matters affecting the interests of the traditional owners of the lands and the manner in which the lands are being managed, used and controlled. Other functions include inquiring into matters concerning the welfare of Aboriginal people.

The committee discharges its functions in part by visiting Aboriginal lands and Aboriginal communities, by maintaining strong relationships with Aboriginal landholding statutory authorities and by inviting representatives from those statutory authorities to appear before the committee to give evidence. During the 2021-22 year, the committee endeavoured to travel to various locations. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic seriously limited our opportunity to visit communities.

The committee continued its three active inquiries during the reporting period. The Aboriginal housing inquiry concluded with the tabling of a final report on 26 October 2021. The committee concentrated on receiving evidence in its Aboriginal governance inquiry for the majority of the 2021 calendar year. This inquiry into governance standards in Aboriginal community-controlled organisations was referred by the then Premier in February 2021.

On 26 October 2021, after receiving oral evidence from a further 13 witnesses in the reporting period, the committee tabled the interim inquiry report. The report contained nine recommendations, which were responded to by the Hon. Josh Teague MP at the state level and the Hon. Ken Wyatt MP at the commonwealth level. After the 2022 March state election, a new committee was established in May 2022. The new committee decided to readvertise this inquiry and allowed for new submissions to be received by 22 July 2022.

There was probably one really important submission. We asked for the Western Australia Attorney-General, the Hon. John Quigley, to provide evidence to the committee because of the work that had been done in Western Australia when they looked at governance in Aboriginal communities. I think that their brief was a bit wider than ours, but the initiative came from me to look at governance, given that organisations were the beneficiaries of millions of dollars and that serious concerns had been raised by a whole range of Aboriginal people when it came to expenditure of moneys.

Therefore there needed to be a legislative framework to tighten up what was going on and to give people confidence that there was going to be a far greater degree of openness, accountability and transparency. I strongly recommend that people take the opportunity to look at what John Quigley had to say because it might well be a model adapted to various state needs as well as a model for other states in Australia. I believe they are the first to do this. It was a very informative submission.

On 15 February 2021, the committee resolved to inquire into Aboriginal heritage issues, in particular the operation of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 and how Aboriginal heritage is managed in this state. This is particularly relevant given the findings of the federal parliament's joint committee inquiry into the destruction of Indigenous heritage sites at the Juukan Gorge in Western Australia. That inquiry led to a renewed call for reforming and modernising Aboriginal cultural heritage protection across all Australian jurisdictions. Much of the evidence that has been given to date has been, to say the least, very interesting.

As at 30 June 2022, the committee had received 33 written submissions in the Aboriginal heritage inquiry. Since the 2022 March state election, the committee has focused on advancing this inquiry and received oral evidence from a further six witnesses by 30 June 2022. The committee is continuing to receive evidence in this important inquiry.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all stakeholders who spoke with the committee and who provided evidence in three inquiries, especially those people who travelled down to Adelaide, sometimes a great distance, to give evidence. I also acknowledge the current members of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee: in the other place, the Presiding Member, the Hon. Tung Ngo; the Hon. Stephen Wade; and the Hon. Tammy Franks. From the assembly, I thank the member for Newland and the member for Heysen.

I would like to thank the staff for their assistance, and I would particularly like to thank Lisa Baxter for her highly organised, highly efficient approach to her duties. They have been exemplary. I would also like to take this opportunity to offer my condolences at the passing of her father. I commend the report to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:08): I thank the member for Giles for his contribution to this debate and very much endorse all that he has contributed. I will just say one or two things further in relation to the work of the committee, and where we have got to as at the date of the annual report because the annual report also reflects upon very much the core ongoing work of the committee in this new parliament.

First, I just refer to the receipt of the committee's interim report in relation to the governance inquiry. As the member for Giles has indicated, I had the opportunity to respond to that interim report by my letter of 18 February this year, that there was a considerable amount of work yet to be done coming into the end of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament. To have found myself then on the committee as a member contributing to that work since then, I have been pleased to do so.

I just want to underscore the important determination of the committee at the outset to continue that work. The committee has determined that there is important further work to do in relation to the governance inquiry, and so we see that ongoing. We will be drawing to a conclusion before too long, but it is important work the committee is undertaking in that inquiry. The annual report provides some insight into why that is the case, and I hope my response by letter to the previous Presiding Member, the Hon. Terry Stephens, on 18 February puts that into some context as well.

The second matter the member for Giles has referred to, being the heritage inquiry, is also productive and ongoing work beyond the time of the annual report. As the member for Giles has adverted, the committee has received a really wideranging and substantial number of inputs into the heritage inquiry. That is recorded in the annual report but it is also ongoing since. Clearly, there are a number of perspectives that are drawn both from representative bodies and from individuals. I, too, recognise and pay tribute to those who have travelled from a long distance and entered into and engaged with this committee in circumstances with which they are not all necessarily familiar, to make a contribution.

For the record at this point, in terms of reflecting on the annual report, the heritage inquiry comes along at a time when there is certainly a focus on not repeating the disaster at Juukan Gorge and also very much in terms of reviewing an act that has its origins in pre native title—it is a 1980s act. When originating, it was a primary reference point in terms of considering Aboriginal heritage. To see that act in the historical context, we now have the native title overlay and we have seen significant reform to the act in the last decade, but it is still in a rather in-between environment now that there is the overlay of native title and, indeed, 30 years of native title history. The two can be

better reconciled, and I look forward to the continuing work of the committee in relation to the heritage inquiry.

I also wish to highlight one person who has assisted the committee in giving evidence from Western Australia, the Attorney-General over there, John Quigley. He was kind to give evidence to the committee in relation to the Western Australian experience, which in the particular historical context of Western Australian legislation has led to reforms in relation to their trusts act. That evidence was of assistance to the committee, as was a great deal of other input. There are two parallel inquiries that are adverted to in the report. There have been important inputs into both of them and I look forward to seeing that work continue.

The member for Giles also mentioned the intent of the committee to visit, indeed plans to visit, the APY lands recently, but that has just not been possible this year. That is a source of regret. It is an important thing and I think the committee ought to be making sure that it is taking all reasonable steps it can to travel to the APY lands, in particular, and to other parts of the state. I look forward to the opportunity to do that. The more we can do to have a relevant relatable connection to, in many respects, remote parts of our state the better.

I note in that regard Peter Goers has been broadcasting from Umuwa these last days. From an ABC radio broadcasting point of view, highlighting that a popular source of reference for people throughout the state in the evenings is now coming to us from Umuwa I hope can bring all South Australians that bit closer to and more familiar with the territory in the APY lands. I called in briefly and extended greetings the other night. He was in the process of engaging with all sorts of aspects of day-to-day life on the APY, and I indicated that regretfully the committee has not been able to get there as we had planned to earlier this year.

Finally, I share with the member for Giles in extending my thanks to Lisa Baxter for her service to the committee. It is not overstating to highlight just how skilled and dedicated Lisa Baxter has been to the committee. She is a tremendous asset to the committee. I for one sincerely trust that we will be able to continue to secure Lisa Baxter's services to the committee for a long time to come. I share with the member for Giles, and I am sure all of us, in extending our condolences to Lisa and to her family on the recent passing of her father. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NOARLUNGA STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE UNIT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:18): I move:

That the eighth report of the committee, entitled Noarlunga State Emergency Service Unit, be noted.

The South Australian State Emergency Service, also known as the SES, is an emergency assistance and rescue organisation, which I am sure is well known to many members. It provides emergency assistance to the people of South Australia 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Its mission is to minimise injury, loss of life and damage from natural disasters and other emergencies. The service relies on the dedicated work of 1,600 volunteers and a team of full-time staff based in 73 units across the state.

The Noarlunga unit services one of the largest response areas in the southern metropolitan region. The area is a mix of public housing, private residential developments, large commercial developments and agricultural land. The SES leases its current Noarlunga facility from the City of Onkaparinga. However, that facility has reached the end of its asset life and no longer meets the needs of the emergency service.

To address this problem, the SES procured a new site in 2020 with the aim of constructing a purpose-built operations unit. The site was strategically selected to provide better access to the greater Noarlunga area. It also allows construction on land owned by the state government, providing great operational certainty going forward. The planned facility will consist of an operations unit, an appliance building and a trailer shed. The operations unit will include a 105 square metre training room, which can function as a major incident control centre during emergencies.

The overall design has incorporated important environmental initiatives, such as water storage tanks, recycling systems, solar power and recycled building materials. A key aim of these

works is to create much-needed space for rescue appliances, vehicle access and staff training. The proposed facility will ensure that the SES has the resources it needs to protect the residential, commercial and industrial assets in the southern suburbs well into the future.

Construction is scheduled to commence in January 2023, with completion approximately eight months later. The capital cost is estimated at \$5.25 million. It has been affirmed by the SES that the Department of Treasury and Finance has been appropriately consulted and that the proper advice with respect to legal, financial and procedural matters has been sought. The committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Noarlunga State Emergency Service Unit. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were:

- Mrs Kristy Phelps, General Manager of the SA State Emergency Service;
- Ms Shannon Barry, a graduate officer with the SA State Emergency Service;
- Mr James Bucella, Building Project Officer, SA State Emergency Service;
- Mr James McDonald, Manager, Project Management, Department for Infrastructure and Transport;
- Mr Justin Tullet, Project Manager, Construction Adviser, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

I thank the witnesses for their time in presenting the project to the committee. Based upon the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:22): I rise to support this report into the new Noarlunga State Emergency Service Unit at Lonsdale. This is a much-needed facility servicing the southern area of our state and is located obviously just to the southern part of metropolitan Adelaide. The response area is approximately 400 square kilometres, and there is a large mix of public housing, private residential developments, large commercial developments and some agricultural land.

The SES at Noarlunga has its existing facility, which is leased from the City of Onkaparinga, and the SES has made a point that this facility has reached the end of its asset life, its operational life, and that it no longer meets the needs of that broader community of the southern metropolitan area and the surrounding community. It is to be noted that during the Marshall Liberal government's term in office, in 2020 the new site was procured with the aim of constructing a new purpose-built service unit, which will be located at Lindsay Road, Lonsdale.

This 5,000 square metres site will allow the construction of a modern facility on land owned by the state government, providing greater operational certainty moving forward. The site is strategically located, with vehicle access to Sheriffs Road and the Southern Expressway, providing crucial and direct access to the greater Noarlunga area. The overall aim of the facility is to provide sufficient space for training and operational crew and rescue appliances, as well as improved access. The building will provide appropriate training and operational facilities, along with off-street car parking for SES staff and visitors, and it will comprise an operations unit, an appliance building and a trailer shed.

In regard to the facilities that the operations building will cover, there will be the 105 square metre training room, which can function as a major incident control centre during a major emergency or multiple emergencies. It has three offices; an operations room; a storeroom; a kitchen; and male, female and accessible bathrooms.

The actual appliance building will comprise five engine bays with acrylic panel-lift doors and battery backup to accommodate SES appliances. There will be male and female change rooms, an accessible bathroom, a laundry area with trough, and the trailer shed will comprise three trailer bays. The design will facilitate the construction of an operational SES unit that is durable, and it will have an operational life of at least 40 years, with an expected site presence of 100 years—so this is building into the future. The design of the whole facility was developed with the aim of ensuring that the operational requirements of the SES were achieved.

In regard to the operations building, it is a single-storey design of steel frame, masonry wall construction, with external steel cladding above and a skillion roof with pre-finished Colorbond sheeting. The glazed areas will be protected from the sun by extensive roof overhangs. It will certainly meet the design requirements of level 3.

The appliance building is a single-storey design of structural steel framing, external steel cladding and a skillion roof, with a combination of pre-finished Colorbond sheeting and translucent polycarbonate to allow natural light to penetrate. The building will obviously have five glazed panel-lift doors, which will maintain a brand of presence in the community and the SES. That building has been designed to meet importance level 4 requirements.

In regard to the trailer shed, it is a single-storey design of structural steel framing, external steel cladding and a skillion roof, with a combination of pre-finished Colorbond sheeting and translucent polycarbonate, again to allow natural light to penetrate. It will have three glazed panel-lift doors. It has been designed to meet the importance level 4 requirements.

As I indicated before, it will have access off different roads in the area. There will be two access points off Lindsay Road. Staff and visitors will be able to enter and exit from controlled access points on the northern and southern side of the site. Emergency vehicles returning to the site will enter from the northern access point and exit from the southern access point. It is noted that the appropriate landscaping will take place.

It is also noted that this build will be around \$5 million. It is to be commended to support not just volunteers in the Noarlunga area but the 1,600 plus volunteers the SES has in this state. It was very pleasing recently to be at Strathalbyn, in my electorate, with the Minister for Emergency Services opening the new \$2.65 million facility there that was instigated under us as the Marshall Liberal government. It is very pleasing to see that support in the southern regional area of our state.

These facilities continue to be improved over time. We need to make sure we keep our community safe in all aspects of emergencies that can happen. The SES have a range of call-outs they deal with, whether it be through storm damage, trees down or crash rescue. Obviously, at Murray Bridge we have river rescue, and a new boat, the *Mulyawonk*, was launched last year. They are looking after what will be happening with high river flows and looking after communities, providing sandbag access to people in river communities right up and down the length of the river in South Australia.

I fully commend this public works build and, as I said, this will make life for our volunteers easier and take this site into the future for up to the next 100 years.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (11:30): I rise in support of this report from the Public Works Committee. I thank the member for Florey and the member for Hammond for their contributions and note their support for this excellent project.

Not to add too much more on the specific design and structural details, as the member for Hammond has succinctly done, I just do want to take this opportunity to note the extraordinary work that our SES volunteers are doing. They do it every single day. As we speak, they are preparing our communities in the Riverland and Murraylands regions for the significant flows that we will be seeing coming through our state through the River Murray leading into December.

I also want to thank the families of volunteers. The families of volunteers are often not thanked publicly, but the families of our volunteers are there when the pager goes off on the weekends. They are there at home when our volunteers are attending training nights to ensure that their capability is maintained and uplifted. They are there when the storms are occurring at 2 o'clock in the morning and our amazing volunteers are paged to respond to our community at a moment's notice. So I say thank you to the families of volunteers, I want to say thank you to the SES and CFS volunteers and rescue volunteers who keep our community safe every single day.

This is a significant capability uplift for our southern suburbs. This new facility in Lonsdale to support the Noarlunga SES unit will be a very substantial investment in that growing community. It will also be a station and a facility that will futureproof and support significant events, significant

emergencies and, in the event of significant disasters, it will support operations being based out of that station.

So I thank those volunteers who give so much of themselves every single day, I thank their families for supporting them to do the amazing work they do, and I commend this new station to the amazing volunteers in the Noarlunga SES and congratulate them on their work in bringing this before the Public Works Committee. I look forward to this breaking earth and being delivered for our community in the south very soon.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:33): I rise to support the motion. I very much appreciate the contribution we have heard just now from the minister insofar as he took the opportunity to thank those volunteers and dedicated staff of the SES statewide. Indeed, that is appropriate, and it would be a rare event that during a sitting week in this parliament we would not have occasion to refer to particular responses, and this week and this season are no exception. The works completed to the Noarlunga SES unit will be well applied. As the member for Hammond has said, it will stand that unit in good stead for a long time to come.

I share with the member for Hammond in also highlighting the important work that has recently been completed at the SES station at Strathalbyn. Similarly, it will set that unit up for the long-term future. It was also a long time coming. I think it reflects that where there is a commitment by volunteers in local areas throughout the state, where we can provide decent facilities, decent appliances and the means by which to apply voluntary effort, we can do so in such a productive way with the resources of the state.

Having adverted to Strathalbyn and the current activity of the SES, it would be remiss of me not to take the opportunity to recognise the recent work of the SES right at the heart of Heysen in responding to what was really a very unusual yet acute set of circumstances in recent weeks, when it was found that, with all this wonderful abundant rain we have been having through the spring, a dam above the town of Echunga was not only full of water but showing signs of the overburden having moved. Concern was raised by a responsible, aware and alert landowner to the potential for concern.

When we look at the range of different possible responses to address that concern, it was the SES that came to the rescue, assisted, it should be said, by the CFS and members of community. However, the SES took the lead in circumstances where residents needed to leave their homes overnight and there was a need to provide for people who were staying out of harm's way to be ready should the worst happen. It was very impressive to see the calm, diligent and thoroughgoing way in which the SES set up their central office. They based themselves at the Echunga CFS over that period of days. The way in which the community swung in behind to assist the SES, the CFS, SAPOL and other agencies was really tremendous to see.

There it was: the SES taking a central role. They can do so all the more with good facilities that are renewed and provide a home base for training and for engagement for the attraction of volunteers. Wherever we have the opportunity to improve these facilities, we should do so. I am glad to see that the Noarlunga SES unit will be one such unit as a result of these important works. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (11:38): I commend the motion and the work of the Public Works Committee in investigating the proposed works at the Noarlunga SES. I want to make some brief comments as one of the local members who has spent some time visiting the current SES facility and unit. It is an incredible unit that does great work in our southern suburbs community. However, it is very clear that the facilities the unit has are significantly out of date. I have been there a few times, including at one of their 24-hour training drills, when the member for Reynell and I visited and saw their work very late at night.

They have a great range of different training equipment and apparatus there, but they are operating out of some very old facilities, including a number of transportable buildings that are not fit for purpose. To give this great unit decent facilities to enable them to respond to the community is very much welcome. In particular, I would like to thank them for all the work they do in responding to calls from the community. Often that is work in terms of storm damage and the like, and often it can be as part of a broader emergency services response to bushfires, etc.

One significant response that will always be very important to my community was an event a number of years ago, when flooding happened at Old Noarlunga and the SES responded incredibly well to help evacuate people from their homes, help prevent further damage, sandbag the area and also help with the clean-up for residents afterwards. Whenever people in our community need help, those SES volunteers are always there, and it is only fitting that we should make sure they have appropriate facilities for them to do their work.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:40): I also rise to support the motion and commend the new station and the report of the Public Works Committee to the house. My electorate of Davenport is based down in the south. It is not super close to the Noarlunga station, but I am quite familiar with the Noarlunga SES team from my former role as Mayor of the City of Onkaparinga. I have visited the Lonsdale station quite a few times and, as we have just heard from the member for Kaurana, it is definitely in need of an upgrade.

I remember being there on one of their training nights when it was pouring with rain. Rain was coming inside, and they were all struggling to work in those conditions. They showed me around some of the different areas of the site where they run their training sessions. The work they are doing down there is quite incredible, and it is actually quite terrifying to see some of the processes they go through when they are training to prepare them for the work they do.

They had a big pile of concrete, bricks, logs and things they had to climb through, and I saw what it was like when they rescue people in those situations. The work those volunteers do is pretty outstanding. I think there are about 60 or so volunteers at the Noarlunga site, and I know that they are extremely dedicated.

Very much like the CFS, it is a life decision when they become a volunteer. I know that quite a few of them make decisions around their lives—for example, where they are going to live must be within a two minute drive from the station so that when their pagers go off they can be there in time to get out there, save the world and protect people. We are very grateful for the work that our SES volunteers do.

We just heard from one of the other members that there are about 1,600 volunteers across our state at 73 different units, and they do all sorts of helpful work when we have storms, floods or bushfire. When there are major fires, they are always out helping the CFS. I know that they also work with our police units to assist with traffic issues. They are always there to help and they are always there on call. They are absolute heroes.

As we heard from our emergency services minister, it is also the families we need to thank. These heroes, these volunteers, always put their community first when that pager goes off. They will drop everything and get out there to look after our community and protect not only our people but also our properties. Some of the stories our volunteers have shared with me when I have visited their centres are quite incredible. It is really tough work that they do, and some of the things they see in their line of duty impact them forever. We just cannot explain enough how grateful we are for the commitment they provide to us.

I think it is Wednesday nights they have training at Lonsdale, so rain, hail or shine they will be there looking out for each other and training each other up. There are some really young kids who have volunteered there, all the way through to people who are well past retirement. I think we are just so grateful to have people like these in our community who are prepared to put their own lives on the line to save our lives.

The site there is quite dilapidated. I know they have very small locker space and change rooms, which means they cannot have men and women changing at the same time, so they have all sorts of timetables to share the facilities. This new site will allow them to grow their team and be able to deliver more of the great services they have been delivering for many years at that site. I would like to thank the Public Works Committee for their consideration of this extremely important asset. I know that all the southern communities will be very grateful to see this new site go up and the Noarlunga SES able to continue doing the good work they do.

The south has not been without its emergencies. It was not that long ago that there was some significant flooding at Port Noarlunga, which I am sure the member for Kaurana remembers

well. The SES were there doing a lot of sandbagging, working with the council and other volunteer groups to make sure our communities were protected from those floods. It was only a year or two ago that there were some significant bushfires in the Cherry Gardens area, and they were there helping out the CFS as well.

On behalf of the southern community, I would like to thank the Public Works Committee for their consideration, and we look forward to seeing the new station built soon. I commend this report to the house.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:45): I rise also to make a brief contribution to this Public Works Committee report. It is commendable in all the ways that members have already spoken about and, as we have seen, it has been long needed down there. Obviously, as well as being a flood-prone area, it is an area of growing population. Anything that we can do to assist the SES in those peri-urban areas, particularly, when they are called upon to do all sorts of work, including flood mitigation, is to be commended.

Over the last four years, I have been lucky enough to see many SES stations and see firsthand the challenges the SES face. Obviously, they are a large group of volunteers, and I will get to that in a minute. Any large state-funded organisation has its challenges in maintaining viable workspaces. I will not name them for the purposes of this debate, but there are stations out there, in the regions particularly, that do need urgent attention.

However, as I said, it is a very difficult task for governments of any stripe to adequately address all those funding needs in one go. I trust that the current government—and, to be fair, the previous government, too, were fairly committed to this project as well, which is a big project—make sure that they are adequately funded and do the job they need to do.

I do quickly want to add my voice to the ministers' observations about the volunteers and their families. These people go above and beyond what most of us here would do. They are available 24 hours a day, every single day of the year, and they are there for no other reason—not for self-glorification, certainly not for money—than their love and their commitment to their communities. I want to add my voice to that of the rest of the members of this house to commend not only the work of the SES and the work they do every day and, of course, the work they are now doing in the Riverland and the Murraylands and so on with the pending problems they will have with the flows coming down the Murray, but also those members who take the time to go interstate.

I recently spent some time in country Victoria, and I know that they are crying out for help in terms of the volunteers they need to address the significant rains and flooding they have had there. I just want to thank the SES, particularly those who do take the time to go interstate and outside their own regions to help their fellow SES volunteers. I commend the report to the house.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:48): I would like to speak in support of this report and recommendation from the Public Works Committee, in terms of upgrading facilities for the SES in the southern suburbs. My view would be that any upgrading of facilities for our emergency services, particularly for those that are volunteer based, is worthy of our support and also worthy of our support in our community.

All our emergency services, whether they are paid workers or volunteers, play an increasingly important role in our community, whether it is the CFS, the MFS or the SES, and there are a whole range of other allied emergency services as well. The reality is their role is increasing in terms of the community's safety, given the climate change environment we live in today. The reality is that, with the extremes of weather we are now experiencing, we are going to be calling more and more on our emergency services to actually keep our communities safe.

Some things we can do better and therefore perhaps we will not need their services, but in some situations we are not going to be able to retrofit our urban footprint or retrofit a whole range of things, so our volunteers will be required to do a lot of emergency work in terms of rescue, protecting life and also protecting property.

For the short period of time I was the emergency services minister and involved in emergency services in this state, I was fortunate to visit a number of SES units across the state, both in the metro

area and the country regions. In the general community, I think they are one of the services perhaps not fully understood in terms of the scope of work they perform in our community.

They do more than just sandbagging or removing trees and branches off roofs, etc. They do quite a bit of rescue work in association with the marine rescue wing of their service. I know there is always a call for additional resources along the south coast, along the Limestone Coast, for the rescue work they do there because the water is a bit rougher. When I visited some units in the country areas I was pleasantly surprised at the scope of work they do in terms of rescue work. They actually go up and down cliff faces, etc., rescuing people.

There is always a greater need for volunteers. Like all volunteer-based organisations, the SES and the CFS were hit by COVID in terms of people not being able to participate as volunteers. More importantly, and this is generally true right across the volunteer sector, some people have not returned to volunteering work. Both as a government and as a parliament, we need to work out why this is the case and what we need to do to remove barriers to people participating in voluntary work.

My view is that voluntary work is very important not only from a cost-saving perspective but also in terms of what volunteers do, whether that is in the SES, the CFS or volunteers in a whole range of other fields. Volunteers help build communities and build connections and that is very important. They also build a skill base in communities; they build leadership skills. People who take on leadership roles within the SES or the CFS actually build leadership skills that are transferrable to other parts of the community and can be brought into their work life.

It is increasingly tougher for volunteers. A lot of volunteers who may also work full time will find it harder to find the time to put into volunteer work if they are raising families. Having said that, I reaffirm that we as a government and as a parliament need to work out what we need to do to assist volunteers. One of the biggest complaints I get from people who want to volunteer is some of the bureaucracy behind just trying to volunteer, how difficult it is to volunteer, all the paperwork you have to do and all the record keeping you have to do, etc. Some of it makes sense, but some of it may be counterproductive and a negative in terms of our community.

When we were in opposition, I was very pleased to commit to investing in an SES unit in my electorate. I know that people in the Liberal Party have derided those election commitments. I can assure you it is one of the election commitments that has been publicly aired in my community. People know exactly where it is going, people know exactly how much it is going to cost and people do actually support it.

In fact, one of my local newspapers, *The Bunyip*, has all the election commitments my party made at election time. Just before the election, I was on page 3 and after the election they said, 'Okay, Piccolo, we are going to check every one you deliver.' I can assure you we will be delivering, despite the Liberal Party warning us not to commit to those commitments. Building an SES unit in Gawler is one of those commitments. Despite the fact that the Liberal Party want us to break those promises and not support the commitments we made, I think it is important that we do maintain those commitments.

Mr Teague interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen is called to order. There is a point of order being raised by one of his colleagues, which I will hear under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I have been reading the Public Works Committee report closely and I am struggling to identify the relevance of anything the member for Light is saying to it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light was reflecting, as I understand it, in general terms on the government's policy including in relation to emergency services in his own electorate and other government policy. I will listen carefully. It has been the practice of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members! It has been the practice of the house to allow members some latitude in debates of this type.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Light! The member for Heysen and the minister will cease their exchange. Order!

The Hon. J.K. Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is called to order.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: He is undermining you, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light has the call.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey! Member for Cheltenham, if you have a matter to raise in relation to the conduct of the member for Heysen, you can raise it as a point of order.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am glad that I am able to light up the debate this morning.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light has the call.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: My day job has been a dad, so dad jokes come with that. Coming back to the SES unit, which has been promised and will be delivered by the government, it was one of about \$16 million worth of commitments which my party made leading up to the election and which we will be delivering on 100 per cent. I can assure you that my local councils are very impressed with the commitments we have made. They probably wanted more but we can only do so much.

One of the commitments we made is the Gawler-Willaston SES unit. This is a project for which I clearly lobbied within my party to get the funding but, more importantly, I would like to acknowledge John Lawrence, who is an SES officer previously with the Salisbury unit, who lobbied quite strongly and has been campaigning for some time for us to get the SES unit built in the Gawler area.

The new SES unit or facility in the southern suburbs is very important. I can tell you that the one at the other end of the metropolitan area in the north is important. My electorate is currently covered by two SES units. When I say 'covered', they are not actually located in that area. We have the Salisbury unit, which do good work and also the Kapunda unit, which also do good work. The Kapunda unit—I must get this right—also have horse unit, a horse service within their unit too.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr Brown: What are the names of the horses?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The names of the horses? If they were named after me, they would be thoroughbreds, wouldn't they? Or the Italian Stallion.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The interjections warranted that comment, I think. I will get back on the horse. Those two units do serve our area, but they are spread thin, and that is the importance of this new Gawler unit. I would also like to acknowledge the minister who came out to Gawler recently to make the official announcement on behalf the government that the unit would be proceeding and that work on that unit will be commencing early next year. I can assure you it is fully supported by those other two units there; they were present at the announcement and they think it is important as well. It was also supported by the CFS because all emergency services work together in partnership to make our community safer.

For me, it is always good news when I hear money is being put into our emergency services, particularly like the SES unit here. I must for the record mention I will be joining the SES unit in my Gawler-Willaston unit. I am not sure how useful I will be. I might be behind pushing the pens and doing some admin work; I am not sure how much physical work I could do.

The Hon. J.K. Szakacs: Orange is your colour.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Orange is my colour, thank you, minister. Orange is the new black, isn't it? I support the recommendation and the committee's work.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:59): I want to thank members for their fulsome contributions to this debate on this particular report. I particularly want to thank the contribution from the member for Hammond—a characteristically fulsome appreciation of the contents of the report—and it is good to see bipartisan support of projects of this type.

I would also like to thank the Minister for Emergency Services for his contribution. I know he has always been a big supporter of the SES and continues to do a great job, in my opinion, as Minister for Emergency Services. I would like to thank the member for Heysen for his contribution. I know he is a very passionate supporter of the SES in his local area.

I would like to thank the Minister for Health for what he had to say. In particular, I know that Noarlunga is an area he has a very keen eye on to make sure they get the services they require. I would also like to thank the members for Davenport, Elizabeth and Light for their contributions. With that very brief summing up of the contributions of various members, I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

Bills

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November 2022.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:01): The situation that we faced last evening was an offer from those of us present to do all we could to take up our shovels and rush on down to the railyard, such was the urgency with which this debate was brought on yesterday via a suspension of standing orders immediately following the bill having been jammed through the Legislative Council.

We are finding that the government is finding itself in the invidious position of having to justify to the people of the state of South Australia why it is in such urgent haste to see this bill through the house, and why it is willing to treat the House of Assembly in its public pronouncements about this bill as easily characterised as no more than a rubber stamp is all really quite concerning. I am sure that the people of South Australia will form that view in relation to the way in which the government is going about this.

The opposition has been at pains to stress throughout the course of this debate its support for the building of the Women's and Children's Hospital. We want to see it done. What we are concerned about is this hasty and really very dramatic change of location, an extraordinary blowout in the cost that is projected for the construction of this building a decade from now and the blowout in the time that is required, to which I have just adverted.

We see that there is a project the government wishes to proceed with—there is a new way of going about it the government has just announced in recent days—but this is an extraordinary, expensive project becoming evermore expensive by the hour, taking a very long time indeed and affecting not only the future of health in this state but very significant aspects of heritage and the Parklands, all of which deserve at least the respect of proper scrutiny.

I am not going to go ahead and foreshadow the attitude of the government in the course of this debate, but I hope that I can be that persuasive. I hope that I can be that persuasive to bring the government to see that in order to chart a course in this state that will have such dramatic ramifications for the present and future generations, let alone an appreciation of our colonial and Indigenous history, this house should afford the members of this place and the community of South Australia the opportunity properly to consider what is going on.

What we have before us is a short bill, which has been described by numerous contributors to the debate already as one that is unprecedented and extraordinary in the territory it covers. It is a bill that runs to only 10 pages, one of which is a full-page of what I would describe—and I think I do service to this—as a mud map. It is no more than that.

The schedule to this bill sets out the project site and support zones in such broad-based terms that one would struggle to get beyond the geographical location of some distant-scale image, let alone be able to navigate the particulars. That is because the nature of this bill is to confer upon an individual minister extraordinary power to make future decisions, including the transfer of parkland to the minister in fee simple, including the destruction of State Heritage Places at the minister's discretion, and including provision for the relocation of South Australia Police facilities and the police horses to an area of the Parklands. I will come back to that in a moment.

What I want to focus on just for the moment is that the other extraordinary part of this conferral on the minister of powers is that the only minister who is even designated in this bill is the poor old minister responsible for the Police Act who is designated in part 5—Miscellaneous. That is extraordinary: it is headed Miscellaneous and dropped in at the back of this bill. The police minister is identified as the relevant minister on whom is conferred the capacity to acquire Parklands in fee simple to accommodate the police horses on their move.

Let's make no mistake about this. Let's just be steady and stepwise about what is going on. When the former government made plans to build the Women's and Children's Hospital, it designated—and I know because I signed off on it, and contrary to the Minister for Planning's mischaracterisation on 28 September in this house—the barracks in the health zone with a specific overlay for the sensitive re-use of those barracks within the health precinct. So I encourage members of the South Australian community and all members of this place to look carefully at the contribution of the Minister for Planning on 28 September, mischaracterising as he did the nature of that planning decision.

Re-use of heritage places is the gold standard—we know that, it happens all the time. Re-use is what was contemplated on the eventual move by police by the previous government. It is very important that we are accurate about this in the debate. The Minister for Planning was not and has not been in so characterising the nature of what was to be done under the previous government.

The next best in terms of preservation of heritage assets is to faithfully maintain in a move where practicable. We know that because the Burra Charter says so; the state Heritage Council has considered these possibilities. We know that those 10 police barracks buildings located at that site, the subject of state heritage, have already been the subject of an expression of concern by the state Heritage Council to the Deputy Premier in its letter of 13 October. There will be an opportunity to traverse that ground in the course of this debate.

What has been jammed into this house for urgent passage involves a combination of unprecedented shocks: a conferral upon a minister of the power to order the demolition, to order the acquisition of parkland and, by the way, to another minister (presumably another minister; I will get to that in a minute), to order the relocation of the horses, take on Parklands. I want to be clear about this re-use. We have known for some time that the police have contemplated a move. That was not part of the previous planning decision.

In fact, so distant was it that the previous government did not allocate any resources to the contemplation of any such move. It was not imminent; it was not associated with previous government's planning decision to see the move of those police horses. Again, we will traverse it in the course of the debate. It should be traversed in the course of a proper committee of inquiry upon an adjourned debate. We will do our best, given the constrained circumstances the government has forced on us.

Perhaps what is most startling about this most invidious set of circumstances the government now finds itself in is that, never mind their presence or otherwise in the chamber, the Deputy Premier, the minister for heritage, and the Minister for Planning, who splashed around in this space briefly in mischaracterising the debate on 28 September and has not been heard from since in this regard—neither of them are carrying the debate on what is a planning bill. Neither of them are around. What we do not know is whether or not either of them will be the minister for the purposes of this act, the

minister who is referred to in nearly every paragraph of this short act: the minister's conferred power to take over land, the minister's conferred power to make a planning amendment.

The minister will now be the master of the Parklands, to the extent that may be necessary. To the extent that there is an ordinary planning process that might be involved in this space, it actually will not be all that much because the minister will be taking that on too. I do not know, but from the fact that the Minister for Health happens to be here leading the debate from the government's point of view, one might be forgiven for suspecting that the minister might be guess who? The minister for all these purposes might all of a sudden be guess who? The Minister for Health.

So the Minister for Health all of a sudden is going to be the minister for heritage, the Minister for Planning and the Attorney-General to relevant extents because this act as well confers power on said minister or ministers—there is a paragraph for each one; it could be any number of them—to amend any necessary legislation that might be felt necessary to achieve all these ends. Well may we say, 'All the way forward for the Women's and Children's Hospital,' because it seems that nothing is going to save the Parklands or those heritage buildings that for the time being are standing in their way'.

In the short time that I have remaining in my second reading contribution, I just want to advert to one other particular matter that I expect will be interrogated in the course of the committee stage of this bill if in no other way, and that is the curious set of circumstances in which part 5 of this bill has come about. Part 5 we will remember is headed Miscellaneous and contains clauses 10, 11, 12, 13, 14—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: —breathtakingly so—in relation to the relocation of certain SA Police facilities, the horses. What we saw, let's remember, on the announcement of this new plan, this startling new plan from the government, was that hand in hand with it came a provision of \$2 million, as I recall, for SA Police to go about a search, imminent now as it is this necessary move.

Alright, so far so consequent on the plan to demolish the heritage buildings. So \$2 million, and we heard from the commissioner in commenting on this, 'Yes, it is something that is a job of work. It is good to have the resources to do it,' and I think he described a five-kilometre geosearch in terms of being close enough to the CBD to make the important work of the police horses in the city feasible.

He talked about all kinds of possibilities that might be looked at with that \$2 million, but no mention was made by the government—and I presume the reason there is no mention from the commissioner is that he is not aware either—that along down the track is going to come part 5, Miscellaneous, of this bill, which is suddenly going to say, 'Oh, well, don't worry. You can jam your police horses into the Parklands,' and take them over to the extent that the Minister for Police thinks might be a good idea to acquire in fee simple. That will all be explored in the committee. It is an outrageous process and it is no way to treat the people of South Australia.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:17): I rise to briefly speak in support of this bill. I just remind members what this bill is about. I think it is very important to remind ourselves what this is about. What is the bill for? It is called the New Women's and Children's Hospital Bill 2022.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Acting Speaker, I gave the member for Heysen and other members the due respect of listening to them. I did not agree with them, but I listened to them. I wish they would grant me the same courtesy.

The bill is for an act to facilitate the development of the new Women's and Children's Hospital and for other purposes, and that is why this bill is before us. It is appropriate for the Minister for Health to have carriage of this bill because, in the end, it is a facility he will be responsible for. It is about building the hospital, it is about building a world-class hospital and it is about building the right hospital in the right place.

That is what the Liberal Party cannot cope with, because the community accepts building the right hospital in the right place is the right decision. This is building a hospital for the future. That is

the difference between what the Liberal Party wants to impose on the South Australian community—a substandard project. They are not my words, they are the words from a lot of people in the Liberal Party, too, and they are the words of most people in the medical profession.

The Liberal Party has said that they are opposed to this basically because their proposal was better. Actually, I have not heard anybody in the public domain say that it was better. With due respect, you have actually said that you were shovel ready to build it. Perhaps you were ready for the lawnmowers to cut some grass. I am not sure about the shovels.

The Hon. C.J. Picton: No shovels.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No shovels, just a bit of mowing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, so it is interesting to see that they are critical of what we are proposing—because what we are going to provide is a world-class proposal. When you look at the people who are critical of this, who is critical of this? The Liberal Party have been critical of it, essentially, and there are some people who are critical not so much of the hospital but of its location. I acknowledge that, and we will come to the heritage issues in a minute because there is nothing like a born-again heritage advocate.

During the last government, if there was one government that did a lot to trash heritage in this stage, it was the Liberal government. Those members who sit here now claiming to be advocates for heritage sat there saying nothing—absolutely nothing. Their silence was deafening.

Mr Telfer: You have gone the other way.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No, I haven't, not at all. I have been quite consistent. The member for Flinders interrupts, and he was actually the President of the LGA at the time, if I remember correctly. Quite rightly, on behalf of the LGA he expressed concerns about what the Liberal government was doing with the Planning and Design Code in terms of heritage in this state. I will come to that because it is very important.

The other criticism is that this bill has been rushed. On the one hand, the Liberal Party are telling us they were shovel ready; now they want us to delay this project. You cannot have it both ways. It is quite clear that the proposal by this government is supported by more people in the community than their proposal. It is as simple as that. They are trying to find some weasel words to actually withdraw from what was really a substandard proposal they had put before the election. Well, the election made it quite clear. We went to an election committing our government to a world-class Women's and Children's Hospital, and that is what we will deliver.

What this bill does—and why it is very important that we are debating this bill today—is it makes sure we have certainty about the direction the government is taking with the hospital. It is important that all the relevant government agencies, and the industry who are going to build it, know what we are about to do. This bill is the foundation for this hospital, in the sense that it enables us to actually start the work on it and, importantly, to deliver on that promise.

I acknowledge, as other speakers have, that there are people who are critical of the location and the impact it will have. This is something the government will have to address. Certainly, the government has to do some work to rebuild, in some elements, our credentials in terms of heritage. I am sure we will do that. I note that the Minister for Planning has already started doing some work in improving that.

I come to heritage because when the previous minister—not the previous minister but the minister before him, who was then the member for Schubert—the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure introduced the Planning and Design Code, one thing the code did was trash conservation zones and local heritage listings in this state. It basically removed all protections for those things in this state. It is interesting that the members who are now pro heritage said nothing at the time. Not one of them stood up in this place and expressed concern.

It was under political pressure that the new Minister for Planning, the member for Bragg, because probably a lot of her electorate were against it as well—the then membership for Bragg, I

should say, as that has changed as well since then. What that decision enforced was to force councils to spend much-needed funding to get all these local places revisited in terms of their local heritage. My own council spent \$200,000 of important ratepayer money on something that should not have happened.

In the end, they did back off, but that was only under political pressure from both the opposition of the day and a number of alliances and community organisations that campaigned strongly against it. It fell on deaf ears within the Liberal Party for a long time, how we would decimate the heritage of a number of streets and locations throughout the state. Particularly in the electorate of Adelaide, there were a whole range of campaign groups who were concerned about the way the Liberal Party, the Liberal government of the day, were going to trash whole elements of landscape.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We are. We are talking about heritage because that is what speakers talked about—heritage. I am talking about heritage, because it is important, and the credentials of the opposition on heritage. It is very important to talk about heritage because in the end governments have to weigh up the pros and cons of proposals and, at times, make decisions that are very difficult. In the end, we have made that decision.

As not only I but also members of the Liberal Party have said quite publicly, we have made the right decision. In fact, yesterday a letter from Michael Pratt was read out to this chamber. He made a bit of a 'Pratt' of the Liberal Party in terms of his commentary, didn't he? This is a person who has been a Liberal Party member—if not still a Liberal Party member—for many years; in fact, he was the federal Liberal member for Adelaide. He referred to the Liberal Party as 'hapless', if I remember correctly. That is where the Liberal Party stands today: nitpicking this bill for some minor thing, rather than saying, 'Come on board, we support this, the community supports it. This is a better proposal. Let's make it happen.'

As people have said, this government will be thanked for doing the right thing, making the right decision, making sure that we have a world-class hospital for women and children. Importantly, we are going to futureproof this building as well—both the RAH and the Women's and Children's should they need to be upgraded in the future. That is what the previous proposal by the Liberal Party prevented. It actually built a hospital for today but not for tomorrow, not for the next decade or the next generation. What do people in the community want? They want governments to make decisions that are futureproofed—and we are doing that.

It is important that governments plan, implement and build for the future and not for electoral cycles. Clearly, the Liberal Party's proposal for their Women's and Children's Hospital was an electoral cycle project. It was designed to get them across the line at the 2022 election and it did not. The community saw through that. That is why I am supporting this bill—because it facilitates a very important project, namely, the Women's and Children's Hospital to be built as soon as possible, as soon as practicable, and to be a world-class hospital.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (12:27): It is a great pleasure to sum up this debate. I particularly thank speakers for their contribution, particularly the member for Light, who I significantly agree with, and also the other members whose comments I significantly disagree with. This is a really important piece of legislation for the future of our state, to make sure that we have this hospital built on a site that provides land that is suitable and land that has the space available—this site has double the size of land compared with what was being looked at previously on the RAH west site—and to make sure that we can get that process started as soon as possible.

As has been talked about, this is a project that has been planned and proposed in South Australia for a very long time and, under successive governments, has not been able to get to the point of being developed. There were a number of comments from the other side that this was somehow ready to go and that shovels were poised, ready for deployment on that site. That is absolutely not true. There were very significant issues that had to be dealt with. It was absolutely completely incorrect, and it is absolutely a fallacy to say that there was any ability that shovels were going to be in the ground for a project that was still being worked on in terms of what the blocking

and stacking were going to be at the start of this year when we came to government with a number of clear issues that had been identified.

Part of the issue that fundamentally could not be solved on that RAH west site was how to fit services connected on the same level, how to fit the operating theatres and the intensive care services on the same level. This was an issue that had been raised over the successive nine years that this project had been talked about and it was under successive governments. The problem was that the land was just too small for that to happen.

When we came to government, we were briefed on the project. We were told that there had been more work on trying to find and eke out more space on that site. It was now going to encroach further on the Royal Adelaide Hospital—still not being able to fit all those services, but slightly better than had been proposed previously—and, by doing that, it added to the cost, added to the time frames and also added to the complexity and risk to the operations of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

It would have had to be built across the road that goes into the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital emergency department. This obviously had a number of substantive risks to the RAH. By being built closer to the RAH and the helipad on the RAH, it would have meant that the infrastructure that had to be put in place would have had to be much more highly strengthened, adding additional cost to the project as well. A number of these issues were still being worked through when we formed government in March, and we were still trying to find solutions to some of those intractable problems.

As I said in my second reading speech, we well could have just continued on that path and come up with an imperfect solution to those issues, blamed it on the last guys and been done with it. However, we decided that that was not the best outcome for the state for the future for a number of reasons. One is clearly the outcome in terms of the Women's and Children's Hospital and, secondly, the outcome in terms of the Royal Adelaide Hospital as well.

Depriving the RAH of its future expansion space is a critical risk for the future of healthcare delivery in this state because I think that it is clear that, at some stage—I am not sure if it is 10 years or 20 years or 40 years' time—the RAH will have to expand and provide additional space. If we took up that small pocket of land next to it, then that would have caused significant problems, so we went down this path.

I think it is worth noting that this was not something that came out of nowhere. This is an issue that has been raised repeatedly over the past few years, in terms of the limitations of that site, the lack of beds on the site, the concerns about the service offering that would be part of that new hospital and the concerns that despite the claims that have been made it would not be a truly world-class hospital.

As such, I want to thank a number of people who have worked hard behind the scenes to raise that in the public consciousness over the past few years and have also been key elements in terms of our decision to make sure that we take the hard decisions to put a hospital in place for the long term. I do want to thank Emeritus Professor Warren Jones and Dr John Svigos from the Women's and Children's Hospital Alliance, who have worked tirelessly in terms of promoting the need for improvement in services at the hospital, both at the current hospital and also at the future hospital.

They have been doing this tirelessly over the past few years. There have been times I know when both of them have felt: were they going to get anywhere, was this going to deliver an outcome? I think that they can now see that there is a very significant change that has come about because of their advocacy, because they have put their hand up on behalf of the clinicians in the hospital to raise these concerns, and that we are now going to deliver a bigger and better hospital.

A number of other people have been involved in that work as well. I want to thank Dr Steve Keeley, who has also raised a number of these concerns, as well as probably a number of other doctors who might not wish to be publicly named. I also thank Phil Palmer, who has recently joined the Women's and Children's Hospital Alliance, providing support to Warren and John in their efforts as well. Raising those concerns and putting them at the forefront has given us the understanding of the importance of making sure that we build that hospital for the long term and that we do not build a substandard hospital that is going to be full by the day it opens.

Further to that point, I want to thank Bernadette Mulholland and SASMOA. Bernadette has spent a lot of time over the past few years at the Women's and Children's Hospital, both in terms of the issues at the current hospital, in terms of its staffing arrangements—and that led to our policy formulation in relation to additional resources going into that hospital, which are now being deployed—and in terms of what the future of the Women's and Children's Hospital needs to be at the new site, the new hospital. Her advocacy has been strident on behalf of the medical staff particularly and I think the staff more broadly at the hospital in raising these concerns, so I want to thank Bernadette for her work as well.

I also want to thank SA-Best, in particular the Hon. Connie Bonaros for the work that she led through the health services committee of the other place. They held hearing after hearing focused on the Women's and Children's Hospital, focusing on issues in terms of staffing, issues in terms of culture and services and also issues in terms of the development of the new hospital. It is in no small part because of the efforts of Connie and that committee's work, and the evidence that it uncovered, that has led us to making these difficult decisions in terms of making sure that we have this hospital for the long term.

Obviously, as I have said in the parliament previously, I want to thank the crossbenchers in the other place, particularly Connie Bonaros MLC, Frank Pangallo MLC and Sarah Game MLC, who were supportive of this legislation in the other place and made sure that we could make it a reality by opposing a number of the amendments and delay tactics that were put up by both the Liberal Party and the Greens in the other place that would have led to us not having this debate in this chamber today.

I also want to thank so many of the doctors, clinicians, nurses and allied health staff and other officials who work in the Women's and Children's Hospital who have been working very hard on this project. I will single out Jodie Dodd and Laura Willington, who have been working very hard in terms of the development of the model and in particular the development of the model in relation to women's intensive care services at the hospital site, which has been very well received by staff across the hospital. I think we will deliver a much more beneficial outcome in terms of being able to provide those services for women and their babies in the same hospital and making sure that they can stay in the same hospital.

Lastly, I would like to thank the team who have worked on this, in particular, as I have mentioned previously, Jim Hallion, who was appointed to lead the work in looking at the site options. I really want to thank him for his work and for accepting the call-up to do this. I also thank Jim Birch for also being a significant part of that work on that team. He was also clearly part of the work previously in looking at sites. I thank them for the result of that work that has led us to where we are today.

I also thank Brendan Hewitt and the entire project team. They now have a big task ahead of them in getting this project and this hospital built—getting it done. We want to make sure this happens as quickly as possible but in the best way possible to deliver those improved health outcomes for future generations to come.

I commend the bill to the house. This is a significant day. While some suggested this was unprecedented, we did some research and there was a piece of legislation that this very house debated some 109 years earlier about this exact site; the parliament decided to put a police barracks on that site and now we are deciding to use that exact same site for a hospital. So this is a significant day. In a similar way, this will be a hospital that I have no doubt will last for a hundred years on that site, delivering excellent care for women, their babies and children of this state for many, many years to come.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STEALTHING AND CONSENT) BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PRIVATE PARKING AREAS (SHOPPING CENTRE PARKING AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

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

No. 1. Clause 3, page 2, lines 18 to 20 [Clause 3(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

No. 2. Clause 4, page 3, lines 23 to 25 [Clause 4, inserted section 13(1)]—

Delete 'chief executive officer of the council for the area in which the regulated shopping centre parking area is situated' and substitute 'Minister'

No. 3. Clause 4, page 3, lines 28 to 33 [Clause 4, inserted section 13(2) and (3)]—

Delete inserted subsections (2) and (3) and substitute:

- (2) An approval under subsection (1) may be granted subject to such conditions as the Minister thinks fit.
- (3) The Minister may add a condition to, or vary or revoke a condition of, an approval under subsection (1) by notice in writing to the owner of the regulated shopping centre parking area to which the approval relates.

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Mr TELFER: I note that Private Parking Areas (Shopping Centre Parking Areas) Amendment Bill 2022 is back in this place. The debate that was had a number of weeks ago on this bill is a good one to reflect on, because on this side of the house we were very forthright in trying to make sure that this was actually workable legislation. I do note there has been work done within the Legislative Council—and the amendments have since flowed back to us—and although there are only slight changes to the bill that was debated and discussed in this place, I do note that there have been some changes that had their original thought based in ours here in opposition.

In the negotiations to get that piece of legislation through the upper house, obviously these amendments have come into the Legislative Council and are now back to us to consider. The most significant one I note is the one to put the power back into the hands of the minister and to remove it from the chief executive officer, an amendment which was suggested on this side of the house and not accepted at the time but it has been discussed in the Legislative Council. Obviously, we have only just been provided with these amendments, and we are going to be looking at the opportunities for that, but I do think it is a step in the right direction for a piece of legislation that is flawed in its original iteration.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I will make some final remarks. It is true, as the honourable member points out, that we made some small adjustments which were promoted to us firstly by the Local Government Association—and I should acknowledge Mr Clinton Jury. The Local Government Association did have some issues with the construct of the bill. I did not always agree with some of those issues, but I was persuaded further by my friend in the other place Mr Robert Simms, who made some fairly passionate advocacy on behalf of local councils, and of course the member opposite also made similar views known to this chamber. We have listened to the parliament, to the LGA and to the people of South Australia, and I am happy to commend the amendments and the bill to the house.

Motion carried.

COURTS ADMINISTRATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL*Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

Mr TELFER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Telfer-1]—

Page 2, line 4—After 'Hospital' insert 'Development'

This is the first clause, and it is the title itself. As has already been aired in this place in some of the discussion, it is quite clear that this is a development bill; it is not a health bill. We think, to more appropriately reflect that, the insertion of the word 'Development' after the word 'Hospital' would be a better indication of the intent and content of this bill.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The government does not support this amendment as it would add no material benefit whatsoever.

Mr TEAGUE: I rise to support the amendment moved by the shadow minister. I might say, I am somewhat surprised by the government's aversion to accepting, at the very least, an amendment to the title that would provide some indication of what the bill is really about. I would hate to let down George Orwell by descending into cliché, which is the subject of some of his more important writing, but it is Orwellian. The title is something that might lead the reader to expect that they will find not a mud map of a broad area in which they are to find a demolition site and the acquisition of Parklands—

The Hon. C.J. Picton: And a hospital.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, and a hospital. That is at the back, the mud map. The reader, based on the title, will pick it up, look at the title and say, 'The New Women's and Children's Hospital Bill 2022—bit thin,' but on the back, 'Oh, here's a mud map. It doesn't look like a hospital. It's a bit hard to tell what it looks like. It looks like an aerial view of a site, and it looks like it might have some sort of planning and heritage consequences and might involve development. But if we look inside, well, this is going to tell us all about a hospital, and it's going to tell us maybe something about, if not the colours of the walls and the types of drapes and the wonderful machinery that's going to be found in the facility, the appropriation involved or the size of the structure, or the nature of the services that are going to be applied, or the powers of a health minister to do things that are related to health in it.'

That is as it is presently titled, but if it was amended even and only as much as what has been proposed to indicate that it is really about development—and I defer to the shadow minister in this regard—it would be tempting, and I am sure South Australians would be tempted, to provide some further words more properly to characterise what we are dealing with here, such as 'heritage', such as 'Parklands', such as 'police horses', and other words that might more accurately characterise what it is that South Australians are faced with.

But, no, the government opposes that. The government says, 'No, we're sticking with a bill that's titled New Women's and Children's Hospital Bill 2022, and we're sticking with an approach in the House of Assembly debate that is characterised by the Minister for Health having carriage of that bill.' So a nod to parochialism. The Minister for Health is here, and the Minister for Health is carrying the debate, so the Minister for Health wants to hang onto the title, but a most invidious a position it does indeed place the deputy—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: As the member for Schubert rightly points out, it is certainly the member for Adelaide. There will be much for the member for Adelaide to reflect upon, and I hope that the member for Adelaide might share a view in this regard in the course of the committee debate. The member for Adelaide had the opportunity in the second reading debate, and we have not heard from the member for Adelaide.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Point of order, sir.

The CHAIR: A point of order has been called.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think the member has strayed from the relevance of the amendments being discussed here.

The CHAIR: And I think that the member is actually reflecting on another member by mentioning that, so—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Excuse me. I know that members on the left think that they adjudicate this chamber, but they do not, not at this point. You may have to wait a while to do that, so I would ask the member—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: The former Premier joins us. It's nice to see you, sir.

Mr TEAGUE: Talk about reflecting on people's presence!

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Do you know how inappropriate that is?

Mr TEAGUE: Talk about reflecting on presence!

The CHAIR: Sorry?

Mr TEAGUE: How outrageous!

The CHAIR: You are not in your chair, so I should not recognise you at all.

Mr TEAGUE: We are in committee; we are in all sorts of chairs. How outrageous!

The CHAIR: Oh, please.

Mr TEAGUE: That is outrageous, Chair, with great respect.

The CHAIR: With great respect—

Mr TEAGUE: I will address the point of order.

The CHAIR: What is your point of order?

Mr TEAGUE: I will address the point of order raised by the member.

The CHAIR: The minister's point of order was whether you were going way beyond what was required. I agree with him. I am upholding the point of order.

Mr TEAGUE: On the point of order, Chair—

Mrs Hurn: You should apologise. That's disgraceful

The CHAIR: The member for Schubert will apologise to me immediately or leave the chamber. You will apologise or leave the chamber for showing disrespect to the Chair.

Mrs HURN: I will apologise if you could elaborate what I am apologising for.

The CHAIR: For showing disrespect to the Chair. There is a formal way if you wish to dissent from my rulings and my comments. I am more than happy for you to do that. You chose not do it the proper way. You either apologise for the interjection or you will leave the chamber.

Mrs HURN: I apologise.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I accept it.

Mrs Hurn: Disgraceful.

The CHAIR: Member for Schubert, do you wish to repeat what you just said?

Mrs HURN: I am commenting to colleagues.

The CHAIR: Member for Dunstan, you wish to be heard?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, I do. I would like you to reflect, sir, on your comments to this chamber only a few moments ago, and maybe elaborate as to why you made them—or maybe choose to withdraw them.

The CHAIR: It was quite simply that it was good to see you in the chamber. There was no—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: I am sorry, if you want to misinterpret what I said, that is fine. You are entitled to. If there is some reason you think I should convey more to that than I had intended—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Hold on, let me finish.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, sir, I would, because is it normal for you to recognise everybody and say it is good for everybody to be in the chamber? What were you specifically heading towards? You have to uphold the way that this chamber should be administered, and clearly that has not occurred.

The CHAIR: I have explained my view, member.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Can I raise a point of order, sir, which is—

Mr TEAGUE: I am on my feet on the point of order that the minister has already raised.

The CHAIR: I have made a ruling on that, member for Heysen. I made it very clear. You disagreed with the ruling, I understand that.

Mr TEAGUE: No, I did not indicate—

The CHAIR: In fact, your colleagues disagreed with the ruling too; that is fine.

Mr TEAGUE: I did not have a chance to indicate what my view on it was, because I sought to address the point of order.

The CHAIR: Once I have actually made a ruling, you then move a formal motion of dissent or you accept my ruling. Anything else is disrespectful to the Chair. Those are the rules of the chamber. Now, what do you wish to do?

Mr TEAGUE: Well, I had the call last time I looked.

The CHAIR: Okay, you have the call. I suggest you continue your remarks.

Mr TEAGUE: Does the minister wish to raise a fresh point of order?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am happy for us to move on, I think, but my point of order was in relation to the member for Dunstan, who was interjecting out of his seat, and I thought it was therefore appropriate that it be noted that is a breach of the standard orders.

Mr TEAGUE: On the point of order, Mr Chair—

The CHAIR: Yes? You do not even know what I want to say about the point of order.

Mr TEAGUE: No, that is why I am addressing the point of order, as I am entitled to do—

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: —to give the Chair the opportunity to hear from members on the point of order. It would be futile to address the point of order if you had already ruled on it.

The CHAIR: Actually, I was not going to uphold it anyway, but I am happy for you to—

Mr TEAGUE: Well, thanks for the preview. The point, as has been raised, is that, first of all, we are in committee. Members are addressing the Chair from all parts of the chamber, as is the relatively informal custom in relation to the committee time. What I take objection to, and what it should be distinguished from, is references that I made—and will continue to make, relevantly—in relation to the member for Adelaide's participation or otherwise in this debate are completely distinct from observations about an individual member's presence or otherwise in the chamber in the course of debate. They are completely different things. It is for the Chair to uphold the standing orders in that regard.

The CHAIR: I have just been advised there is actually no debate on points of order. The person raising the point of order has an opportunity to put their case before a ruling is made. I understand that is the procedure. The member for Dunstan asked me to explain and I explained it. He can choose to accept that or not. That is his wish. I am not sure how I rule on a point of order that is made against me. That is an interesting one. I suggest we just move on. Member for Heysen, would you like to get back to the topic before us?

Mr TEAGUE: As I was beginning to say, we have before us a bill that starts with a misnomer. The least that the government might do at the outset is to acknowledge that this is a bill that is about development, it is about planning, it is about heritage and, to a miscellaneous extent in part 5, it is about the relocation of certain SA Police facilities—apparently unbeknown to everybody, including SA Police, until we saw it printed at the back end of this 10-page document. I am very much in favour of the amendment.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

RAPID RESPONSE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Ms STINSON (Badcoe): Presented a petition signed by 132 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to install a rapid response pedestrian crossing on Anzac Highway at the Kurralta Park Shopping Centre.

YELLOWTAIL KINGFISH

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey): Presented a petition signed by 206 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 Deputy Premier (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Annual Reports 2021-22—

Children and Young People, Office of the Guardian for—Youth Treatment Orders
Visitor

Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board
Employment Tribunal, South Australian

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Infrastructure and Transport, Department for—Annual Report 2021-22

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

Southern Select Superannuation Corporation—Charter 2022-23

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. C.J. Picton)—

Annual Reports 2021-22—
Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner
Health and Wellbeing, Department for
Health Performance Council
Principal Community Visitor

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. K.A. Hildyard)—

Annual Reports 2021-22—
Child Protection, Department for
Safe and Well: Supporting Families, Protecting Children

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. K.A. Hildyard)—

Recreation, Sport and Racing, Office for—Annual Report 2021-22

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. N.F. Cook)—

Children and Young People, Office of the Guardian for—Training Centre Visitor—
Annual Report 2021-22
South Australian Housing Authority—Triennial Review 2017-18 to 2020-21

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call questions without notice, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Tara Jurkovic and Talia Pennifold, guests, I understand, of the member for Elder. Welcome.

Question Time

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier know whether any local construction businesses have experienced intimidation and pressure on their subcontractors from the CFMEU? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It was reported over the last week that the CFMEU is escalating its campaign against local subcontractors to boycott construction firms who will not sign up to CFMEU demands. This reflects feedback provided by businesses to the opposition.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:03): No, I am not aware of those details. What I can say definitively is that this government is committed very much so to having appropriate and sensible industrial relations in the state of South Australia. I acknowledge that we have a very different point of view, both practically and ideologically, from the opposition. On this side of the house, we believe the union movement has a very, very important role to play in industrial relations in the state of South Australia.

We believe unequivocally in the importance and the power and the necessity of a free and democratic trade union movement in this country and that working people deserve to have professional organisations advocating in their interests, no different from businesses who are entitled to professional advocacy on behalf of their interests. That is why, across—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I can't hear the interjection from the member for Unley.

The SPEAKER: Neither can I. Member for Unley, you are called to order.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: But I dare say I wish I could have heard it because they are always insightful.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: On this side of the house, because we do have that firm view that both workers and businesses are entitled to professional advocacy, we are willing to engage with industry associations, like the Master Builders Association, as much as we are to engage with the trade union movement. Where we see instances of, let's take for instance, trade union officials acting beyond the scope of their remit, acting in such a way that does not accord with professionalism, we are more than happy to stand up against it and call it out. I have demonstrated a willingness to do that not just since being Premier but, quite frankly, throughout the entirety of my time within the labour movement.

What I am also familiar with is the fact that the Treasurer of South Australia only a couple of days ago was very, very proud to report that construction industry jobs in South Australia are at the highest level they have ever been. That is something that we are very, very proud of. This is a government that has a very good working relationship with the Master Builders Association of South Australia. We also value the role of the HIA. Both the MBA and HIA will of course have occasions where they disagree with government policy, and we welcome that criticism. We are not a government that has a bunch of glass jaws sitting along the front bench. We are—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley, order! The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: This is a government that welcomes thoughtful critique of policy, and we are willing to engage on that basis, from both the MBA and the HIA. We see both of those organisations willing to engage pragmatically. I am also on the record saying repeatedly that what we have appreciated with the MBA in particular is that they are an organisation that when they acknowledge a problem they are also willing to proffer a potential solution to the government as well.

We value those relationships. We will continue to value them going forward. But I will say this: while we are more than willing to acknowledge inappropriate behaviour that may occur in the trade union movement or elsewhere, it is also true we are unapologetic about our connections to the trade union movement and always will be.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has the call.

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is again to the Premier. Has the Premier contacted or met with any local construction businesses to ensure that they are protected from intimidation and pressure on their subcontractors from the CFMEU? With your leave—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and that of the house, I will explain.

The SPEAKER: Leader, there's a point of order from the Leader of Government Business, which I will hear under 134.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, that question included a series of facts and assumptions, which is disorderly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That may be, and it may be, too, that it preceded the step the leader took to seek leave. I will—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Schubert! I will give the leader the opportunity to recast the question.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Does the Premier have a plan to protect local construction businesses from intimidation? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The federal Labor government is dismantling the Australian Building and Construction Commission, which was established to protect businesses from thuggish union behaviour.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:08): On this side of the house, we believe in the rule of law. On this side of the house, it is our expectation that all industrial organisations—

Mr Cowdrey: There's nobody to police it.

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —whether they be unions or businesses, comply with the respective industrial relations requirements that we have as a country and the law of the land. It is also true that, on this side of the house, we share a view that I know many do on the other side of the house about the application of coercive powers within our society. What's the acronym for the building and watchdog commission?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: ABCC.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: ABCC, thank you. It is also true that the ABCC had coercive powers, and I know that there are members opposite who believe quite fervently that the application of coercive power should be done in only the most extraordinary of circumstances.

We know, of course, that there are people opposite who felt so strongly about that they were willing to cross the floor on the matter in the previous parliament. When we contemplate the application of coercive powers, it needs to be done very cautiously and very carefully and in the rarest of circumstances. There is a role for it, but it shouldn't be done on an ad hoc basis. In response to the Leader of the Opposition's question, yes.

There are a couple of things that we offer straight up. The first one, of course, is public advocacy and public support for all those who participate within the construction industry, and we will always advocate against any form of inappropriate behaviour, particularly intimidatory behaviour. Secondly, we are undergoing a review in relation to SafeWork. We see that as an opportunity to make sure that SafeWork is given all the authorities and powers and resources that it may require to ensure that the safety and the orderly behaviour of those people who operate on construction sites are upheld.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is again to the Premier. Does the Premier support a state-based building construction commission?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:11): Again, what I support is good industrial relations throughout the land in every industry across the state. What we will do is make sure that relevant state government agencies that have oversight of this domain are acting and resourced accordingly. What the Leader of the Opposition I am sure well appreciates is that ever since the WorkChoices legislation the state legislature, or state governments, lost almost entirely all their powers when it comes to the regulation of the industrial relations policy field—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Again, the member for Unley makes interjections, sir, and I am still regretting the fact that I can't—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: All the powers rest with the commonwealth in regard to industrial relation laws in this country with the exception of a couple of fields. The first one, of course, is the state public sector, which does not relate to the construction industry in any event, but the second is around occ health and safety laws. They still sit within the remit of the states, and that is why we have that exercise underway in respect of SafeWork.

If we see an opportunity to change the way SafeWork operates with respect to all workplaces, but particularly the construction sector given the interest that currently exists publicly, which we do not think is unreasonable—that they are given the ability to intervene where appropriate.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has the minister heard of any concerns from clinicians within CALHN in relation to ward round directives, and if so has he taken any action to address them? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: In a parliamentary committee last week, the directive requiring ward rounds to be completed by 10.30am was described as an absolute disgrace, with one consultant referring to it as 'completely bonkers' and an impossible task in an already decimated and fatigued workforce, with reports it was completely out of touch with the clinical provision of care to patients.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:13): Thank you very much to the shadow minister for her question. I certainly can confirm in relation to the direction that was issued by the Central Adelaide Local Health Network CEO, Ms Lesley Dwyer, and I understand signed off by the board of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, including the chair, Mr Raymond Spencer. This has obviously been subject to dispute that has been lodged by the Salaried Medical Officers Association, as has been publicly ventilated. It has been raised in the South Australian Employment Tribunal.

This has been raised between SASMOA and the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and it is going through a process of discussion through the tribunal process. Essentially, I don't think that there is any dispute in terms of the central issue, which is that if we can have earlier discharges in the day then that helps the flow in terms of the hospital system. What we have seen over a period of time, particularly in the past few years, is that discharges in our hospital system—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Schubert, you are called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Discharges in our hospital system have been getting later and later in the day and that makes it more difficult for flow from the emergency department into the inpatient wards to occur. If those discharges happen later, it addresses the flow and ultimately addresses access block in the system, which is the key contributor to ramping occurring, which is the key contributor to ambulance delays happening.

There is a key imperative—not just at Central Adelaide Local Health Network but at all our local health networks—to try to improve that flow and to get discharges happening earlier in the system. This is not something that is unique to South Australia. Work in this regard is happening around the country and certainly work is happening at other local health networks on this as well to try to get those discharges happening earlier in the day.

The key concern here is whether or not this forms part of a direction from the CEO of that local health network and the board, or whether it is part of other work that should be happening in

our local hospital network. I certainly haven't heard anybody disputing the fact that we need to try to address the blockages that are leading to discharges happening later in our hospital system, which is causing delays to happen.

There have been a number of good elements that have happened so far. I had the pleasure of visiting the discharge lounge at the Royal Adelaide Hospital a few weeks ago and meeting the nurses who work there. That has been an element that has been in place over the past few months to help discharge happening from the wards to that lounge to free up the beds, which enables flow from the emergency departments to happen earlier.

The nurses are doing a great job there; they can follow up in terms of additional information or additional pharmaceuticals that people might need before they are discharged, or other elements of the discharge process that might still need following up, or transport to the appropriate place after hospital. It means that those beds they were in in the ward can be freed up, that people can go into them and that ultimately we can free up the emergency department.

The key issue is the emergency department being stuck with people who need to be in patient beds. That causes the issue that we see on a regular basis across the system. Those sorts of initiatives are really important. We have been looking at how this has been operating in other health systems around the country as well. We have been particularly looking at what has been happening in Westmead Hospital where they have had a successful program running on this behalf as well.

While there is clearly a dispute that will go through its process—and I obviously don't want to interrupt that process that will happen through the tribunal—I think that there is significant agreement with clinicians across the board that if we can address the factors that lead to those late discharges then that helps access block across the system.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:18): A supplementary question: will the minister overturn this directive?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:18): As I said, this is going through the tribunal process at the moment, but I think the key thing to acknowledge is that we want to make sure that discharges can happen earlier across the system. There are a number of different ways that that can occur. Clearly this is the process why the Central Adelaide Local Health Network have gone down this path. Other local health networks are going down different paths.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Clearly, if we can address the discharge delays that are happening across the system—and we have pulled out the data and it's very clear in terms of almost all of our major hospitals that there is an increasing delay that is happening in the discharges across the system. That is one of the key factors that is leading to the delays in getting people out of the emergency department and ultimately delays in the system. The Central Adelaide Local Health Network which, as members opposite will know, is established under its own board—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —will go through a process working through the Employment Tribunal in relation to that particular direction. But I think that everybody agrees that we need to work together to try to address the discharge delays that are happening and make that process earlier. It's better for the patients ultimately to get out of the beds earlier than they need to, but it also means—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —that people can get the next transfer from the emergency department, where the emergency department clinicians have deemed that it's important for them to

be in an inpatient bed and they need to be in that as soon as possible. There are blockages where people are unfortunately stuck sometimes for days waiting in the emergency department for a bed. It's not only bad for those patients but bad for the system overall.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the minister agree with paramedic Nick Brockhoff and the evidence he gave at a parliamentary committee last week? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: In a parliamentary committee last week, paramedic Nick Brockhoff said, and I quote, 'I would honestly rather be injured in South Africa today, despite their numerous and obvious challenges, than in South Australia.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:20): Thank you, sir, and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call. The question has been asked and the minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members to my left and right! The Premier is called to order. The member for Schubert will cease interjecting. She is warned for a second time. The member for Frome knows better. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I certainly know Nick well, as I believe you do, sir, from his work in the Adelaide Hills.

The SPEAKER: I do.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The Premier and I know him from where we first met him—

Mrs Hurn: Yes, the biggest fear campaign in the history of the state.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned for a third time. The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is called to order. The member for Flinders is new to parliament but does know better. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The Premier and I first met Nick when we were up at the Mount Barker ambulance station when we were announcing that we will build them a new ambulance station up in Mount Barker and we will add two additional ambulances to the Mount Barker region. I think that people who live in your region, sir—and I know that you know this very well—are shocked that there is only one emergency ambulance that is covering the Mount Barker region, which is a very significant region, and people opposite thought that that was okay.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The member for Heysen, he thought that was okay; he thought that was an acceptable situation. But we listened to the paramedics and we listened to people who lived in the Adelaide Hills who said that this was a fundamentally unsafe proposition to only have one ambulance covering the massively growing Mount Barker region. That's why we have committed, and the Treasurer has put in the budget and we are now recruiting additional paramedics, including in the Adelaide Hills, to address those safety risks that Nick—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —and his fellow paramedics in the Hills have raised in relation to the concerns of Mount Barker. But there's more. Not only do we need the ambulance services available but we also need the hospital services available. Those opposite, including the member for Heysen, thought that it was acceptable that we keep the same number of beds at the Mount Barker hospital that it had 20 years ago.

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That's right.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members to my left and right, we turn to the minister.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That's why we are very proud that in our first budget we have committed to tripling the number of beds at Mount Barker hospital for that growing community to make sure that people in the Adelaide Hills can get their care closer to home and to reduce the pressure on Adelaide health services as well. So not only will we be improving the ambulance services but we will improve the hospital services as well because we actually did the work. We went and listened to the paramedics. We didn't just get some *Hansard* transcript from the Legislative Council: we actually went out and listened to the paramedics, heard their concerns and now we are delivering to address those key safety risks in the Adelaide Hills.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert and then the member for Newland, who has been waiting patiently.

HEALTH ACTIVE DIRECTORY ID

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. How many frontline health workers are unable to work in public hospitals due to delays in obtaining a Health Active Directory ID? With your leave, sir, and that of house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: We have anecdotal reports that there are hundreds of frontline health workers wanting to work in public hospitals to cover huge chunks of unfilled shifts, yet they are unable to because of bureaucratic delays in providing them with these IDs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I observe before the question is answered that the standing order does require that facts be introduced. There was not a point of order raised, but I emphasise the standing order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The exchange between the member for Florey and the member for Chaffey will cease, and the member for Frome will not contribute to that exchange. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): Sir, you will forgive me for wanting to do a little checking of these anecdotal reports that the member for Schubert offers up. We will certainly check the facts and provide an answer in due course.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on three warnings, and I draw her attention to standing order 97 in relation to argument, opinion and introduction of facts by leave.

TEA TREE PLAZA CAR PARKING

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:25): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the government's election commitment to stop paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza and any views about the issue?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:25): I would like to thank the member for Newland for her question. I'm very happy to inform the member for Newland that we have kept our promise to the people of the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. That is really important, because we know that residents in the north-eastern suburbs, that shoppers in the north-eastern suburbs, that small business owners in the north-eastern suburbs really care about this matter.

There is a cost-of-living crisis going on at the moment throughout the nation, and we on this side of the house take our responsibility to try to assist where we can very, very seriously. I accept that there is a point of difference between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party of South Australia on this issue. I accept that we care about families and cost-of-living challenges, and I accept that the Liberal Party only care about Westfield's bottom line.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order from the member for Morialta. Member for Chaffey, your colleague is seeking to raise a point of order, which I will hear under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: the Premier is debating.

The SPEAKER: I will keep the Premier's contribution closely in mind and listen carefully.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We made a commitment to the people of the north-eastern suburbs at the election. This mattered not just to the member for Newland but I know it also mattered deeply to the member for King. Both of those hardworking local MPs have been campaigning on this issue particularly hard, along with the member for Wright and the member for Torrens and the member for Florey. Collectively, they have ensured that the people of the north-east have had their voices heard and we have been able to secure the passage of this legislation.

I will just take, for instance, the words of a Coles West Lakes worker by the name of Caitlin, who said regarding this particular change:

I often need to park in the Westfield parking, sometimes having to pay up to \$35 [per hour]—

Sorry, this is a lady from West Lakes who currently has to endure the regime of boom gates—

because I'm unable to move my car on breaks—

An honourable member: Per hour?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Per day, sorry—

I don't feel safe walking from the staff car park to the back entrance at Coles when I finish at 10pm at night either.

This is the sort of situation that potentially could have faced someone at Tea Tree Plaza if Westfield had an unfettered right to charge people parking. Of course, I also know there are community members who have spoken up against this. This is what one community member had to say, and I quote:

Well, I certainly don't support the recent news that Tea Tree Plaza are looking to charge customers and staff to park here at the shopping centre Tea Tree Plaza.

The same community member went on to say:

I don't support paid parking here at Tea Tree Plaza. It's an impost on the community and the North East. It's bad for customers and it's bad for the many people who work here at the shopping centre.

We agree with that person who, of course, is none other than the former member for Newland, Mr Richard Harvey. Now, unfortunately for Mr Harvey—

An honourable member: Doctor.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Dr Harvey.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for West Torrens! Member for Chaffey!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Unfortunately for Dr Harvey, his advocacy skills to persuade the broader Liberal Party that this is something worth doing something about weren't successful. On this side of the house, we do have strong representation of the north-eastern suburbs that is able to advocate for a position accordingly. The introduction of this change means something to a lot of people—thousands of people in the north-eastern suburbs.

We are very comfortable with the fact that we have delivered something for them, but, more than that, we are really comfortable with the fact that at the next state election everyone will know, everyone on the ground will know: if you want to stop boom gates from being installed at Westfield Tea Tree Plaza, you've got to vote Labor because if you vote Liberal they are coming back. That's their position.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order from the member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The Premier is debating, making stuff up. It's just inappropriate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order from the member for West Torrens.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta! The member for Chaffey knows better.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the deputy leader has accused the Premier of misleading the parliament. I ask him to withdraw and apologise immediately.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will first resolve the point of order raised by the member for Morialta. I observe that the question was particularly broad, so was the answer, but within the terms of the question, which may have been crafted to ensure a wide response to all policy issues. In respect of the request to withdraw, in fact, it has not come from the Premier himself. I am not sure if it was directed at the member for West Torrens but, in order to resolve it, it may be that the member for Morialta wishes to withdraw and we can proceed with the opposition's question time.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Yes, sir, I am pleased to comply. I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

APY LANDS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the government intend to implement any recommendations of the Chief Psychiatrist's review of the children's mental health services on the APY lands and, if so, what are they? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr WHETSTONE: A review by the Chief Psychiatrist into the APY lands mental health services was released in December of 2021, with the former government agreeing to implement all recommendations. SA Health's new model of care document fails to mention the Chief Psychiatrist's review.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:32): I really appreciate getting this question from the member for Chaffey because it allows me the opportunity and four good minutes to talk about the comments that the member for Chaffey made about this subject this morning and the absolute gross hypocrisy on a scale that I have yet to see in my time in parliament from the member for Chaffey.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is a point of order from the member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Just because the member feels like he wants to talk about something, doesn't mean—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe, order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —standing order 98 allows him to. In talking about the member's comments in the media without direct reference to the question that was asked, he is in breach of standing order 98.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I observe we are only seconds into the answer. It has been the practice to permit a degree of compare and contrast—other Speakers have described it as context, and I adopt that phrase myself. However, it did appear that debate was about to ensue. Minister, I draw your attention to standing order 98 and I give you the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Of course, this is an issue that has come about because of what happened a few years ago. What happened was that the CAMHS services in the APY lands stopped—they were stopped completely. There were no services and, in fact, the previous government's model for providing these services was going to be providing them telehealth. Kids on the APY lands could get—

Mr Whetstone: That's not true.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It is absolutely true.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The member for Chaffey says, 'That's not true.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: He did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I can provide the house with some facts. It was July 2021 that I am advised was last time that those services were provided on the APY lands.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Apparently, July 2021 was when COVID happened, according to the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders knows better.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I thought it was *Love Actually* everywhere.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: July 2021, those services stopped on the APY lands and I have been very concerned, as has the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the other place, about what was being proposed in terms of an idea that we would have telehealth services. It has been a gap of 14 months until we have been able to get some of those services back onto the APY lands, providing mental health care for those kids who need it. I do significantly worry about what the impact of that 14-month gap has been in terms of the provision of those important mental healthcare services on the APY lands.

Mr Whetstone: What have you done?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The member for Chaffey says what have we done.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We are trying to repair the damage that was made by ripping those services out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Those services were ripped out in 2021. We are now working to put them back, and the member for Chaffey is complaining about the speed or the accuracy in terms of how we are trying to repair the damage that was done. We are working as hard and as fast as we can to make sure that we can get appropriate APY lands mental health services for kids back in place. There is still work being done in relation to the full model of care.

I note there have been some comments from the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People today. I have asked the CEO of the Women's and Children's Health Network, Ms Lindsey Gough, today to meet with April to discuss those concerns. She has agreed to do that as soon as possible. As I said, the exact finalisation of that model of care is underway but, from a government perspective, our desire is to have as many of those on-the-ground services in place as possible, and we regard it completely unacceptable that we had 14 months without any on-the-ground services for kids' mental health on the APY lands.

APY LANDS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:36): Again to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing: does the minister intend to provide permanent mental health support staff and community-based staff to the APY lands? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain, sir.

Leave granted.

Mr WHETSTONE: The Chief Psychiatrist's review recommended that permanent mental health support staff and community-based staff be returned to the APY lands.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:36): As I outlined in my previous answer, we are returning staff to the APY lands. There are obviously significant challenges in terms of recruitment of people to be based on the lands; that is being worked through through the Women's and Children's Health Network at the moment. As I said, the finalisation

of that model of care is underway. But there has been, in the past couple of months, actual services being delivered to people on the APY lands for the first time in 14 months.

I am advised that 5 September was the first time that those services had been provided in the past 14 months. Since then, about every two weeks there has been a weekly visit from service providers, and the finalisation of that model of care is underway at the moment. But to have a telehealth model, as was proposed previously, is completely unacceptable, is not going to work, and our desire is to have as many on-the-ground services as possible.

HOSPITAL CAR PARKING

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on progress regarding hospital workers' parking in public hospitals?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:37): I would like to thank the member for Adelaide for her question because she cares about healthcare workers, I know, as do we on this side of the house.

Just to remind South Australians about what has happened until the announcement today, back in 2019, just prior to COVID, the then state government decided to break its 2018 election promise. At the 2018 election, there was a clear in-writing black-and-white commitment to reduce the cost of hospital car parking. Come 2019, they didn't reduce the cost of hospital car parking but actually dramatically escalated it. That started to take effect at the beginning of 2020, I understand, and then of course COVID hit.

What we saw then from the South Australian then opposition, the Labor Party, was that we advocated for free hospital car parking for hospital workers. I would like to credit the former government for hearing our call and providing free car parking for hospital workers. That arrangement was set to conclude at the end of the emergency management declaration, something we were able to deliver in government, the end of the emergency management declaration, and then health workers were faced with the prospect of actually paying for your broken promise. Since then, what we have sought to do is resolve the issue. I am very pleased to report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to the parliament today that this government is now delivering the lowest hospital car parking fees for our health workers since 2011. We have wound back the clock on hospital car parking fees. They are now paying \$2.50 a day.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on three warnings.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: But, more than that, in recognition of the extraordinary work and service of our healthcare workers, which wasn't just throughout the course of the pandemic but continues today, we are not just giving them the cheapest car parks available since 2011 but we are also providing them with free public transport when they are not able to receive a car parking permit—so either cheap car parking or free public transport. That is a very, very substantial demonstration of our appreciation of the work of healthcare workers.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The member for Chaffey interjects. Presumably they might oppose this policy as well. Maybe fast-forward to the 2026 election. The people of South Australia would be right to ask themselves: what are we going to get?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order from the member for Morialta.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is called to order. I will hear your colleague's point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: this is debate.

The SPEAKER: I have in mind the Premier's answer so far, and I remind him of the provision of standing order 98, which does constrain debate, and an answer must relate to the substance of the question.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: To stick to the strict tenet of the question, there is a compare and contrast here to make, in that the former government's policy was to allow boom gates to be installed at Westfield, slug customers, slug workers and hurt tenants.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is called to order. Member for Flinders!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order, and I understand that the Premier was seeking to adduce a degree of context. There is one minute remaining in the answer, and I remind the Premier of the standing order.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: March 2026, we know what the Liberal Party's position is: let boom gates be installed. The Labor Party is not going to allow that to occur. When it comes to healthcare workers, who have been servicing our community so diligently, they support higher car parking fees.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is called to order.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: You support higher car parking fees. How do we know that? Because you introduced it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Because you introduced it, and what has this government done? We have fixed it. We have rectified it.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We have dramatically reduced your car parking fees down to \$2.50 a day and then, more than that—

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned for a third time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —we are providing free public transport for healthcare workers who can't get access to one of the 17,000 permits that we are providing for record cheap parking. So the compare and contrast isn't just material now—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is on two warnings.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —it will certainly be material in 2026, when people know the points of difference between this side of the house, where we care for working people, and on the other side of the house, where you care for Westfield.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Morialta and the member for Schubert continue to interject, there will be additional action that will be necessary to be taken.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister explain whether unusual voting patterns have been reported in local government elections and, if so, has he sought a briefing on this? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: The South Australian Electoral Commissioner stated on radio this morning that the overall statewide voting trend is disappointing. Other reports have suggested the Adelaide City Council Central Ward has seen a dramatic increase in voting.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:43): We have brought this to the attention of the house before. Everyone knows that the Electoral Commissioner is responsible for the elections going forward from hereon in. I have not had any substantiated claims about any of the accusations I am hearing in the media. I have the fullest respect and the fullest confidence in the Electoral Commissioner. If there are any anomalies, the Electoral Commissioner will be able to handle that quite adequately. I am very sure that we all have confidence in the Electoral Commissioner to make certain that everything is aboveboard and legal.

If the member for Flinders or anybody else in this house has any proof whatsoever of any anomalies, I encourage them strongly to report it and make a complaint directly, with the evidence, to the Electoral Commissioner themselves.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Has the minister received any advice about alleged perpetrators of fraud or irregularity in local council elections?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:44): To reinforce my comments just a minute ago, to my knowledge I haven't received anything direct or substantiated. I hear comments, unsubstantiated comments, on the radio and I also see unsubstantiated comments in the media, in *The Advertiser* and so forth. To reinforce what I have indicated before, if the member for Flinders has proof or substantial evidence, please take it to—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —if you want, take it to the Ombudsman—the Electoral Commissioner. As you know, you were the President of the Local Government Association. You understand the system.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: You understand that councils are not operating this election this year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The previous government put it in the process of the Electoral Commissioner—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —handling the electoral process—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is warned.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —right through the process. All the ballot papers go to the Electoral Commissioner, and the Electoral Commissioner has the highest integrity, so if the member has any issues, please contact the Electoral Commissioner.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I see the member for Narungga.

EDITHBURGH JETTY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:46): I have a question for the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister and the government consider the installation of a scuba diving platform at the Edithburgh jetty as part of the jetties pilot program? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: The government recently announced a pilot program of five jetties, including Edithburgh, which is one of the top dive sites in the state, thanks to its marine life and the Investigator Strait Shipwreck Trial that is currently almost inaccessible for divers. I have previously written to the government about this issue and would be pleased if they could commit to the installation of a platform.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46): There is strong consideration for the member's request. He is a fierce advocate for his local community and has inundated my office with emails and letters on a number of matters, not just jetties but also local roads and other matters. As I said previously in this parliament, jetties are the lifeblood of regional communities and their use helps activate local communities, especially with local tourism. The Edithburgh jetty is a fine example of that. Anything the state government can do to try to enhance that visitor experience would—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is on two warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —we will look at. What we are looking for is good suggestions, and that is a very, very good suggestion. Obviously, we will be considering all those through all the processes that we go through normally. I do point out to the member that there are a number of budgets and the Mid-Year Budget to go until the next election, and obviously there are a number of facilities already in place to help maintain our facilities as they are and, if we can enhance them along the way, we will.

That is an example of a local member of parliament coming up with a good suggestion to the government of the day to try to improve the local amenity of their community, less concerned with the goings-on in Victoria, say the Birdcage, for example, and more concerned about what is going on here in South Australia. I tell you what I wasn't doing: I wasn't drinking 389 in the Birdcage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is on three warnings. The member for Flinders and then the member for Badcoe.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:48): My question—

Mr Whetstone: Get your little minions to do all your speaking.

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

Mr TELFER: My question is to Minister for Local Government. What action is the minister taking to ensure that voters can trust the process and results of local government elections? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: Reports over recent days have identified irregular enrolments at the West Torrens council election and an alleged voter scam in the Adelaide City Council election.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (14:49): I thank the member for his question. I have reiterated a couple of times now and took questions previously regarding who is operating the local government elections this year. It was the previous government that put the proposal through that the Electoral Commissioner will handle all the elections, including the ballot papers going out and the ballot papers going back to the Electoral Commissioner.

We are in the middle of a local government election process at the moment. The Electoral Commission is responsible for the conduct of the elections and will ensure their integrity, and I have the fullest respect and trust in the Electoral Commissioner. Once the election process has been concluded and the results declared by the commissioner there will be a review and an analysis undertaken to identify whether changes are appropriate or necessary. The government is not in the business of commenting on allegations, and I urge anyone to come forward with any complaint regarding the election process.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The member has just said that allegations and evidence have been produced. If the member—

Mr Telfer: No, I didn't. That wasn't the question.

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders is warned.

Mr Telfer: I asked him about the processes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders is warned for a second time and will cease interjecting. Members to my left and right, the minister has the call.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: If you have any evidence whatsoever, bring it to the attention of the Electoral Commissioner. I cannot stress enough that I have the fullest confidence in the Electoral Commissioner, and if they see any anomaly they will investigate it.

RIVER MURRAY

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:50): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier update the house on preparations for predicted high-water flows along the River Murray in December?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:50): I thank the member for her question. Yes, I would be delighted to update the chamber on the status of the flow of the Murray. As members may well be aware, there is a weekly forecast that is being undertaken in order to keep the community up to date with the expected high-level water.

This week, we have been informed that it is likely still for it to be 135 gigalitres of water flowing over the Victorian border still in early December. So that has not changed in the last week, although what has changed is that there is an expectation that the high water, probably at around 100 gigalitres, will last longer than previously expected—well into January and probably for the entirety of January.

That is as a result of more rain that has fallen further into Victoria and the management by the Victorian government of their water sources, in particular the Hume Dam, which will see a flow

of water come through in several weeks. There is also a moderate possibility of the flow reaching 150 gigalitres a day in early December.

As members will also I am sure be aware, the predictions that are made are done so on the basis of water currently in the system should rain continue to fall; and particularly if it falls close to the Victorian-South Australian border then we may well see higher rates yet to come. It is important that we maintain these forecasts at a regular rate and make sure that the community is well aware. I pay tribute to the Minister for Emergency Services and the head of the SES, who have been working very closely on managing the situation as we get close to that high water time.

There is an expectation of blackwater coming through the Murray. That is when—and it is an inevitable consequence—a large amount of organic material is washed into the river all at once, and as that decomposes the water as deoxygenated and some fish, particularly the larger fish, find that extremely difficult to manage. We are concerned that there will be a fish die-off that is seen, and we ask that if people observe any fish die-offs that they inform PIRSA about that.

Lake Victoria has been identified as a fish haven, and there is work being done to make sure that remains clear of any blackwater event in order to create a haven for the native fish. There has also been an amount of work done for levee preparation, which I am sure members will be anxiously concerned about, making sure that levees that have not had to be used for a very long time now—the water that we are talking about is as high as we have seen since the mid-1970s—are able to maintain protection for important infrastructure and town centres.

At a meeting last week which I attended briefly, along with the Minister for Emergency Services, all the mayors and chief executives of the Riverland and Lower Murray councils attended, and they have undertaken to do an audit to look at each of the levees on their lands to identify whether there is work that is required.

I have seen a report already from the Renmark Paringa Council that has identified some 22 levees that need to be looked at. Two of those have already been not only looked at but also the early works and the completed works have occurred. Early works have started on another two. There are still about six that are required to be looked at, which should start from tomorrow, and the rest, where there is work required, that will be starting I am informed around 7 November.

We have a reasonable expectation that works are being undertaken where we are aware there are concerns with the integrity of levees. I am pleased to say that the work between local government and state government agencies appears to be going extremely smoothly, and that cooperative effort is going to stand us in good stead as we head into early December and we see that high water.

ELECTORAL COMMISSION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Has the government provided any extra resourcing for the Electoral Commission to deal with complaints and uphold the integrity of the election, and is the minister aware if ECSA has been assisted by the Electoral Integrity Assurance Taskforce in any investigation into local government elections? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: ECSA have confirmed that they have received more than 800 complaints, apparently a new record.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:55): I am certainly aware that we have had to provide some supplementation to the Electoral Commission. Of course, there was the not unexpected by-election in Bragg and we are working through whether we need a separate contingency for another one this financial year as well—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —if we can pin down someone's intentions, of course, in the coming months. But I hear, according to Breaking @ 8 on FIVEaa, that this may be imminent.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As to the member for Flinders' specific question about supplementation for the commission with respect to local government elections, my understanding is they predict that every four years there will be an additional effort in order for the Electoral Commission to play its superintendence role of providing the elections, but I am happy to come back to him with the details of what component that is of their budget, particularly in this financial year, and, perhaps if it helps the member, how that compares with normal years when these sorts of specific elections aren't being held.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND BULLYING

Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how sporting clubs in the north-east are teaming up to help stamp out violence in our schools?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:57): I thank the member for King for this important question and for her advocacy and hard work in her community and bringing that community—which is my community as well—together to tackle violence in schools. As members of this place no doubt will be aware, overall our schools are fantastic places.

Overwhelmingly, they are very, very safe places for our young people. One of the things I feel very fortunate to be able to do in this job every day is to get out to our early learning sites, child care, preschool, primary school, our TAFE sites, our RTOs and our high schools and see the fantastic work that our educators do on a daily basis. It is a really important reminder for me, as Minister for Education, of the fantastic work that happens every day in our education system here in South Australia.

However, there are some cases of course where a minority of students—and I stress that it is a minority of students—behave in ways that are completely and utterly unacceptable. I must say that as Minister for Education I have absolutely zero tolerance for any kind of violence in any of our schools. Along with the chief executive of the department, Professor Martin Westwell, we have taken very strong action to respond to some of the recent incidents where violence has occurred whilst also focusing our attention on some of the longer term change that needs to be made, some of the cultural change that of course includes this government's election commitment to ban mobile phones in high school settings as well as the existing ban in primary school settings.

In recent times, the last few months, Golden Grove High School has been in the media with some pretty serious cases of violence there. I know that anyone in this place who saw that footage would have been shocked, as I was, in terms of the severity of those cases. We all know that there is a very long-lasting effect upon those who are the victims of violence like that and of bullying and it is something that we absolutely cannot tolerate.

The school has taken strong action in response to those incidents, and we have placed extra supports at the school. They are still there to this day, including a recently retired very senior principal who has gone in to provide extra leadership support. We have security guards in place, a behavioural specialist and a parent liaison, and I think they are starting collectively to turn things around. I am very pleased to speak today in this place about how the community more broadly in the north-east is also stepping up to take action.

The member for King has been doing some fantastic work about bringing together local sporting clubs who indicated they had an interest in being part of the solution to this violence. Golden Grove Football Club, the Modbury (Hawks) Football Club, the Tea Tree Gully football club and North East Hockey Club have all joined forces, thanks to the hard work of the member for King to bring them together, to play a role in encouraging good behaviour at our schools and making sure that the perpetrators of those violent acts do not get away scot-free and learn the severity of their actions.

These clubs collectively have come together and made a very strong statement that if any of the members of their individual clubs are found to be the ones perpetrating this violence, not just at Golden Grove High School but at other schools in the area, then they are going to take action to not allow them to play whatever it might be—hockey, football, tennis—on the weekend. I think that sends an incredibly strong message to young people at those schools, and to the broader community too, that this is something we have to all tackle together. I want to express my pride of local clubs in the north-eastern suburbs for standing up and being part of the solution.

One last thing I would like to say is that the actions of the member for King here really personify the role of a local member of parliament—to be part of the solution to bring together other people from their community to be actually part of that solution rather than sitting from the sidelines.

Time expired.

CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS STORAGE FACILITY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Has the government reduced the scope for the Cultural Institutions Storage Facility for the South Australian Museum, the Art Gallery and the State History Collection? With leave, sir, I would like to explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: In estimates, the minister confirmed the facility was due for completion in June 2024 and, in reply to a question on notice, the minister confirmed the \$91 million budget was in place. This facility is tremendously important for the protection of priceless artefacts, a collection worth over a billion dollars, noting that priceless and irreplaceable artefacts from the Aboriginal collection have previously been damaged in burglary and weather events due to the inadequate current rented facilities.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:02): I thank the shadow minister for the question. There is some work being done at the moment on cost escalations that we are looking at at the moment. I have no update to give, but I will come back to the member with an answer to that when we finalise the plans.

CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS STORAGE FACILITY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): A supplementary, sir: when will the plans the minister has just referred to be finalised and, therefore, information about the scope be able to be provided to the public?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:02): I don't have a date at the moment to give to the house.

The SPEAKER: A further supplementary, I understand, arising out of the subject matter. We are testing the limits.

CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS STORAGE FACILITY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Thank you, sir. A supplementary to the original question: is the minister being briefed on the reduction in scope in terms of the size in square metres of storage, currently planned to be available and now proposed to be available?

The Hon. C.J. Picton: You're assuming a fact.

The SPEAKER: I am going to, in fact, take that as a principal question and allow it to be put on the basis that has been put. There are only seconds remaining. We are in the dusk of question time.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:03): I don't have any brief on actually a

reduction in scope at the moment. Some work is being done. When I get a briefing on that, I am happy to come back to the house.

Grievance Debate

WALL, DR I.B.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan) (15:03): I rise to speak on the very sad passing of Ian Baker Wall AM—an extraordinary South Australian, a wonderfully talented engineer, businessman, generous philanthropist, husband to Pammie and father to Annabel and the late Lucinda and, of course, friend to so many in South Australia.

Ian Wall was born into a modest family. His mother and father worked extraordinarily hard to provide every single opportunity to their son. Ian attended Pulteney Grammar School, the School of Mines and Energy and St Peter's College. On completing his secondary education, he attended the University of Adelaide, residing at his much-loved St Mark's College.

Ian was a conscientious and well-liked student, referred to affectionately by his fellow students at St Mark's as Prof Wall. He participated in all of the broad extracurricular opportunities that St Mark's offered whilst he was attending, and it was at St Mark's that he met Alastair Wood and Jim Bettison, whom he would later go on to form the Codan company with. This was described by Ian as his work on the side while he was working as a television engineer at Philips.

Codan is an extraordinary South Australian company. In its time, it has employed thousands of South Australians, it has created enormous shareholder wealth and, of course, it has exported billions of dollars' worth of South Australian product overseas. In 2008, Ian Wall was honoured with the Medal of the Order of Australia for services to business, particularly through the design and manufacture of electronic communication equipment, and to the community through philanthropic activities.

In 2019, he was further honoured for significant service to the community through philanthropic initiatives, becoming a Member of the Order of Australia. Ian was, of course, a generous philanthropist, and he was joined in this pursuit by his beloved wife, Pammie. All South Australians should know of their generosity. All South Australians, current and future, are the beneficiaries of their extraordinary generosity over decades and decades. Their interests included health, heritage, veterans, educational institutions, politics, the visual arts and, of course, the performing arts.

Ian and Pammie were regular attendees at just about every single fundraiser in South Australia. They were extraordinary with the schedule that they kept up. They were seen as the glamorous couple that were the ornament to any fundraiser in South Australia. They would often attend multiple fundraising events in a single day and, in fact, sometimes two in a single night.

Recently, probably only going back two months, I was at a dinner with Ian and Pammie and Ian had to basically break up the dinner that night at about 10.30 and announce to the table that he was off to another function. This was typical: they wanted to squeeze every single bit out of the wonderful life they lived together. Ian lived his life to the full, a thoughtful, modest, committed South Australian who loved his family and who loved his state.

I had the enormous privilege to spend much time with Ian Wall. He was always happy to share his time and his wisdom. His personal story is one of great inspiration. I can think of very few South Australians who have achieved so much and who have given so much. I spent much time with Ian during his final weeks. He was extraordinarily well cared for at Calvary Wakefield, Regis Mitchell Park and, finally, at the Flinders Medical Centre. By his side every day was his widow, Pammie.

In his final days, both Ian and Pammie were conferred with honorary doctorates from the University of Adelaide—both very worthy recipients. Ian's final farewell will be held at St Peter's Cathedral next Friday 11 November at 2pm and then at St Mark's College afterwards. Ian Baker Wall passed away peacefully on the morning of 26 October. He was 91½ years old. He leaves an incredible legacy. He will be remembered always as a great South Australian. I extend my sincere condolences to his widow, Pammie, and his daughter, Annabel. Vale, Dr Ian Baker Wall AM.

SKILLS SHORTAGES

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:08): It would be news to very few that there is intense competition for workers, with skills shortages experienced across Australia and across a variety of industries. It is something I hear about everyday in my community, and I am sure that you are all hearing it as well.

Whether it is frustration from employers about their employees being poached from one workplace to another, or not being able to secure a worker with the right skills, or feeling that perceptions about a particular industry and the pathways available to a person are not being adequately portrayed, I have heard it loud and clear that strategies need to be employed to address the shortages we are experiencing.

I am proud that this government is doing what it can to support the cultivation of a skilled workforce in several ways, which includes the establishment of five new technical colleges. The first of these is to be built at Findon High School and will be operational by 2024; the remaining will open by 2026, something I am very excited about because it does include one in the north-east. I am pleased to report that this has been well received by residents from my community, as they recognise that these colleges will be beacons of excellence across our state and that they will create pathways for students towards further study and employment.

I am also pleased to be hearing from my community their desire to see our industries diversify to meet the shortages we are experiencing. I want to focus today on how we ensure that we get more women into the jobs that our state is going to depend on as we look to get our state ready for jobs of the future. A big component involved with jobs of the future is STEM.

Mr Speaker, did you know that the participation of women and girls is one of the biggest STEM workforce social challenges? Nationally, as of 2020 only 13 per cent of Australians working in STEM fields were women. Worryingly, this figure has risen only slightly, by two percentage points, in the last decade. It takes role models like our very own Chief Scientist for South Australia, Professor Caroline McMillen, to engage young women in science and demonstrate the career paths available to them.

It takes organisations like Science Alive that are committed to playing a role in changing this and making sure they keep young people interested in STEM and, importantly, keep them interested to follow it through. That is why this government was proud to sponsor this year's event—because it aims to lift science out of the realm of universities and labs and makes it accessible and exciting to the general Australian public through a series of events and interactive experiences.

I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to listen to the many stories of women platformed by Science Alive earlier this year who shared their interests and their journeys with many young women from schools across the state. Their stories were inspirational and really displayed the unlimited potential there is to be had in the world of STEM, not only sharing their careers but, as importantly, the journeys they took to get there.

One story that made a particular impact on me was Tiahni Adamson's. A proud Torres Strait Islander woman with a passion for conservation, Tiahni has been working with the CSIRO on Indigenous education programs, such as the Aboriginal Summer School for Excellence in Technology and Science. A role she has shared did not exist when she was in high school and considering her pathways, but she stuck to her passions and interests and has been blown away by where that has led her.

Tiahni is conveying her special connection with our land to educate, advocate and nurture sustainable living practices on country, with the ultimate goal of fighting climate change with Indigenous knowledge. Her message was clear: do not be dismayed by perceptions about the direction a student should take towards entering the workforce because we are living in a really exciting time, when there is an immense development of what is going to be available to you. Just look at the opportunities that are arising as a result of the development in the hydrogen space.

But the truth is that, without more of this sort of thing, young women are not going to turn to fields they cannot see themselves in. Highlighting what is out there and combating rigid gender stereotypes is one way we can encourage more girls to get excited about the prospects of a career

in STEM. That is what Science Alive does well—getting thousands of young people out to their event and providing both children and their parents opportunity to engage directly with people in STEM occupations, showcasing the wide variety of career options available.

Science Alive help to address the perceptions of what people are capable of and they highlight the path towards achieving dream career goals, whether it be fixing complex machines, caring for the environment using space technologies, or working on the next big video game. So, to the girls of this state, I want to tell you that there is a future for you in a STEM career right here in South Australia, and I am glad that there are organisations like Science Alive that are actively working to show you how you can get there.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:14): After four years of warfare and the deaths of millions of civilians and military, the guns on the Western Front finally fell silent on 11am on 11 November 1918. It marked the end of the First World War, a war in which more than 60,000 Australians lost their lives; 156,000 Australians were wounded, gassed or taken prisoner from a country of fewer than five million people at that time. These selfless Australians fought for their country and many paid the ultimate sacrifice. Since then, countries including Australia and New Zealand and Canada and the United States recognise 11 November as the annual day to commemorate those who lost their lives in battle.

On Remembrance Day, all Australians are urged to observe one minute's silence on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month each year. It is a moment to remember and reflect upon the sacrifice and the courage of those who fought so hard to keep us free. A silence falls across the nation, flags are lowered to half mast, the traditional red poppy or sometimes a sprig of rosemary is worn with pride, and we solemnly stand for the reading of the ode taken from the poem *For the Fallen* by Lawrence Binyon. The *Last Post* sends shivers down our spine.

It is also a time to reflect on the wars which really have shaped civilisation, wars which have ultimately changed lives and, of course, we commemorate those brave men and women who tragically lost their lives protecting our nation. Right in this very moment, we are seeing countries right across the world locked in a desperate and terrible conflict, with mounting casualties and devastation.

We must remember our past to avoid these horrible circumstances, and it can often feel as though perhaps we have learned very little from the tragedies of those gone by. As Sir Winston Churchill famously said, 'Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.' So on Remembrance Day, let's remember our history, let's tell our stories and keep alive this tradition for generations to come so that we never forget and that we always strive for peace.

The gratitude that I feel for the sacrifice of those Australians and that my community and my colleagues in this place no doubt feel is really quite hard to put into words. I also recognise that serving in Australia's armed forces is a serious commitment and, from the bottom of my heart, I thank those South Australians who are current members of our ADF or who have served in the past. I also acknowledge the important work of many ex-service organisations that provide support to our veteran community and their families. We often know that transitioning from military life can be a really tough and difficult period for veterans and their entire communities. It is critical that they have access to quality support and services to help them through this tough transition period.

I would like to express my deep thanks to all the RSLs across the state and in my local community of Schubert for the work they do, not only for our veterans and for the families of those who have not returned but for their dedication put into conducting Remembrance Day services right across the state. They are an amazing marker of respect for those who have fought so hard for us, and I am very much looking forward to attending and commemorating this very special day next Friday. As we do approach Remembrance Day, let's take the time to reflect. Lest we forget.

Recently, I have also had the opportunity of attending so many local school graduations. It is such an exciting time for these students, their families, their schools and teachers, because they are on the cusp of something that is pretty exciting. We know that our school exam period is often

daunting and stressful, and I wish all of the students in my local community all the very best for their upcoming exams and for whatever is to come.

I had the particular pleasure of attending my alma mater, which is Nuriootpa High School, where I presented the Schubert public speaking award. That was a particular source of pride for me to see people who are passionate people still coming through Nuriootpa High School. I wish everyone all the best.

Time expired.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:19): I rise today to talk initially about the hydrogen power plant in Whyalla, which was partly initiated by the opening questions from the opposition yesterday. They like to mention the hydrogen power plant. I would exercise a note of caution: when it came to the big battery in this state, the phalanx of Liberals and National Party people who turned up to attack that great initiative, that highly innovative initiative, and who called it a big banana at the time, they are the ones who are looking like big bananas given the success of the battery.

I am confident that the hydrogen power plant will be another one of those projects that will put South Australia at the forefront when it comes to exploiting our massive renewable energy resources. One of the important things with regard to this plant is that it is important the state does take first mover initiative, especially in relation to the construction of a large electrolyser at Whyalla—a 250 megawatt electrolyser. That first mover advantage in the context of hydrogen proposals in Australia will be important. It will be important because at the moment there is something like 147 different hydrogen proposals at different stages in Australia. To take first mover advantage will help us cut through some of that.

I have met with a number of the big companies, not necessarily the companies involved in wanting to construct or contribute to the hydrogen power plant but companies that see this initiative as something incredibly tangible that has amplified their interest in investing in South Australia. It is no secret that a number of large companies are looking to do some potentially exciting things when it comes to hydrogen in my part of the world in Whyalla and to the west of Whyalla.

The scale of some of these projects is seriously ambitious. A lot of it is aimed not only at the overseas market but also at domestic use. Of course, we have to get to the point of demonstrating that we can do this commercially at scale, that we can drive down the production costs of hydrogen using renewable energy to drive electrolysers.

Compared with a lot of other places in the world and in this nation, South Australia is well placed because on the northern part of Eyre Peninsula and further north we have a world-class solar resource that overlaps with a world-class wind resource. We do have that potential to have incredibly cheap energy, and we are going to need cheap electricity to drive the electrolysers.

There has been some critique, and I think it is constructive critique, when it comes to hydrogen. A number of people have expressed some scepticism. Dr Saul Griffith is very much associated with the use of wind and renewables in general to drive what he calls the electrification of everything. A lot of what he has to say makes some sense, but it should not be the electrification of everything because I believe that hydrogen is going to play an important role.

We had another announcement today. It is good to see a big company in my electorate, BHP at Olympic Dam, has just entered into an offtake arrangement with Neoen. Come 2025-26, that is going to meet 50 per cent of Olympic Dam's electricity needs. That, added to the offtake arrangement with the Port Augusta energy park, which was entered into over a year ago, is going to significantly reduce the emissions profile of BHP at Olympic Dam. It is one of those great examples of watching the mining industry greening itself, and hydrogen is going to be an important part of our future.

COLTON ELECTORATE

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:24): I rise today to draw the attention of the house and my community to the annual Remembrance Day service that will be held in our community this year. For the first time, to the best of my knowledge, the Henley & Grange RSL, which each year organises the service, will be conducting it at Henley Square. They are encouraging the public and locals, if

they have the opportunity next Friday 11 November, to come down and be a part of the service. The Remembrance Day service will commence at 10.30am at the square, where we will recognise those who have served our country and paid the ultimate sacrifice in retaining the freedom that we enjoy.

I have always loved having the opportunity to attend Remembrance Day and ANZAC Day services. I think they are made that little bit more special when they are held in coastal locations. In previous years, when our ANZAC Day service was held on Seaview Road, we heard waves crashing and remembered during those moments of silence the fact that so many of our most important and key conflicts have been undertaken on beaches, in coastal areas, none more so than at Gallipoli. Again, I encourage all members of the public, all locals in the Henley Beach area, to come down and pay your respects this Remembrance Day at 10.30am at the square.

There is lots of excitement around the Henley & Grange RSL with the redevelopment of their clubrooms now well underway, with a full demolition and removal of the current transportable structure, which sat west of the main building, and the extension and refurbishment of the main building. The works include a new open area to the west, replacing the transportable structure that I just mentioned, and internal works to facilitate a new disabled access toilet and refurbished bar and toilet area. A new ceiling will be installed throughout the whole building to link it together.

The renovations are well underway, having started after the last day of trade on Monday 9 May earlier this year, a day when, certainly from all accounts, the bar was totally drunk dry. My latest update is that renovations have picked up again pretty quickly after a small delay that saw steel beams take some time to get to site. I know that members of the Henley & Grange RSL are keen to get down there and back into the facility. It is not too far away—hopefully in the next few months. In the meantime, though, they are meeting on Thursday evenings at the Henley Bowling Club. For anyone interested, please head on down. I would like to also take the opportunity to put on the record my acknowledgement of the current president, Mr Malcolm Whitford, and his committee, for their work in the area.

It would be remiss of me not to recognise the service held on 8 October for the Korea Missing in Action war memorial service at the top of Port Road. It is organised each and every year by the Korea & South East Asia Forces Association. It was good on that day to have the opportunity to catch up again with John Jarrett and Michael Domarecki, two well-known people to the Henley & Grange RSL and the Korea & South East Asia Forces Association.

I rise today also to recognise the achievements of our local football clubs during this 2022 season. It has been a huge season of success for the Henley Sharks, with their A Grade Women winning the premiership and their C and D grade teams taking home a premiership. I had the opportunity to attend their senior presentation night just a couple of weeks ago. I congratulate Jack on his A Grade Best and Fairest on that night. To the committee members and volunteers of that club, thank you for everything that you do. Thank you to Vinnie Ruggalo for his service to the club as the A grade coach over the last number of years.

I would also like to acknowledge the Lockleys (Demons) Football Club for the work they did over this season, with the C grade getting a premiership, the B grade getting their three-peat premiership and the A grade just falling short. However, there are exciting times ahead for the Lockleys Football Club, given that they had secured promotion to division 4 next year. Good luck to the Sharks and the Demons next year, and we wish them the best of luck.

BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:29): In February next year, it will be the 40th anniversary of Ash Wednesday. On 16 February 1983, I remember sitting on the couch in the front room of my parents' house listening to the radio for updates. I was eight at the time and my brother just a baby. My mum came to me and my sister, handed us a garbage bag and said, 'Go fill it with what you want to save.'

I remember it so clearly, as for years afterwards I would panic every summer. I promised myself that when I grew up I would never live in the Adelaide Hills. In 2002, 20 years after Ash Wednesday, I bought a house that sits on the northern slope of the Belair National Park. Clearly I had recovered from the ordeal.

On 8 February 2014, it was forecasted to be a 40° day and catastrophic conditions. It was pretty early in the morning, and I wondered what time I should leave on a catastrophic day and how I did not know that. I casually got up and started preparing what I should take. Suddenly, I heard planes flying over our house, and then the phone rang and someone said that we needed to evacuate and then there were the sirens.

A fire had started in the Belair National Park across the road. Panic set in. Thoughts of my childhood resurfaced. I grabbed my child, heart beating through my chest, and took off to my parents' house. The fire had started from a spark from a freight train and taken off up the hill. Fortunately, firefighters got to it quickly and were able to bring it under control. The fire did not escape the park that day, but it is only a matter of time.

In 2021, we had the fire in Cherry Gardens. Things had changed a lot for me. I was now running toward the fire instead of away from it, but my child and pets were at home alone. When I reached the fireground with my Upper Sturt crew, it was clear that it was not going to be a small fire. I was fortunate to be able to call my mum to go and get my child and the pets, but this is one of the questions our CFS is currently asking people of South Australia in their latest campaign: what if you are not home but your family and your pets are?

I am dedicated to helping my community to become more resilient and more prepared. We know that we have only a few roads out and that we need to do better at leaving, not sitting around wondering when to leave, like I was. On 13 November, I am hosting a bushfire resilience forum. It is important that my community has the facts. We have several iconic parks and boundless natural scrubland, which on the wrong day at the wrong time could be catastrophic.

I am pleased that the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, the member for Cheltenham, will be joining me, along with an impressive group of experts. We need to have a serious discussion with my community about the very real threat. It is really a matter of when and not if, and as the CFS campaign's slogan states, 'If you think you're safe, you're probably not.' Joining the panel from the CFS is Ray Jackson, Assistant Chief Fire Officer, with years of frontline experience. Ray will be letting my community know about what they can do to be safe. He will also educate them on the new AFDRS and what that means.

Also attending from the CFS is Aiden Galpin, Manager of the Planning Management Unit, to talk about our area and the risk it holds. Members of my community, especially those living in Glenalta and Belair, want to know what the plan is for the national park should a fire start. We will have a representative from the Department of Parks and Wildlife to discuss bushfire management plans for Belair and our other national parks, including Sturt Gorge, Shepherds Hill Reserve and Brownhill Creek.

Mitcham council has plans in place to engage in vegetation control as well as community support, and Mark Austin, Manager of Environmental Services and Community Safety, will also be joining the discussion. Locally, we will have the Sturt Group Officer from the CFS, Dale Thompson, to talk about a local response, the capacity of the CFS and what their response will look like, as well as suggestions for keeping our residents' homes bushfire safe.

Living in a high fire danger zone, we should be thinking about our own responsibilities and how to keep our home safe. Whilst I would hope residents' bushfire plans in our areas are to leave early on catastrophic days, making sure that their home is well prepared for an oncoming fire will not only help them but also their neighbours and the whole community. We also need to be prepared for the time that we cannot leave—the car does not start, the kids are home alone or you do not have a car at all. Being bushfire prepared means considering all these things. There are ways that we can make our properties more resilient by making wise choices about our gardens.

I have invited Josh Laynes from State Flora in the Belair National Park to also join the panel at the forum to talk about what plants are more resilient than others so that those who wish to be mindful about this can get some ideas about protecting their property. I am also hoping that many of our CFS brigade members will join us so that our community can see and thank our volunteers. They are our neighbours, our friends and, in my case, my son, and we need to thank them all for not thinking twice about running towards the fire. So I invite all my community to join me at the Belair

Community Centre on 13 November at 2.30pm for an in-depth discussion about becoming a bushfire resilient community.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 15 November 2022 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

Mr TEAGUE: Before the break, I was beginning to provide a brief contribution in relation to what I have described as the meritorious proposed insertion of the word 'Development' in the title of the act. It is no small thing that at the outset of this committee process we actually do the right thing by the people of South Australia by directing them to what this bill is really all about.

I have indicated that we have in the chamber today the Minister for Health leading the government's carriage of this bill that is named as a bill that, in fact, related to health might be named. But we know that not a single aspect of this bill, in fact, relates to matters that would ordinarily be within the relevant ministerial responsibilities of the Minister for Health. I provided what might have been an incomplete list of the ministers who might more properly be expected to be leading the debate from the government's point of view and being responsible for the bill.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Point of order: I am not sure how which minister is managing this on behalf of the government is of relevance to what the title of the bill is.

The CHAIR: I think that the title allows some scope for some discussion on that. If the member for Heysen wants to use up his 15 minutes or 30 minutes left to discuss that, that is fine. Unless he makes some reflection on yourself or other ministers, I have to let him go.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you very much, Chair. As I was just beginning to indicate, the combination of the two in this case, the misleading Orwellian title of this bill combined with the fact that the government is choosing to—and it is no reflection on the competence of the member for Kaurna and certainly, in this context, no reflection on the relevant competence of a Minister for Health in the government of the day, far from it. In fact, there are plenty of occasions in the course of debate in the house at which those matters ought properly be tested.

It is particularly invidious for the minister for heritage and the Minister for Planning to be placed in the positions that they have respectively, not leading the way on this particular bill, because it should be expected that those two ministers in fact would have a lot to impart in relation to the subject matter of the bill. We will come to it later on, but the South Australian Heritage Council has published its letter to the Deputy Premier, the minister for heritage, to the Minister for Environment and Water, as her title indicates, with the responsibility for heritage. That is who the Heritage Council is interested in addressing with respect to this bill, and that is just one example.

I do not see that there are too many relevant bodies, individuals or members of the community—certainly those who are focusing their concerns on what this bill will go ahead and impact—who would think that they would be expecting the answers to their questions to be given by the Minister for Health in this regard. So, at the very least, if the government is going to come in and have, as it were, a debate characterised by its carriage by the Minister for Health, it can name the bill in a way that does not doubly mischaracterise the nature of the debate and the nature of the legislation for the people of South Australia.

There will be an opportunity more particularly to address those concerns in terms of the particular subject matter of the bill. But at the outset, and I said it in the course of my second reading debate contribution, if we are going to see this bill jammed in here to the House of Assembly, and we are going to see a government that is continuing to resist reasonable calls for the opportunity, which might only be over a matter of weeks, to engage with bodies such as the South Australian state Heritage Council and others about the way in which this is all going to pan out, if we are going to see that resistance, then the very least we could do is have an accurately named bill to commence the debate.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIR: Your questions now relate to the title as it stands, not as you had sought to amend it.

Mr TELFER: Yes, absolutely. Minister, did the government ask the Park Lands Authority for their perspective on any implications of the legislation as named in this clause?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think we have been clear in terms of the process that has been undertaken. We had a site review undertaken, which was led by Jim Hallion, that led to the site selection process that was released publicly, and then this has been a development across government and has not been worked through with the Park Lands Authority.

Mr TELFER: Can the minister advise whether the National Trust made some sort of submission to that process, as he has illustrated?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Not that I am aware of.

Mr TELFER: Can the minister advise on the views of the Heritage Council on this bill?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I understand that there is a letter that might have been referred to by the other member previously that is on the Heritage Council website, where they have made their views known in relation to that.

Mr Telfer: What were the views? I haven't read the letter.

The CHAIR: Firstly, you need to stand to speak. Secondly, you have asked a question and he has answered it. I will allow you a supplementary, but that is your third question.

Mr TELFER: I was just asking on the views, not whether they had views, sorry. I was asking if the Heritage Council had views on this bill.

The CHAIR: You have just asked—

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I will let the Heritage Council speak for themselves; I will not put words in their mouth. I think it is fair to say that clearly there has been a difficult decision in relation to heritage in this matter. The bill, as we will get to hopefully at some stage, in the actual guts of the legislation has a clause in which expires the State Heritage Places in relation to the project site. Obviously, that has been of some concern to some people in relation to heritage matters.

There have been other prominent heritage advocates, however, who have advocated that in this case, as I think Professor Warren Jones has noted, health trumps heritage in this regard. That is the difficult balance the government has arrived at, and we have made no secret about that.

Mrs HURN: How does the minister respond to the views of the Heritage Council?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think we are being clear in terms of we will be going through a process in relation to the heritage on the site and working with the Heritage Council and other bodies in terms of how we can undertake a process of preserving as many of the stories and history of those buildings on the site as is possible.

This is work that is being worked through with the Department for Environment and Water, their heritage branch. This will be undertaken. We are looking at a number of examples around the world where these sorts of projects have had to be taken, where photographs and histories will be undertaken of those heritage aspects.

Mrs HURN: As a supplementary, when you refer to preserving the buildings, you are referring to the stories, presumably, and not to preserving the actual buildings, or is there a view in place that that is something that is possible through the process you have referred to? Also, I wonder whether the process that has been undertaken by the department, whether there is a view to table that document or the findings of that so that the people of South Australia can see it.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I will check *Hansard*, but I do not believe my language was as I was quoted by the member for Schubert. Certainly, I was not referring to the buildings themselves but preserving the stories, taking photographs of them, visual and audio collections of that material to enable that to be preserved. We are looking at examples where that has been done, where there have had to be buildings of heritage value that are removed around the world. We will be certainly working with the heritage branch in relation to how that can best be done in South Australia.

In relation to the release of any documents in relation to that, I believe that work is still underway, but I suspect that we will be making notifications about that with the Heritage Council over time as the project develops.

Mrs HURN: Just to be clear, I was not quoting you, I was just seeking clarification as to whether you were referring to preserving the buildings in their structural form or also seeking to preserve the stories, so thank you for confirming that it is about preserving the stories and not the buildings.

Mr TEAGUE: I just want to take up this question of the attitude of the South Australian Heritage Council. The South Australian Heritage Council wrote to the Deputy Premier by letter dated 13 October 2022. I think it has been referred and accurately so that that letter is available publicly. It is published on the state Heritage Council's website. That having been said, I have a degree of sympathy for the Minister for Health in looking to do his best to field questions about the subject matter of the letter. It is not within his portfolio area and I appreciate the fact that he has adverted to his awareness of it.

There are a number of pertinent matters that are the subject of the letter, to the extent it might be appropriate that I refer to it at some length. It is a letter that is addressed to the Deputy Premier from the Chair of the South Australian Heritage Council, Keith Conlon. The subject matter of the letter is the requested report on the decision to demolish the Thebarton Police Barracks.

Necessarily so, in the course of the second reading debate—perhaps it would not be so necessary in ordinary circumstances—in the circumstances of the egregious contribution of the Minister for Planning on 28 September in this place, in response to a government question, I might add, mischaracterising, as he did, the decision that I made on 16 December last year in relation to the status of those buildings, that contribution is found commencing on page 1693, 1694 and 1695 of *Hansard*.

For completeness, my personal explanation setting the record straight in about the most succinct way possible is at pages 1700 and 1701 of the same date. Given that that planning decision in December last year not only provided for the re-use of those buildings in accord with their state heritage character and preservation of both the buildings and their heritage character in the course of any re-use within the health precinct, but so far from any change of use—that is, through the departure of the police—was that from contemplation that there was, in fact, no provision, no plan and no action undertaken by police or government either in the lead-up, in the immediate aftermath or as late as the approach to the election to provide for any move.

In other words, there was not going to be any change or threat to the buildings consequent on the planning decision—in fact, the opposite for the long term—and in the short term, in terms of the anticipated eventual move of police and the horses away from that place, there was no planning or provision for doing so. I have spelt that out as abundantly clearly as I think I am able.

In those circumstances, when the South Australian Heritage Council is writing to the Deputy Premier, the now minister responsible for heritage, it should not be surprising that the South Australian Heritage Council in October is expressing a novel view about the threat that is imposed to those state heritage buildings, the result of this legislation. So let's be super clear about it. At page 2 of the letter, moreover, the state Heritage Council says:

Demolition of State Heritage Places has been extremely rare. No Government, as far as we are aware, has demolished a confirmed State Heritage Place in its entirety before, let alone a whole precinct. Heritage protection law has been upheld for more than four decades in this State.

It is a matter that has been adverted to by others over the journey, including as recently as this morning when Chris Sumner provided a 50-year overview of the circumstances in which we find ourselves and the context of those four decades to which Keith Conlon refers at page 2 of the letter. The council goes on to say that the council is extremely concerned about the precedent this government's decision sets for the future. So it is concerned in the specific and it is concerned about the precedent that this sets for the future.

The council then goes on to say that there are some particular things that need to be considered, and in a thoroughgoing way; it is the perfect thing for a committee of review to consider at the very least, in my view. They are under two headings, and I will seek the minister's indication that these will be done—firstly, capturing the heritage to which the member for Schubert, the shadow minister, has referred to just now, and I quote:

In the event of special legislation being passed by Parliament to allow demolition of the Thebarton Police Barracks precinct—

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Point of order.

The CHAIR: There is a point of order. I need to deal with the point of order.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am wondering if you could rule, sir, on whether the member for Heysen may well have strayed from the topic of the discussion of the title of the bill in relation to these very detailed comments in relation to heritage that perhaps may be dealt with later in the debate.

The CHAIR: I do not know. It has been the practice to allow some latitude on this matter. I am aware that the member only has nine minutes left to speak. I will let him ask his questions but I just remind members that repetition is not something which is allowed, so they cannot ask the same questions under different clauses.

Mr TEAGUE: I will quote from the beginning of the paragraph for the benefit of *Hansard*; it need not be repeated. I quote:

In the event of special legislation being passed by Parliament to allow demolition of the Thebarton Police Barracks precinct, the Council strongly recommends the full site should be recorded in perpetuity. This will involve a range of techniques and processes. Further details of such preservation are included in Attachment 1.

I will not read that in its entirety. That is No. 1, minister. No. 2, is archaeological investigations, and I quote:

Council also recommends the archaeological investigations apply to all areas within and adjacent to the Thebarton Police Barracks precinct where the ground will be disturbed or excavated to enable the construction of the new WCH.

Given the history of this part of the Adelaide Park Lands there are reasonable grounds to suspect that archaeological artefacts of heritage significance are likely to be found.

Can the minister guarantee that both of those exercises will be done?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I thank the member for reading out the letter, which obviously will be a help to the member for Flinders, who said he did not have access to the letter earlier.

Mr Telfer: Very useful.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Very useful, the member for Flinders says. As I said earlier, that has been under consideration as we consider how we work through the process of being able to retain the stories and heritage values through photography, through audiovisual means, as well as considering the other issues that have been raised by the Heritage Council in relation to consideration of the development of the hospital.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

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

In committee.

(Continued from 2 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 relevant ministers on their feet. All questions must be directly—and I repeat 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 Minister for Education and the member for Morialta. Member for Morialta, would you like to get the ball rolling?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the minister for having the foresight and wisdom to invite Mr Coltman to the chamber first. I will take his lead and start with a couple of questions in relation to TAFE SA.

Pages 509 and 510 talk about the whole-of-government agreement in relation to the facilities management framework. I understand that TAFE at the time of the audit was still operating under the interim arrangements put in place last year, and the Auditor-General reports that there is one more remaining matter of concern in relation to the new MoAA and that it continues to work with DIT to resolve it. Can the minister advise if that has been resolved, what the issue was and explain what the challenge here is and is it resolved?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am told, although I do not have the detail of what the issue was here, that it has been resolved. I am happy to come back to you with what the issue that has been resolved was, if that is okay.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for taking that question on notice. I look forward to the response in due course. Still on page 110, and I am fairly sure that this is picking up from some questions I asked in 2017 and that the minister may have asked himself once or twice, are we any closer to resolving this issue around hourly paid instructors continuing to start work without signing a letter of offer? As far as I can tell, TAFE's records have indicated increasing percentages every year, an improvement. Does the minister care to wager on whether it will reach 100 per cent in his term?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I do have some information about hourly paid instructors. The member is right: it has been a topic of questions in this forum and estimates for many years. Mr Coltman has advised me that TAFE SA is now exploring a time and attendance system that will ensure that hourly paid instructors cannot commence work until a signed agreement is in place. It is expected that the system will be fully implemented by the end of the financial year 2023.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can the minister shed any light on what is described by the Auditor-General as noncomplying managers, that TAFE SA has had to advise that it will have no tolerance for those contracts? How widespread is this problem? Is it a handful of people? Is it somebody? Is it more widespread than that?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am happy to give some information on that. I have stats in front of me around compliance. Pleasingly, in 2019-20 compliance was at 74; in 2020-21, compliance was 94; and in 2021-22 compliance was at 96 per cent. That is 1,035 out of 1,075 contracts signed before commencing work. Mr Coltman advises me that he believes—and this is not necessarily a completely accurate figure but to the best of his recollection—it is about six instances in the past 12 months.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: It sounds like significant improvement. Congratulations. I will take us to page 515. I want to unpack a little bit of the training hours issues. The Auditor-General identifies a level of flexibility that TAFE has in relation to the MoAA. Do these training hours include training done in correctional facilities, in our prisons?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am told it does.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Does TAFE continue to offer that program in our prisons?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Yes, they do.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Has TAFE been able to extract any funding from any other source of government to deliver this program in our prisons?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am told that TAFE continues to use the allocated funding that comes through Skilling SA to provide that training in our correctional facilities.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Is the government committed to continuing this important work?

The CHAIR: The member for Morialta knows where he is going.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thought you would appreciate this being asked, sir.

The CHAIR: The minister can respond or not.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Yes.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will move to page 519, which has a fair bit of description about the Bolder Future for TAFE SA plan, which I think was introduced in the first half of 2021, so in the 2020-21 financial year. It describes the seven program areas for significant work and priority for TAFE SA as approved by the board. I note the Auditor-General talks about progress being regularly reported to the TAFE SA Board. I also note the government has announced a review. Let me ask a question in a different way to ensure that the Chair is happy. Can I ask: does this Bolder Future for TAFE SA, as set out on page 519, still comprise the strategic direction for TAFE as of now?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am advised, member for Morialta, that the government is going to continue to deliver the initiatives and vision set out under A Bolder Future for TAFE while it considers this government's priorities, and in at least some way of course that will be informed by the road map that is being put together by Jeannie Rea.

We are expecting that to be not too far away. Jeannie is going to do a pretty quick piece of work around that, and we will see what is recommended and what comes out of that road map, and that will inform our future direction. However, insofar as what is being delivered now, yes, A Bolder Future for TAFE is still being delivered.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I ask either a supplementary or a question of clarification? With respect to the road map work you are talking about, and I think you identified an individual's name, there was a public announcement that there will be a task force or a working party of some description and a number of people apparently involved in that group. Are we talking about the same thing?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Yes, we are.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Do we have a list of the people involved in that working party or task force preparing that road map?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Not in front of me, but I am happy to take that on notice and get that to you.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Have there been any adjustments to the items listed, programs 1 to 7, and the actions to be undertaken in this since the election?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: As a point of clarification, member for Morialta, page 519, the seven programs? We continue to deliver against the objectives of the seven programs listed on page 519.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Within those seven programs, has the government at any point directed TAFE to change any of its measures they are undertaking to deliver against those seven programs?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The answer is no.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: We might move to the Department for Education. I would not go too far, as there is a chance we may come back. In relation to page 82, the Auditor-General talks

about gaps in asset information, and in particular information on the condition of individual school buildings and facilities. Does the Department for Education have any lists of building ages and conditions of those buildings? It obviously does not meet the definition the Auditor-General describes as 'did not maintain information on the condition of individual school buildings and facilities', but I would be surprised if there were not some sort of list. Can the minister advise?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: To clarify, your question is whether or not the department keeps a list of that infrastructure or those buildings that might have been identified on page 82 under 'Gaps in asset information'?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: On page 82, the third dot point is the provocation for my question. I am wondering what sort of register there is identifying the age of all the fleet of buildings within the education department on all the different sites?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: In 2022-23, the new facility management service provider, which of course, as you know, is Ventia, will develop an asset information strategy in collaboration with agencies participating, which will be supported by asset information tailored to reflect the needs and unique requirements of individual departments. For example, for this department this information will include asset condition. It will include a useful lives for buildings, as well as improvements and furnishings.

The department's Strategic Asset Management Framework will reflect the anticipated availability of enhanced asset information data. I might just add—and this will come as no surprise to the member for Morialta because I think he heard me give about four speeches last week where I said the same thing; in fact, he may have helped me out with a couple of answers in those speeches—that I think 44 years is the average age. Even with all the work that has been done in terms of capital upgrades for a prolonged period of time, that is still the average age of a building.

A lot of the conversations I have had with Professor Westwell and Mr Bernardi have been around making sure that asset management plan is up to date and having a long-term plan for how we maintain existing stock and I guess build new stock as well. This year in terms of the gaps in asset information identified by the Auditor-General, that will be an important part of that long-term vision for us.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the minister for that answer and obviously the work that Ventia will be doing in developing this coming off of a base of zero information being available. The minister identified an average age of 44 years, so I guess what I am seeking to establish is whether there is an existing register, much as it might not meet the standards the Auditor-General would like to see. Is there an existing register and can the minister advise us what it is called?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I will take that on notice, member for Morialta, and come back to you with an answer, if I may.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Just above that, it talks about Education's 20-year infrastructure plan and identifies that a draft plan was presented to the senior executive group in July and was expected to be completed by the end of September. Can I ask if that has taken place?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The member for Morialta's information is correct. The department's 20-year infrastructure plan was presented to the department's senior executive group on 21 July this year. Feedback, which included updated enrolment projections, is currently being incorporated into that plan. The latest advice I have is that it is anticipated that the 20-year infrastructure plan will be completed by the end of November this year.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Is that plan intended to be analysed and considered by Infrastructure South Australia or only outcomes of the plan that ultimately result in infrastructure projects worth over a certain dollar amount?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am advised, member for Morialta, that the department will work closely with Infrastructure SA on the implementation of that plan.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I turn to pages 84 and 85 and in particular the reference that starts on the bottom of page 84 towards the employee performance development plans being overdue. Certainly I make no criticism of issues that resulted because of COVID. The

Auditor-General has recognised that COVID had an impact on that. The Auditor-General reports Education as saying it was developing a performance development framework for teachers in 2022 for implementation in the 2023 school year. Can the minister confirm how that framework will operate?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I can, thank you, member for Morialta. You are correct. The Auditor-General found that 39 per cent of the department's employee PDPs were overdue as of 30 June this year, whilst also acknowledging the department had fewer overdue performance development plans at that date, 30 June. I think the exact total was 11,991, compared with 12,264 on 28 February the year before.

The department has implemented several strategies over previous years that have resulted in an improvement in that overdue PDP figure, including a biannual campaign, where all employees are expected to have a current PDP as at 31 May and 30 November each year. During the six weeks leading up to both those dates, the department implements a communication campaign to promote bringing PDPs up to date. The biannual PDP planning cycle had been effective in reducing overdue PDPs.

As the member for Morialta pointed out, COVID and the Omicron variant impacted the workforce, as you would expect, leading to staff shortages and increased absenteeism across terms 1, 2 and 3 of this year. Fortunately, we are seeing those levels of absenteeism dropping, which is fantastic news. To reduce the pressure on all sites, all non-teaching activities and non-essential communications were placed on hold to allow sites to focus on managing the impacts of the pandemic. I think that was the wise and prudent thing to do.

Normal communications, including these PDP reminders that I mentioned just before, are going to be resumed when it is appropriate. I do not have a date about when that will be, but I would imagine—given the figures that we are seeing coming through on a daily basis in terms of the number of people in the system who have COVID, or might be absent because of it—that should not be too far away.

To further support effectiveness in schools and preschools, the department is developing a performance and development framework for teachers to clearly articulate the connection between developing individual practice, school improvement, and performance and development processes that anticipated this framework would be completed this year ready for implementation next year.

All communications were reintroduced in term 4, week 2. That is an answer to an earlier question about communications being restarted. That just commenced last week, if that is correct. The communication plan reflects the process used in late 2021 before it was put on hold.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The page before that mentions that the classroom and student support workforce plan was in the design phase. This is in relation to the broader workforce planning the education department has been doing in the last couple of years. I note that the department earlier this year already released its Educational Leaders and Teachers Workforce Plan. Can I just clarify: in relation to the classroom and student support workforce plan, are we here just talking about SSOs who operate in classrooms and potentially disability settings or is this a broader group of staff? Are we able to identify how many staff that part of the plan is going to be applying to?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am advised the bulk will be SSOs, but I am happy to come back to you in terms of other staff who might be included and a more precise figure in terms of how many it might be.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Turning to page 89, the Auditor-General reports that the rate of major capital works will decrease over the next few years, with the most significant upcoming projects being the new Morialta Secondary College and additional accommodation for the Adelaide Botanic High School. Can the minister advise whether the department will be putting forward new schools in Mount Barker or the northern suburbs of Adelaide?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am happy to advise the member for Morialta that we are in discussions, basically now, on the exact issues you have identified. In fact, the chief executive and I have spoken publicly already since March—and this will come as no surprise to the member—about the areas that have been identified as having really significant enrolment pressure, including

Mount Barker and the northern suburbs, so we are looking at that. I hope to have some more to say about that in the not too distant future, but they are under active consideration at the moment is the way that I would put it.

I think anyone who has spent some time in either of those areas, or is aware of population growth and enrolment pressure there, would understand that the two areas identified by the member there are in need of the attention and focus of the government.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I ask whether that also extends to the Adelaide CBD past the third tower at Adelaide Botanic?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I might ask you to clarify, if I can. I assume your question is: with the exception of the 700-place expansion of Adelaide Botanic High School, do we have any other plans for expansion of space within the shared zone? At this stage, we do not, but I would say that is also one we are keeping a very close watch on.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am sure you are, thank you. Can I turn back to page 71, which provides some of the more general commentary. The Auditor-General refers to a figure of \$364 million, and I have seen different reportings of how much has been identified in each year. I wonder if the minister is able to provide—on notice, if he likes—a breakdown of the year-by-year investment over the last few years that correlates to that \$364 million. Depending on which financial papers you look at, it presents figures in different ways, so I want to make sure I can compare some apples with apples.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Thank you to the member for Morialta for that question. I have a bit of background information I can provide, and then I think I will need to take on notice a more extensive list of what those projects that make up the \$364 million are. I can tell you that the \$364 million of construction works that are noted in the significant events and transactions section of the report refers to continuing or new construction works in progress across sites.

There are a number of capital works projects that are still being progressed by the department. This will come as no surprise to the member, but they include sustainable enrolment growth programs associated with round 3 works schools, the Morialta Secondary College major works that are taking place right now, other major and minor works at 36 schools, and demountable and modular building works at six schools. However, I will take your question on notice in terms of trying to provide you with a more extensive list of what else makes up the \$364 million, if I may.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. I have a question in relation to the funding that comes, and is identified on page 71, from the commonwealth: \$691 million in income and \$1.3 billion in income in relation to administered items. It may well be that the transfer payments of \$1.6 billion take care of some of this as well, but I want to clarify exactly how much of this is the transfer of funds under the National School Reform Agreement, known as the Gonski funding.

Presumably, a lot of that \$691 million is Gonski funding for public schools and a lot of the \$1.3 billion is Gonski funding for non-government schools. Presumably, a fair amount of it is funding under the National Preschool Agreement, which I would assume is mostly accounted for at the top, but potentially it could be under administered items. I assume that some is in relation to chaplaincy. My question is: are there any other categories of funding where we are getting money from the commonwealth in any of these lines, and can the minister identify how much in each of them are the relevant figures?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I have some information for you, member for Morialta, and that is I am advised that on page 18 of the department's financial statements, at 2.2—which is a list of what makes up the \$691 million, which is from that top line item from page 71 to which your question referred—there are about 14 or so line items there that come to a total of \$691,283,000. They include things like the National School Reform Agreement, as was pointed out, and that is the bulk of that \$691 million.

There is also the Preschool Reform Agreement; the National School Chaplaincy Program, which you also identified; the Rural Care Worker Program; Connected Beginnings; the Community Childcare Fund; the Indigenous Advancement Strategy; and detainee minors. The other items included are the Australian Early Development Index; Inspiring Aus Science; JobKeeper; National

partnership—advanced technology, although I think in the 2022 year there was nothing under that from what I can see here. The SA Aboriginal Sports Training Academy, or SAASTA, is the last line item there. Collectively, those items come to the \$691 million identified under commonwealth income on page 71 of the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Are you able to take on notice the other lines that are not referred to in that \$690 million?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am happy to do so.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will ask one last question, if I may. Page 71 talks about the education department continuing to roll out its education management system. Given that I spent four years hoping to blaze a trail that a major IT reform within a department would work, can the minister tell us how that is going and where it is up to?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I think I can say very broadly that it is progressing well, but I think I might take that on notice and get you a more detailed answer about where we are up to in terms of actual rollout and volumes, if that would suffice.

The CHAIR: That concludes that part of the examination. Now I think we have the change of ministers. Minister Bettison, I understand, we have next. Can you invite your advisers over?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Which portfolio would you like to start with?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I think the Tourism Commission perhaps.

The CHAIR: I remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions have to be asked by members on their feet, and all responses to questions also have to be answered by ministers on their feet. 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. Welcome, minister. Welcome, member for Morialta. We can now start.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I take us to page 442? Talking about functions, we are attracting, developing, owning and supporting major and strategic tourism events. Indeed, there are some other functions before; ensuring a coordinated approach to promoting South Australia is one of them. Is the major events fund not in this portfolio? Is that the case and, if so, why?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: You are actually referencing 2021-22. There was no reference to the Tourism Commission by the Auditor-General about the major events fund. It is under the responsibility of the Premier.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Yes, and the question was in supplementary to that answer: why?

The CHAIR: The Auditor-General did not ask that question and did not involve himself in that question. Member, next question.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Can I ask for clarification, sir? Am I allowed to ask a supplementary in relation to information provided by a minister in an answer?

The CHAIR: It does not have to be a supplementary. You can ask it as a question, but the question still has to be within the guidelines for the examination of the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will take your wisdom, sir. Can I ask then in relation to ensuring a coordinated approach to promoting South Australia, which was identified certainly by the Auditor-General as the functional responsibility of the South Australian Tourism Commission, does that remain one of the functional responsibilities of the South Australian Tourism Commission?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Your specific thing is about coordinating an approach, a coordinated approach?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Yes.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: One of the key things for the SA Tourism Commission, which remains and has remained whether it be 2021 or 2022 or now, is particularly our focus around destination marketing. That has always been a key part that we have done and that remains a key

coordinated focus of the SATC, as it did in the year that we refer to with the Auditor-General. That coordinated approach is about how we market ourselves to the world, and that has not changed. In fact, although I do not wish to speak about 2022-23, it was raised with us that it needed more support and that was soon to be there.

In May 2021, the domestic advertising campaign A Little More was launched in South Australia and key interstate markets. Of course, that was such a difficult time for us because we were facing border closures, the international market had ceased at that point, so we really needed to focus on South Australians enjoying their own backyard. That was a very coordinated approach, even if I spoke from opposition. I think we saw South Australians enjoying their backyard for the first time, realising how much we had to offer and then, when those interstate opportunities came, that marketing campaign went out there as well. So it was a very coordinated approach and we will continue to lead that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Given that coordinated approach across the whole of government, has the SA Tourism Commission, or indeed the minister, provided any briefing to the member for Mawson in his work promoting South Australia to the world on behalf of the government in the 2021-22 financial year or any other?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The Auditor-General made no reference to this in focusing on 2021-22.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The Auditor-General did, I submit, minister, make reference to the responsibility of the Tourism Commission in the minister's portfolio about having a coordinated approach to promoting South Australia. I am seeking to establish if that has taken place.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: On what dates was that briefing provided to the member for Mawson?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: My answer is yes to a coordinated approach, but there is no reference here to 2021-22 and no reference to the member for Mawson here. The coordinated approach as Destination Development continues and will continue as it did in 2021-22.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The coordinated approach in 2021-22, did that reference major events?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: When I think about a coordinated approach, I think specifically around marketing and how we market our state to South Australians, interstate and, of course, internationally, and that is what was done and what continues to be done. The Auditor-General made no reflection on this except to say that was the role of SATC, and that continues to be the role of SATC.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I turn the minister's attention to the next line, which is on the first line of page 442, where the Auditor-General identifies part of the Tourism Commission's role as being 'attracting, developing, owning and supporting major and strategic tourism events'. Is that no longer the role of the Tourism Commission?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The Tourism Commission still plays an incredibly strong role in this area. In fact, we are very excited about the Santos Tour Down Under coming back in its traditional format. Of course, we recognise in the year that we are talking about, 2021-22, there was a lot of leadership that was required to do what I called the Festival of Cycling, if I recall accurately.

When we look at some of those areas we took leadership in, Tasting Australia is one of the key things that was produced in South Australia that we own. That was an exceptional year. When I look at April 2022, the very high-end opportunities that came out—such as Tasting Australia Eyre, which was supported by RAA Travel; if I recall accurately—they were sold out. That went off to six or so different destinations, and 150 local businesses were utilised, and there was the Town Square Kitchen as well.

Just next week, we have the Christmas Pageant. For two years, it was a ticketed event at the Adelaide Oval to deal with COVID. These are the events we continue, and that is not to

underestimate all the other events we sponsor, whether it be WOMAD or the Adelaide International. The role of SATC in managing events is still incredibly strong, and that is a key part of what we have done in 2021-22. I see that we will continue to do that in the future. SATC is still the lead here. We have incredible talent and incredible depth for managing those events. South Australians love these events and will continue to do so.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Is the minister able to provide a list of the events that are referenced in this dot point, the events that are described by the minister as 'owned by the state government', but I stand to be mistaken, certainly the ones that are identified as major and strategic tourism events by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I did detail the significant ones, but I am happy to take that on notice to provide that detail.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can the minister identify if any of those events are no longer to be considered under the domain of the SA Tourism Commission or indeed the tourism portfolio going forward?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I think those questions would have been best asked of the Premier, and he was on yesterday.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I ask about the next dot point, developing tourism resources to maintain and preserve South Australia's environmental and cultural heritage. Is the minister able to reflect a bit on what that cultural heritage is in relation to the tourism offering that we are able to provide to the world?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Just last week, I held an amazing dinner with leaders from our Aboriginal community. When we think about our Indigenous cultural heritage, that continues. As far as what happened in 2021-22, I could not talk about it at this point. Obviously, the member for Dunstan, the former Premier, was the Minister for Tourism.

We recently held a national Tourism Ministers' Meeting here. I was happy to co-host it with the federal Minister for Trade and Tourism. If there is one thing that I see as our absolutely unique selling point in Australia is having the longest living culture on earth. I am very interested in how we can support our Indigenous tourism operators. Recently, there was an event at the Circle at Lot Fourteen. They have been supporting Aboriginal businesses to establish and develop. I am very keen to keep talking with them and seeing how they can work in supporting the tourism industry.

The Tourism Industry Council of SA has indicated interest in providing support for an Indigenous tourism operators' alliance. We have been quite influenced by what has happened in Western Australia. We are seen to be the leaders in this field. We are really keen to walk alongside people as they establish their businesses. When we talk about culture, what I hear from people is authenticity and Aboriginal people telling their own stories that are incredibly important to them. How do we make sure that we are supporting Indigenous corporations?

We are currently working on an Aboriginal tourism strategy. It has been in development for some time. Personally, I am interested in very practical support for people as they build their businesses. The Living Kurna Cultural Centre people came to see us. We know that when people come off cruise ships they are very interested in what they can see here, so that cultural heritage continues. Apart from the development strategy that started last financial year, that is the key part here.

One of the other key things is that, as part of the Public Service, the South Australian Tourism Commission is committed to the goals of the South Australian public sector to increase employment of Aboriginal people across the sector. As at 30 June 2022, one full-time equivalent person is identified as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. That is obviously something I am keen to increase as we continue to talk to people. There is a reconciliation plan the SATC looks at. This is something incredibly important to us and very unique to Australia, but it needs support, and we will be looking to do that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I take us to the next page. It states that income sponsorship and participation income declined by \$1.6 million, 30 per cent. Is the minister able to identify whether we expect this income will recover in the future or in the current financial year?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am advised that COVID had a massive impact on those events. Recovery is going well and we expect it will bounce back to what it has traditionally been. Let me take this opportunity to recognise that we are still building back post-COVID for tourism. Things are looking really good. We are at 6.2 billion; we had reached a high of 8.1. Just this week, we welcomed in the cruise ships—104 visits are due this year—but we still have some way to go.

One of the key things is that, as much as I have gone out there very positively, we saw some build-up last financial year, some positives from a low of 4.4 billion, but there is some way to go. A lot of people have exited the industry and we have to encourage them back. As we go out with events and sponsorships, which you will see reflected here, I think we will see people come back to the industry.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I take us back to page 441, and in particular the second dot point, which refers to the significant events and transactions that the Tourism Commission managed, the seventh and eighth instalments of the \$10 million Great State Voucher program. This scheme will not be renewed in 2022-23 according to the Auditor-General. I have a couple of questions on this one, so I will ask them one at a time. Is the minister able to outline the total value that the Great State Voucher scheme injected into the South Australian economy and flowed into the pockets of tourism operators and businesses?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: There were eight rounds of the Great State Voucher. As I recall, sitting on your side of the house, we were a very big supporter of this. In fact, it was an incredibly important scheme. I was really pleased to advocate to include not just accommodation but also experiences. I continue to meet people as I go out and about as Minister for Tourism who say that having the experiences as part of the Great State Voucher was incredibly important and saved their business.

We saw that the consumer spend for the Great State Vouchers was \$148.6 million. That is over the eight rounds. That was over more than one financial year. I would have to come back with the specifics for 2021-22. It was really important. However, I did find rounds 7 and 8 quite interesting and what that looked like. Obviously, that was right at the end, just before the election. While obviously that was then seen with some positivity around accommodation and bookings, it was a little bit different in the way it was funded, which is really interesting as minister now.

We saw that there was a deficit then of a net result, and that deficit was \$10.5 million. That was with respect to rounds 7 and 8 of those Great State Vouchers. That is a budgeted deficit that was approved by the Department of Treasury and Finance. If I recall, it was not allocated at all: it was from existing cash reserves. It was quite interesting that that decision was made. It was not an appropriation: it was from existing cash reserves, which has led to this net result with a deficit to us.

There is no doubt at all that those Great State Vouchers were really important. You can look at the money, but what was important—and I have heard this again and again—was that it reminded South Australians that tourism and hospitality were doing it tougher and continue to do it tough. That recognition and having those vouchers reminded people that they needed their support, particularly when JobKeeper ended. That was devastating for tourism and hospitality. Many businesses in South Australia did well out of COVID, but there is a group that really did it hard and that was tourism and hospitality, and they continued to do it hard for quite some time.

Those Great State Vouchers helped, and the return on investment was 5.9:1, so they worked quite well. It was really important to me that they reminded South Australians that tourism and hospitality still needed their support.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the answer and confirmation of the significant positive benefit of the program. I am interested in the comments you made about the budgeted deficit that Treasury approved in relation to the provision of rounds seven and eight. Is the minister expressing a concern about the government decision to provide rounds seven and eight, or

can I confirm that the minister is supportive of the program as it was rolled out across the years that it was in existence?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am just simply making note of it.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The minister became minister obviously in March this year, so for several months of the financial year under the report she was the minister. Did the minister have feedback from tourism operators since she has been the minister prior to 30 June this year about the program and how it went?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes, I have already elaborated.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can the minister advise the house why she cut the program then?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: On coming to government we were very clear that the Great State Vouchers were there to stimulate the economy. It was incredibly important at a time when tourism and hospitality were doing it tough. What we needed to do was pivot, something tourism businesses had to do a lot of.

We need to direct that support towards marketing. We made it very clear in the election policy that that is where the direction was going to go. I think what we have seen is that we have done well. The TF data said the CBD was the most active of all states in July of this year so I stand by that decision. That decision was important to make, but I recognise that the Great State Vouchers played a significant role. I recognise that, but now we are focusing on marketing.

We know that it is going to be competitive and if there is anything that I have found from my Tourism Ministers' Meeting is that all of us cannot wait to have more visitors come into our states. We need to make sure that we have that focus now on selling South Australia to the other states, to the world. We are getting back to what was normal and that is going to take focus and we are prepared and focused on that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the minister. As a supplementary to that last question, prior to the return to what is normal, have tourism operators—potentially in the financial year that the Auditor-General's Report is limited to—raised with the minister any desire to shut down the Great State Voucher program?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I had many, many conversations with people prior to becoming the minister and since becoming the minister and many of them are very keen for us to go back out and support and to market who we are. They recognise the role that they played. I do not recall any particular conversations that I have had where people have asked for the vouchers to go back. The only people I have seen who asked were the opposition. We then came out with great results in the CBD and the highest hotel occupancy we have had for some time, whether it be regional or CBD.

They played their role and I recognise that, but now we are onto a new thing. It was very much a short-term stimulus to support an unprecedented event—a global pandemic—and that was very clear. I guess what I hear more and more from tourism operators is they are ready. They are excited and they really enjoyed having South Australians come and enjoy the regions.

They have seen the interstate guests come where we had great events like the rugby, where we had 8,000 people from interstate. We have the cricket on at the moment, and 40 per cent of the tickets are from interstate and overseas. They just want to get back to business as it is. They recognised that the vouchers played a role but, really, they want to make sure that we are getting out there and selling South Australia.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The next line talks about the \$20 million Tourism Industry Development Fund. Can the minister outline the total visitor expenditure that has been generated by this fund?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The Tourism Industry Development Fund was fully allocated in early 2022, with 114 projects receiving funding across all 11 tourism regions. It did take some time, longer than people expected, for those tourism projects to run out. We know construction costs have

gone up. We know that sometimes it has been hard to get people in to finish those construction projects.

The project was of the value of \$82.7 million and, of the last financial year, 62 of those 114 projects were completed or near completion. Those projects roll out and we will be talking about the fund this time next year. Once again, we are looking at a stimulus that was provided due to the global pandemic of COVID. I think that we have seen that continue to roll out and that will be of benefit for the future.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I think the minister identified that there were 114 projects. How many of those projects have now been completed?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Are you talking about 2021-22? I answered that question.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: That was in the comments before? So is that 62 overall, or 62 that were completed in that financial year noting that the funding was all provided before the end of June?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Sixty-two out of the 114 projects were completed or near completion on 30 June 2022. If I remember correctly, 61 of those 62 projects were funded in 2021-22 and one was funded in 2020-21. We would expect the completion of those this financial year.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am going to ask one or two more questions in this area, and then we might find a little bit of time for our friends from DPC. Page 442 states that the findings of the audit were communicated in a management letter to the chief executive. Can the minister confirm whether we are talking about the old chief executive, the interim chief executive or the new chief executive; to whom was that letter sent?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am really glad you mentioned our incoming chief executive. What an exciting announcement just recently. Emma Terry will be joining us in the second week of January, coming as the executive director of marketing from Tourism Tasmania. I am very excited about that appointment, but I cannot say that without recognising what a wonderful acting CEO Stephanie Rozokos has been. I really appreciate her advice and the steady roll of the ship as we await our new CEO. As I understand it, on 30 June 2022, Rodney Harrex was the CEO.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can the minister identify why Mr Harrex ceased to be the CEO?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I do not see any reference to that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Given the time, we will move to multicultural affairs. I am sure we could have spent five minutes talking about that, but let's not. I think page 339 is probably the best reference. Can I confirm with the minister, as the advisers are changing over, the multicultural grants in this area. Is this the line through which funding to community language schools is being delivered?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As this relates to 2021-22, at the moment I can go through our current grant program for 2021-22, which is Advance Together. It is supporting multicultural organisations to improve their governance and strengthen their capacity—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sorry, the question is in relation to community language schools. If this is not the budget line, then I might suggest a different budget line, maybe page 71. Is the minister able to identify if she is responsible for the delivery of the community language schools funding that in 2021-22 appears to have come from the Department for Education?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In 2021-22, that is correct. Perhaps I could clarify that that funding will continue to come from the education department, the additional funding as announced in the election policy, and in fact the key part of the multicultural policy that we put out. It is so disappointing to see that the opposition did not put out a multicultural policy at all. Actually, it was raised with me, and continues to be raised with me quite often, that one-quarter—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: relevance to the question, sir.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Minister, there is a point of order. Relevance?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Relevance to the question, sir.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): I think the minister is providing some context. This is a relaxed atmosphere. She can answer in any way she sees fit within the bounds of the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As announced, one-quarter, \$4 million over four years of the additional funding for multicultural affairs, will be directed to the community language schools. However, the education department will remain the key funder of this sector, and that relationship will continue.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: To confirm, is that \$4 million the responsibility of the Minister for Education?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: No.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Is that \$4 million part of DPC or Education?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: DPC.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: And then provided to Education in the form of grants, or through Education from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, to the community language schools association, to the school? Can the minister explain?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Looking through a multicultural lens at community language schools, a challenge we had which was raised with me—and I would suggest perhaps raised with you, member for Morialta—was in relation to venue and locations; cost, access and funding; teachers; maintaining quality standards; student behavioural issues; accessibility to training; supporting who are mostly volunteers in these community language schools; increased costs due to COVID; sourcing materials, including books and IT and furniture; and, of course, the registration process. We have 98 community language schools here in South Australia, teaching 48 languages. Community Language Schools South Australia registers the schools and also provides training for people to go there.

There are also concerns around the registration process, which is quite complex and time intensive. There is also a drop-off in engagement of older students. These were issues that were raised. I recognise that the education department has done some great work, and under your leadership I understand the role with community language schools was something that was focused on, about how they could contribute. I also understand the way that they are funded and distributed has changed in recent years. We build on that and we look at what we can do.

I just announced recently the year 1 priorities. The first activity for community language schools in South Australia will be to develop and deliver a governance and compliance training package. The training package will include assistance for schools to develop a plan for their ongoing governance and ensure compliance with the legislative requirements for running community language schools in this state. I just announced that recently.

The second priority will be to increase staffing at Community Language Schools South Australia, to provide intensive case management and curriculum development for new and existing community language schools for an initial 12 months. The third element will be activity for Community Language Schools South Australia to deliver some of its face-to-face school personnel training workshops, teacher workshops and child safety workshops in the north of Adelaide. All training is currently provided at Hindmarsh and Goodwood. Relocating the training to the north of Adelaide will make it more accessible to a large proportion of the community language staff. That is just the start.

Obviously, I identified quite clearly that there are many different areas that could be improved. Having a multicultural lens on this is looking at how we can support people. We are talking about people who volunteer their time, often 40 weeks a year giving that commitment. We think being bilingual is important—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It's a start.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It's a start—that would be supported. I am really looking forward to announcing further support, and that will be rolling out shortly.

The CHAIR: Time for the examination of this section has now expired. We now move to the next minister and the next member of the opposition. 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 have to be asked by members on their feet. Equally, ministers giving a response need to be on their feet as well. 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. Minister and members of the opposition, we are ready to go.

Mr TELFER: Minister, thank you for your time. I refer to Report 8, Part C: Agency Audit Reports, page 17. There is a reference within that document to the transfer of the Office of Local Government from the Attorney-General's Department to the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. Can you let me know what has been the cost of that process?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Are you talking about the transfer from AGD to the Department for Infrastructure? That happened on 1 July this year. I am advised that that will be covered in the budget for next financial year, not up until 30 June of this particular year. It will be in next year's budget.

Mr TELFER: In Report 8, Part A: Executive Summary, pages 21 to 24 provide a commentary from the Auditor-General around, firstly, the processes for performance and local government audits, as well as some commentary around the necessary obligations on the Auditor-General, including budget obligations:

We have averaged five performance and local government audits over the past seven years...I believe we should be producing 11 performance audit reports annually across both public and local government sectors. This will bring us in line proportionately to what other audit offices are committing to...across other Australian jurisdictions.

The commentary states:

In the 2022-23 State Budget my Department is required to achieve efficiency dividend savings as follows:

- 2022-23 Budget—\$300,000
- 2023-24 Budget—\$317,000
- 2024-25 Budget—\$338,000
- 2025-26 Budget—\$537,000.

Does the minister believe the capacity of the Auditor-General's capability to perform appropriate local government audit work is diminished by these cuts?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have been advised that the funding for the Auditor-General's Department is funded through the Treasury department, so that should be a question for the Treasurer.

Mr TELFER: Could I just reiterate. My question was: do you as the local government minister believe that the important work that is done to audit local government entities through the work of the Auditor-General is undermined by the reduction, rather than an explanation about the reduction?

The CHAIR: The minister is only required to respond up to 30 June 2022, but you can go further if you wish.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that this relates to the next financial year and it will be relating back through to the budget coming forward for the next financial year. I do not think this is relevant to this particular period of time for the Auditor-General's Report. I do not want to be saying what my thoughts are. My information is that I should only be answering the stuff that is in the Auditor-General's Report itself, not what I think.

Mr TELFER: Indeed, I respect that. I have quoted directly from the report. I was asking for your perspective on that as the local government minister, not as the Treasurer specifically but as the local government minister.

The CHAIR: The minister has actually given his response. Do you have a new question, member for Flinders?

Mr TELFER: Yes, absolutely I do. I will refer you to Part C: Agency Audit Reports, page 539.

In 2021-22 grant deeds for 54 projects were executed—

through the Local Government Infrastructure Partnership Program—

though one grant deed was terminated by the council as it ceased the project due to construction and cost issues. Grant deeds for the remaining three projects were yet to be finalised as at 30 June 2022.

The question is: which deed was terminated, and by which council?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised—and I will read it out—that while the Auditor-General's Report notes that the Office of Local Government participated in the assessment of the projects submitted by councils for funding under the program, the delivery of the program was undertaken by the Department of Treasury and Finance, as then the Treasurer was responsible for that program, not the Office of Local Government.

Mr TELFER: So to clarify, you do not have the information on which deed was terminated, and by which council?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: No, I do not have that. That is a question you should be asking through the Department of Treasury and Finance, when the Treasurer has his opportunity under the Auditor-General.

Mr TELFER: Do you have any information on the three projects that remain outstanding as at 30 June?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that that is all managed by the Department of Treasury and Finance, and that is a question that needs to be asked to the Department of Treasury and Finance, to the Treasurer. They managed the whole lot and they would have all that information you require.

Mr TELFER: To clarify, the Local Government Infrastructure Partnership Program has no involvement from the Office of Local Government and the Minister for Local Government?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that the Office of Local Government was only involved with the evaluation of the projects. The management and all the projects were done and managed by the Department of Treasury and Finance.

Mr TELFER: To carry on a little bit from that, when there was a deed terminated by a council within the 2021-22 financial year, was that funding that was left remaining after the termination of the deed reallocated to any other project, and was the office involved in that reallocation?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I just want to repeat that I am advised that we were only there for the evaluation of the project. We were not involved with the management. All of that should be a question to the Treasurer, because it was handled fully from then on, after the evaluation, by the Department of Treasury and Finance.

Mr TELFER: I respect that, but the question was: was there any further evaluation that needed to be made on any project due to the termination of the project and thus funds becoming available?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that the Office of Local Government was only involved in the initial evaluation, and from then on it was all wholly managed by the Department of Treasury and Finance. Again, I just say to the member: that is something he should be asking the Treasurer when he comes in for the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr TELFER: What is the role of the local government minister in regard to the Local Government Finance Authority referred to in the agency financial statements included in the annual report?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The Local Government Finance Authority is operated in accordance with the Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983. This act is committed to the Treasurer, the Hon. Stephen Mullighan, and if any questions are asked regarding the Local Government Finance Authority report it is therefore recommended that we go back to the Treasurer because it is all managed under the Department of Treasury and Finance.

Mr PEDERICK: I reference page 302 of Part C of the Agency Audit Reports, which mentions there being a backlog of road maintenance work required. It states that—

The CHAIR: Are we on the Minister for Regional Roads now?

Mr PEDERICK: Yes. It states that 1,520 kilometres of regional sealed roads were in backlog in 2020, with this forecast to grow to 2,330 kilometres of backlog by 2025 if only minimum safety work was performed. What constitutes minimum safety work?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that the project you are talking about is called the 'point and patch'. The department looks at it and makes certain the road is safe, looking at any potholes there. Some shoulder sealing is done, and also we make certain that we fix it up as soon as we can, the potholes in particular. It is called the 'point and patch', and they just have to ensure that the road is safe, and they will then come back and do other work later on.

Mr PEDERICK: On the same page, it states that the rough order of magnitude (ROM) cost over four years of holding the backlog to 2020 levels was estimated at \$520 million, while the ROM cost over four years of eliminating the backlog was estimated at \$1.5 billion. What type of work would be required to eliminate the backlog of regional sealed roads?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that with regard to this backlog that includes culverts, they are aware that there is lots of maintenance to be done, etc., but this is an issue that really should be directed to the Minister for Infrastructure, who is Minister Koutsantonis. I would suggest that you put that to him when he comes to the Auditor-General's Report committee. The department is well aware there is a lot of backlog there, but, as I say, they are looking at culverts and so forth.

Mr PEDERICK: So you are telling me, minister, the Minister for Regional Roads is not responsible for the backlog of work on regional sealed roads; is that what you are telling me, sir?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: As the Minister for Regional Roads, I work closely with the Minister for Infrastructure. We have a lot of work to complete as we liaise with each other, but we feed all of the information we find and prioritise it and look at the funding on a priority basis, dependent on the budget we have for all the regional roads out there. It really is in cooperation and discussion between the Minister for Regional Roads and the Minister for Infrastructure.

Mr PEDERICK: So you are telling me, minister, that you are not responsible for any of these regional road programs?

The CHAIR: Can you just repeat your original question which led to the subsequent two questions for me, please?

Mr PEDERICK: My original question was: what type of work would be required to eliminate the backlog of regional sealed roads?

The CHAIR: Is the minister able to describe the nature of the work? You are only required to report up to 30 June 2022, but what is the nature of the work required?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The backlog of road maintenance has been building up over many years, as you would be aware, including when the opposition was in government. What we are trying to do is work our way through the prioritisation of that, looking for funding, etc. We can take that on notice and get more information back to you, as much as we can.

Mr PEDERICK: At the bottom of page 302, it says:

DIT also manages approximately 10,000 km of unsealed roads, of which 500 km was estimated to be in backlog with an estimated ROM cost of \$50 million.

My question, minister, is: is there any other work besides grading that would be required to eliminate the backlog of road maintenance on the 500 kilometres of unsealed road?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: For some of those roads out there, as you would be aware, the backlog has accumulated over many years. The condition of the road depends on each individual road. Some of it might be just new gravel required on it and may have to be graded down, but this backlog would also include culverts and other things. That is a very technical question, but we can

try to get more information and get that back to you. That is a technical question, and I will have to liaise with the Minister for Infrastructure on that one.

Mr PEDERICK: In reference to page 53 of Part A: Executive Summary, figure 9.2 shows the original budget and actual budget of numerous major project spends for 2021-22. Noting that the reason given for the lack of spending on the Strzelecki Track was rain events, can the minister advise the status of the project?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: As you would appreciate, there has been lots of rain up in the northern areas—lots and lots of rain up there. Basically there is a lot more work to be done on that. That is being analysed at the moment. We will get more information and get that back to you. Certainly it is a technical area and it is being impacted by lots of rain up in the outback areas, as you can understand, in the last 12 months.

Mr PEDERICK: On the same Auditor-General line, given only \$15 million of the \$45 million budget was spent on the Victor Harbor Road duplication project, can the minister tell us the current progress of this project?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Clarification to the member: are you talking about the duplication part of the road itself?

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, it is the project shown in the diagram of all the costings of the other roads. There is only \$15 million of the \$45 million spent on the Victor Harbor Road duplication project, so I am just wondering about the current status.

The CHAIR: The report says \$17 million. Are we talking about the same project?

Mr Telfer: Let's say the shortfall.

Mr PEDERICK: The shortfall, there is a major shortfall.

The CHAIR: So you are asking what is the status of the project as of 30 June 2022.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes.

The CHAIR: That is fine. I am just clarifying.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have been advised that the contract was awarded and the works were started on April 2022. While it is a bit behind schedule, we are advised that the work should be completed by June 2024.

Mr TELFER: In Part C, page 292, there is a statement from the Auditor-General, reading:

Our review of the Highways Fund noted that a schedule setting out the program of works for 2021-22 was not submitted and authorised by the Minister before the start of the financial year as required by the Highways Act 1926.

Is the minister referred to in this part of the document you, or is it the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am advised that is the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister Koutsantonis. I am not directly involved with that one.

The CHAIR: Highways Fund, page 292. The question is regarding, 'Our review of the Highways Fund noted that a schedule setting out the program of works for 2021-22'; is that correct?

Mr TELFER: Correct.

The CHAIR: Well, I would have thought that would be the previous government, if you are dealing with that year. It should be referred to the previous minister then.

Mr TELFER: The paragraph then goes on:

DIT's response confirmed that the program of works was submitted and approved late and that it was working to retrieve a copy of the approval.

Can I get an explanation as to why?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have been advised and I will read it out:

Our review of the Highways Fund noted that a schedule setting out the program of works for 2021-22 was not submitted and authorised by the Minister before the start of the financial year...

So that would refer back to the previous Minister for Infrastructure and Transport at that stage.

Mr TELFER: You are obviously the minister now, but I was asking the department for an explanation as to why there was that delay at the time.

The CHAIR: The minister's response for the department is from the time he is minister. He is not responsible for the actions, inactions or otherwise of previous ministers. It is clear from the documentation that this schedule was actually to be submitted by the previous minister and the previous government. Sadly, you cannot ask him because he is not in parliament anymore.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The CHAIR: Let me finish. This is a question to the minister, not a question to the department. If you wish to clarify what happened between March and June in that regard, I am happy for you to ask that question.

Mr PEDERICK: We are going to try Veterans just for the last couple of minutes. I refer to Veterans SA, Defence SA, 1.2: Objectives and programs, section 3.2: Advisory Board, Council members and employees, Veterans Advisory Council. Has the minister referred any matters for investigation to the Veterans Advisory Council?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I inherited the Veterans Advisory Council as the Minister for Veterans Affairs coming forward from the member for Dunstan who was the previous Minister for Veterans Affairs. The only thing I have asked from them is that we have changed the expressions of interest for the membership of the VAC but I have asked for no other direct information from the VAC. I think that is what you are trying to understand.

Mr PEDERICK: You have not proceeded with any investigations?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: No, I have not at this stage.

Mr PEDERICK: In regard to administered item 9.1: ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund, it appears that \$82,000 of the \$100,000 was used of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund. Can the minister explain why \$18,000 of the funds appear to be unspent?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: We have the list here, and I am just going to explain. Of all the commemoration funds, \$100,000 was allocated to the RSL, and \$81,788 was expended and the other \$18,000, whatever it was, I am not too sure whether that is still with Veterans SA at this stage. We will get that information for you to clarify that, but certainly the \$81,788 was used, and the other 18,200 and something dollars was unallocated.

Mr PEDERICK: So you will let me know for clarity whether that has been rolled over for the next year or not?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: We will take that on notice.

The CHAIR: I will allow you one more question if you like.

Mr PEDERICK: On Defence SA, 1.2, objectives and programs, which veterans groups and how many of them do Veterans SA work with minister?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: There are lots of groups that Veterans SA are working with. I am happy to take that on notice and get that back to the member, but certainly the RSL and the organisations, as we all understand, do a really good job out there. I will certainly get all that information, as much as I can, and get it back to you.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

Mr TEAGUE: In commencing my contribution in this regard before the last pause, I got to the point in the context of the South Australian Heritage Council's 13 October letter to the Deputy Premier. It indicated not only the South Australian Heritage Council's observations about the unprecedented nature of the decision, and the consequences being the demolition of the State Heritage Places, the 10 buildings within that barracks precinct, but then identified those two areas of work that are identified by the state Heritage Council as critical.

The state Heritage Council is being practical about this and perhaps contemplating that it is only going to get one opportunity to address the minister for heritage prior to the legislation being debated, such is the haste with which the government is progressing. It has put it all out there, not so as to say that this is the State Heritage Council's preference—far from it—but to indicate those things that ought to be at the very minimum completed by the government.

While the state Heritage Council does not address it specifically in the letter, it would seem to flow directly from this letter that the next question is: what are the moneys that are set aside to do this work? That is, the capturing of the heritage and the archaeological investigations—and that might be subject to some questions in a moment. But just to place this in the appropriate context, that is, of a debate that is being jammed into a period of days, the government suspended standing orders in the house yesterday, forced on debate yesterday and is now jamming it into every available gap in proceedings today with a view to running out the door with the shovels.

This comes not only in the context of the 40 years that the State Heritage Council is talking about but also the context of the 2005 act which represented a culmination of the work on the Labor side, characterised by what Chris Sumner described this morning as Dunstan-ite, Bannon-ite, Rann-ite unifying approaches to consideration of the Parklands, which similarly extends to heritage in this context.

There, Chris Sumner, in his observations on ABC radio this morning, is lamenting what appears to be this unfortunate fault line that seems to have emerged in the government between those who would make fulsome commitments on the one hand—and it is not me saying it but the Deputy Premier in her capacity as minister for heritage. There has been significant reference to it, making all sorts of very explicit commitments on the one hand, and the member for Adelaide in the lead-up to the election making multigenerational commitments to the preservation of these things, and now we see the government coming along and taking an urgent different approach.

We are all in favour of a Women's and Children's Hospital being built, and we would love to be in that space. While we are debating a planning act and a heritage act—and I would love to have the minister for heritage sitting across the way here to address this—the very least that Chris Sumner and all of us, and all South Australians are asking for, and dare I say entitled to, is that there be some meaningful and thoroughgoing response to this state Heritage Council's request for those two issues.

I ask the minister, if we cannot have even a committee of inquiry for a week or two in the context of this correspondence being out there and directed to the minister for heritage, can we at least have a thoroughgoing response in this committee to the question of how those things are going to be addressed, what they are going to cost and how we can, as it were, somehow get to a reset in what has been a recent disturbance of faith in the commitment to custodianship on the government's behalf of both the Parklands and heritage?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I reiterate my answer to previous questions and statements from the member for Heysen and others in reiterating that the letter that has been written by the Heritage Council is being considered and work is underway between the Department for Environment and Water and the new Women's and Children's Hospital project team in relation to those heritage concerns and suggestions that have been raised by the Heritage Council as the process for the project is continuing.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, this is your third and last contribution on this clause.

Mr TEAGUE: Thanks very much, Chair. This is an opportunity for the minister to make it really explicitly and abundantly clear that there is no answer, therefore, to the question of how much money has been set aside—no answer—and indeed whether or not there is to be any undertaking

in response to those two particular matters that were raised in some detail, nearly a month ago now, by the state Heritage Council.

Again, and I will be corrected, I am not trying to be somehow unnecessarily rigorous about this, but in what has been a really short time line we have the 13 October letter from the state Heritage Council in the context of a commitment of \$2 million to police to search for a new place to keep the horses. We also have a part 5 of this bill which has been produced and which arrived a couple of weeks ago, after that money was committed, yet we do not have an answer on money for these works or indeed whether or not they are going to be done, but we have a resistance to any proposal to preserve them—that has been ruled out—and there has been resistance to any proposal to pick up and move them—that has been ruled out.

Again, I am not asking the minister for heritage for a response to the letter to that minister—that is a matter for the minister, arguably—but here we are with a bill that talks about a move of police in circumstances where money has been provided to assist them to look at all options. There is nothing, however, that addresses these coherently—if I might say, with respect to the chair of the council—as set out in the 13 October letter.

Is there not a dollar amount? Is there not a plan of any kind that might be aired? If not, why can we not possibly have a committee to get to grips with this and to give South Australian people the sort of confidence that Chris Sumner and others have spoken about? You have to bring the South Australian people along.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I certainly do not accept the premise of the question as it relates to the funding that has been provided in relation to the move for South Australia Police. The suggestion I think was made that the funding was somehow made in the last couple of weeks subsequent to the bill's production, or thereabouts. It was always considered as part of the process in determining the government's decision in relation to proceeding on the barracks site.

It clearly was a pivotal path in terms of being able to undertake this work that we would have to establish a police premises elsewhere, and to do that we would need to provide the police the requisite funding to undertake a business case and other planning work that is necessary for the relocation of those services that are currently on the barracks site.

That was a determination that was made some time ago in conjunction with the decision of the government to proceed down this path. In relation to the letter that has been produced, as I said and have reiterated a few times, this is going to be closely considered by the government between the Department for Environment and Water and the heritage branch and the new Women's and Children's Hospital project team. We will be working with the Heritage Council in relation to that.

There is a lot of work that clearly has to be done in terms of considering the matters that have been raised and also considering at what point some of those things may be considered in relation to when access will be available to the barracks site, because it is obviously still a working premises at the moment. All of those things are being worked through at the moment and considered very thoroughly.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mrs HURN: I have a question in relation to the commencement because of course throughout the entire journey of this debate the government has really tried to give this strong sense of urgency about the need to get this bill through, because this bill is in some way going to kickstart the construction of the new Women's and Children's Hospital.

What we know is that the access to the site and some of the detailed works that will be happening on the site are only going to be required by the last bit of next year. That is why it is interesting to talk about the commencement date. I wonder whether the minister can give us an update or an understanding as to what action will happen on the site once this act, presumably, is proclaimed.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As the member will be able to read, this clause sets the date to be fixed by proclamation. That is the date that the government will be seeking to proceed with as soon

as we are able to proceed through the parliament, which is likely to be the next sitting week given the time now.

In terms of site works, there will be significant investigation works that will be happening relatively quickly and, in addition, obviously this now allows us the pathway to have the approvals in place to start the procurement, planning and detailed works that we need to do to get the enabling works underway in the middle of next year, as well as get the early works underway as soon as possible.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO 2) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Tuesday 15 November 2022 at 11:00.