

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15 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.

Bills

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 3 November 2022.)

Clause 2.

Mr TEAGUE: I have a question in the context of where we find ourselves. As we recommence the committee, we remind ourselves that where we left the debate earlier this month—or, in fact, the end of last month—we were exhorted to pick up our shovels and run out to the project site, such as the urgency that the passage of the bill and the process towards the project were characterised by the government and in terms of the process of debate of the passage through this house overseen by the Minister for Health.

We have now come to the middle of November and, in the particular circumstances in which we find ourselves, we have just concluded council elections for the term ahead. In the circumstances of the results of those council elections, particularly in respect of the Adelaide City Council being announced over the weekend, it appears what we have learned is that there is a change of a number of councillors, but more particularly a change of Lord Mayor of the City of Adelaide.

The newly elected Lord Mayor is on record, pretty much over the course of the last generation, the bulk of the last 25 years—including during the time of her service previously as Lord Mayor and subsequently as a minister in previous Labor governments—about the importance of both heritage and Parklands retention, but perhaps more particularly Parklands retention.

In the circumstances of a change of Lord Mayor, but in the more particular circumstances of the well-known and leading interest in this subject matter of the Lord Mayor-Elect, is the government proposing and picking up on what no doubt has been a deliberate indication in clause 2 that the commencement will occur at proclamation to consult, negotiate, take on board or otherwise allow an opportunity for the new Lord Mayor in particular, and the newly elected council more broadly, to engage with the draft bill with a view to contemplating any informed feedback that might arise from that process?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: There has been no change in the government's position in regard to this legislation.

Mr TEAGUE: Perhaps then, in picking up on that, which might come as news to the newly elected Adelaide City Council—and certainly I can indicate that it is news to me; I hope it is not news to the Lord Mayor, but if it is, there we are on the record—what, if any, involvement therefore, assuming that I understand the minister's answer correctly, will the Lord Mayor and the Adelaide City Council have in relation to the application of the machinery of this bill post proclamation?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I fail to see the relevance in regard to clause 2—Commencement, that the act comes into operation on a day fixed by the proclamation. In relation to the Adelaide City

Council, once again, there has been no change in the government's position that that we will continue to engage with the Adelaide City Council. However, this is an act of parliament for which we are seeking parliament's approval for this project to go ahead.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr TEAGUE: First of all, the first definition in clause 3 is that of 'development'. Can the minister indicate the minister with responsibility for the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Obviously, that is available on the public record through the SA government legislation site in which all ministers have been allocated via administrative arrangements for various acts of parliament. I believe it is the planning minister who is allocated from the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act.

Mr TEAGUE: It is good to have that on the public record. Perhaps, just referring to the minister's answer, in case my question had been unduly clumsy, I might have phrased it in terms of whether or not there was any plan for the government to change or to diversify the responsibility in light of the Minister for Health having carriage of this bill, but I thank the minister for being clear about that in all the circumstances.

Regarding the definition of 'project', the project is defined to mean 'the new Women's and Children's Hospital to be developed in accordance with this Act'. It seems to me that the definition does not have much work, if any, to do in the rest of the act, but can the minister perhaps indicate whether or not there is any more light that might be shed on the Women's and Children's Hospital and how that might be relevant to the rest of the machinery of the act and obviously in circumstances where the act is directed far more to the question of the project site and the development?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I thank the member for Heysen. I am not entirely sure I understand the question. The project is defined as the new Women's and Children's Hospital. Obviously, that will involve building a new Women's and Children's Hospital. I think we have been relatively clear in terms of what the project scope of that will entail. I think an interpretation of that would reasonably include all the things that a hospital would involve in its various many forms of the development of a hospital. Obviously, we have a good example in the current Women's and Children's Hospital in the various elements of what would define a hospital in regard to that project.

Mr TEAGUE: For the purposes of this bill, we have seen—and we will come to it at some stage, but it is at the back of this bill—schedule 1, titled 'Project site and support zones'. It is an aerial view of the geographical area with some areas designated by heading, including the project site. I make the observation for the moment, and we will get to schedule 1 eventually, that nowhere on the—

The Hon. C.J. Picton: Eventually.

Mr TEAGUE: We are kind of there in a way now. In light of the minister's answer, nowhere on the mud map do we see the word 'project' or, as far as I can see, do we see any further work for that definition to do. Jumping ahead, we have a definition of 'project site' and that tells us to see how that might be further elucidated. The point really is that what we are clear about here is that this is really about dealing with the planning matters that are associated with the project site and the allocation to a minister or ministers about what you do with the land area and related matters, including those of heritage, that are brought in when preparing the land area for the proposed use.

While we have the schedule 1 mud map, we do not have included in the bill—again, we might, and that might go some further way to explaining why the Minister for Health is involved in this bill—a schedule 2, for example, that includes some of the pictures of a hospital that we have seen circulated in advertising in the days leading up to the announcement of the choice of site, for example. They seem to have been prepared and there seems to have been some considerable amount of work done to provide a kind of flyover or other material that assists in the promotion of the Women's and Children's Hospital, defined as 'project' in this bill, but we do not even see that finding its way into the bill.

All we have—and I think schedule 1 captures it quite well in terms of characterising what this bill is about—is an aerial view of a land area and we have the provisions in the bill for decisions to be made about that land area and then, because of what we know about the proposed destruction of the heritage buildings on the project site, we see powers in relation to the preparation of the project site.

There is a lot more that is to do with those things that are to be destroyed and the preparation of the site and really an absence of anything to do with the hospital itself. In those circumstances, again, so we are clear, we have a planning and heritage bill here. We know that the minister has carriage of the process of the bill through the house. Perhaps can the minister give an indication in terms of time lines.

If we are not seeing that here, is there some plan for there to be some further elucidation about the project, seeing as it is defined in this bill? Will that need to be the subject of some separate bill, or are we stuck for the moment with an advertorial campaign on the project and meanwhile the parliament is being, as it were, limited to something that has been characterised as needing to be run through very quickly and urgently but confined entirely to, really, the project site and then consequences of the need to deal with what is on the site already?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: To the extent that I understand it, the question asked was: is there going to be another piece of legislation? That is certainly not the government's intention. This is legislation that will enable the processes to be approved for this hospital to be developed on this site, as you have said in relation to the project site, and the project is the Women's and Children's Hospital.

We have been clear that there is work that needs to happen in terms of the detailed planning of the hospital, so I do not think it would be appropriate at this stage to annex detailed plans in relation to the hospital. As we will get to later in the bill, there will still be a process where that will go before development processes, but it will be deemed approved as it goes through those processes. This is an opportunity for the parliament to say that it approves the development of the hospital on this project site and the other related elements of this legislation, which will enable us to bypass what would be quite a lengthy process in terms of other avenues we would potentially have to go down were it not for this legislation.

Mrs HURN: Minister, in relation to clause 3(2)(a), where it makes reference to 'the opening of a road extends to the widening of a road', could you take the committee through which roads will be widened as a result of this bill passing?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We have been very clear that obviously Gaol Road will have an impact, as it was going to have an impact in relation to the previous proposals for the Women's and Children's Hospital on the alternative, much smaller site. Obviously, as we have outlined, there will be works in relation to the widening of Port Road, which will enable the hospital to be developed. That will be one of the first things that happens out of this project. I am advised that it is really those two roads to which that section refers.

Mrs HURN: Following on from that information and making reference to Port Road, obviously this is a main arterial route right through the city. Could you take the committee through what the impacts may or may not be for traffic as a result of the widening of Port Road, and can you also rule out that Port Road will be closed throughout this development?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As we discussed in the briefing we had, a significant driver of the work that was done in relation to the site review under Jim Hallion was looking at Port Road. There were a number of alternatives for the hospital that were considered that would have had a very significant impact upon Port Road, that would have involved its closure for quite significant periods of time. That obviously would have been very impactful for the residents of Greater Adelaide, particularly the western suburbs, and that is one of the reasons why they were not the preferred options to proceed down that path.

Clearly, in relation to Port Road, there will have to be works, but they will be minimised as much as possible. I am advised that there will not need to be a full closure of Port Road. There may be lane restrictions from time to time as we are in that process of widening Port Road and installing the new intersection for the new hospital development, but that is work that will be progressed to

ensure as little disruption as possible as part of those works because we understand what an important arterial road Port Road is.

Mrs HURN: I potentially could have misheard this, so I will have to go back and have a look, but, minister, did you just indicate that other options were considered as a result for the Women's and Children's Hospital site that were not chosen because of the impacts on Port Road and that those impacts would be more significant than this current site, or is that a reflection of the fact that, by choosing this site, the impact is less?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: You just have to read the site review to see that there were a number of different considerations. One raised quite often, which I think is worth putting on the record, is that people say, 'Why can't you build over the rail lines?' The issue, which was something that the site review spent some time investigating, was: could we bring the rail lines under and extend the hospital footprint across?

Unfortunately, there are a number of issues with that. The freight line would mean that we would have to build structure support for the hospital to withstand a freight train hitting it. I am sure no-one would want to be in a situation where a freight train brought down a women's and children's hospital. To put such structures in place, they would need to be of such a width that they would not be able to fit between the rail lines that are currently there, so the rail lines would have to be spread out more than they are at the moment, which would involve significant disruption to the rail corridor.

It would also mean that the Port Road bridge is not wide enough for that rail corridor to proceed under it, so there would have to be a rebuilding of the Port Road bridge if we were to do that, which would obviously lead to very significant cost and disruption as part of doing that. Out of all that pain and drama, I think the advice was that we would only receive about 80 to 100 metres of land that we would be able to build across the rail lines even after doing all that. It was certainly an option that was ruled out.

It is an option that you hear about and you think, 'Oh, well, that makes sense. Why don't we do that?' but the detailed work that was done made sure we understood the complexities and difficulties of that. The site that has been selected, I reiterate again, was the site that received the highest overall score and also the highest clinical score out of that site review process.

The CHAIR: Member for Schubert, you have exhausted your three questions.

Mrs HURN: Supplementary, sir—and it is a very quick supplementary.

The CHAIR: I will allow it on this occasion.

Mrs HURN: Thank you very much, Chair. Minister, as a supplementary following on from that answer and in relation to the narrowing of Port Road, or indeed needing to close some lanes, at what point over the next decade do you think that we will start to see the closure or the narrowing of Port Road?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We are actually widening Port Road; we are not narrowing it.

Mrs HURN: I may not have been clear to the minister, because it does also say that the closure of a road extends to narrowing it and that the opening of the road extends to widening it. I suppose on that basis I ask for your indulgence, minister, to provide further clarification. You are reducing the lanes that are available for motorists. At what point will you be reducing the lanes available for motorists?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am happy to answer the member's fifth question on this clause. The advice I have is that when we are talking about closing the road, that is largely in relation to Gaol Road, which will have to be closed for some period during the construction of the hospital. In relation to Port Road, we are widening the road. During that process, there may well have to be some lane closures; that will be minimised as much as possible to allow traffic to flow, but it was definitely not of the issues we would have seen under other various proposals that were considered as far as the project goes. Ultimately, it will result in a wider road there.

As has previously been discussed, we will be also building a shared-use pedestrian bicycle path and separating that from Port Road, which will enable that widening to occur and enable those

intersection works to be constructed, but at all times the project will be making sure that the impact on motorists is minimised as much as possible.

Mr TELFER: For clarification—I obviously listened closely to that explanation from the minister and Port Road being such an important feeder road into our city in particular that is used by a lot of motorists and a lot of commuters—and for the record, you speak about the closure of lanes, but are you talking about a temporary closure of lanes on Port Road? If so, do you have any sort of insight into what length of time these temporary lane closures would need to be in place?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The advice I have is that this is, as we have mentioned, one of the areas where we will be seeking to have works underway late next year. This is for the process of widening Port Road, for constructing the shared-use path. I am advised that, for the majority, if not the entirety, of any closures that would have to happen, it would involve one lane. It is ultimately about making sure that we can widen Port Road in the process of doing that and that we will be working to make sure that the impact upon motorists is minimised as much as possible as part of that process.

Mr TELFER: I am not trying to be cute about this, in the words the Premier might use. Some more clarification for me: are these lane closures going to be temporary and, as I asked in a previous question, for what period of time would you envision them being closed? Are we talking about one lane of Port Road or two lanes? Can you give a little bit more insight into what that planning part of it is so that it is on record for the commuters who use that road?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yes, definitely temporary, as part of the process of expanding the lanes on Port Road and also making sure that the intersection for the hospital can be constructed. I do not have the exact dates. It is a balance, because we want to ensure that the works happen with the least disruption possible, but we also want to make sure that they go forward as quickly as possible.

Obviously, the quickest way of constructing anything would be to close everything down and do it. We do not want to have that happen in relation to this project because we want to make sure that we continue the traffic flow on Port Road, so we will be balancing those issues. We will be making sure that we minimise the disruption but also attempting to make sure that it happens as quickly as possible.

Mr TELFER: As quickly as possible is obviously in the eye of the beholder. I am trying to get an insight into whether it is envisioned that this would be a lane closure for a period of days, weeks, months or longer. Is it envisioned that it would be a considerable length of that section of Port Road, or are we talking about only small sections for commuters? I still do not really have clear in my mind exactly what a closure process of lanes, even temporary, might look like for people who are using this road, especially if it is for an extended period of time.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: In relation to the works—as I said, temporary works—to enable that lane widening process and widening of the road to occur and the construction of the shared-use paths to occur, like any road project it will go through a process where either the government or, in this case, the managing contractor in place in Lendlease will go to the market and seek responses. They will put forward a detailed plan in relation to that, and so of course we do not have the exact timings that the member is seeking at this stage. From a policy perspective, I can answer that we are seeking to have that work balanced in terms of trying to minimise disruption when it is constructed but also having it done as quickly as possible.

The CHAIR: That was your third question, member for Flinders.

Mr TELFER: Sorry, I thought that was my second, a supplementary for clarity.

The CHAIR: No.

Mr TELFER: Sorry.

The CHAIR: That is okay. You do not have to apologise. Member for Heysen, you have asked three already on this one. I have been very meticulous in keeping records and I have crossed out when I have made mistakes. The member for Schubert has actually asked two supplementaries on this one too—exhausted. You need to resume your seat, member for Heysen.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr TEAGUE: Perhaps just by way of preface and to where we have got to now, it ought to be abundantly clear that there are a whole range of fairly fundamental questions that South Australians will reasonably be interested in having answers to. I would perhaps make that overriding observation about the debate that we are kind of forced to be having in a committee context and we are participating in to the best that that possibility affords us.

I refer back to observations at the outset some weeks ago that not just us here on the opposition side, who want nothing more than to see the completion of a new Women's and Children's Hospital as soon as possible and with a maximum efficiency both as to time and to cost, but there are a range of very important and, in many respects, deeply held views and values associated with the process towards that.

It is for that reason that we have sincerely maintained the view that we have about the merits of having had the opportunity for a committee process, albeit brief, to explore these matters in somewhat less prescribed way. I think it would assist the committee greatly in case the minister might at least take that on board in considering the scope and extent of answers that are given to what are really fundamental questions about how we are to proceed from here, but of course that is a matter for the minister.

In relation to the effect of this act on other legislation, the subject of clause 4, we will come back to responsibility for the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. These are questions that, yes, one might expect there is a straightforward answer in relation to ministerial responsibility, but the reasonable question might be asked in circumstances where the minister has just opined at length about matters to do with the addition or subtraction of lanes of a road, the closure, widening or narrowing of the road over a period of time as yet unspecified, matters that again—and I had forgotten about him for a little while—the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport might be more reasonably expected to be across in detail.

So we can add a third minister who might be expected to be playing a leading role, if not having carriage of this bill in all the circumstances. The minister has done his best to traverse that territory and the question remains extant, I think—I stand to be corrected—about whether or not all these references to 'minister' throughout the bill are indeed going to be devolved to the Minister for Health. Hopefully, we can be clear about that as we come to it subsequently.

I think it is clear enough, the overriding effect of subclause (1), but what can the minister say more particularly about the effect of subclause (2)?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Thank you; there was a surprise twist at the end there with that question that I did not see coming. Subclause (2), as it says, 'applies to land notwithstanding the provisions of the Real Property Act 1886', which is a very longstanding piece of legislation in South Australia. That piece of legislation, as I am sure the member is aware, has a number of processes in relation to transactions and transfers in relation to real property and we are making clear that in relation to this act those provisions to deal with those land transfers do not apply in the sections of this act that make clear how those transfers are to occur but would apply in relation to the land for this project.

Mr TEAGUE: I am going to resist the urge to give some sort of running commentary on that answer, but I think it speaks for itself. I will perhaps just indicate that it would be of assistance, I am sure, to those who would seek to understand the operation of this act to know at some stage what more particularly is the purpose of overriding or curtailing or otherwise making the Real Property Act subject to the operation of this act. That is not to say that those things are necessarily offensive, but it would be of assistance to have that more particularly on the record, in my view at least. I ask the minister in a similar way for any particular reason for the inclusion of subclause (3) as well.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It is a similar answer. Clearly the Land Acquisition Act, as people will be aware, has a number of processes in which land is acquired. In relation to this land, there are clauses of this bill that we will get to at some stage that involve various pieces of land being acquired,

and that would not run through the standard process through the Land Acquisition Act but through the processes and sections that parliament is considering in relation to this legislation.

Having this clause 4(3) makes clear that it is this act of parliament that will determine the process in relation to those pieces of land and not the processes that are set forth in the Land Acquisition Act.

Mr TEAGUE: So we understand it, it sounds as though, at least on the face of that answer—this bill has already been described as unprecedented. We have a flagged departure (and I hear the minister indicating that that is spelled out in the subject of this bill), and that is fine and we can come to it, and perhaps that is appropriate. But while we are at it, and seeing it most succinctly expressed, what are the particular processes the minister refers to which are the subject of the Land Acquisition Act 1969, which are said not to apply to any vesting of land under this act?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As I said, none of those provisions in the Land Acquisition Act would apply. The acquisition, the transfer of the land, is outlined in this bill, and those are the provisions that would apply in relation to that. While I have the floor, the member alleged that this bill was unprecedented, and I can provide the parliament with some information on that front.

We have done some research in relation to a bill that was assented to on 18 December 1913; funnily enough, it was to cover a similar parcel of land to establish the police barracks to begin with. The act may be cited as the Adelaide Park Lands Alteration Act 1913, and it included a map outlining where that was to occur.

There was a change to that act in 1917—the Adelaide Park Lands Alteration Act 1917—when at some stage there must have been a decision to increase the land available to the police barracks for that purpose. So there are two precedents in relation to the legislation that we are discussing today.

Mr TEAGUE: I just ask that you table those documents.

The CHAIR: They are on the public record, are they not? He will give them to you.

Mr TEAGUE: I note that with appreciation.

Mr TELFER: We are talking about clause 4, the effect of the act, and there has been a lot of discussion publicly in the media and the like around exactly what precedents this bill does set when it comes to interactions with other pieces of legislation. I think there is a real concern that there might be a modern precedent, notwithstanding pre World War I precedents that have been cited recently in this place.

An honourable member: One was during World War I.

Mr TELFER: Indeed. I do note that there are those concerns within the community. When looking at clause 4—Effect of Act, and when reflecting on the words the minister used when we were last looking at the discussion around this when he used the words 'health trumps heritage', there are concerns that this might well be a precedent in the effect of this piece of legislation, in the effect of this act, that there might be other pieces of legislation which indeed may trump heritage or there may be other decisions that the government uses to trump other pieces of legislation.

I have real concerns when it comes to proper lawmaking around bills that may be in opposition to other established pieces of legislation. In light of that, and in light of the minister's comments around health trumping heritage, I ask the minister whether there are any other pieces of legislation or any other plans the government has to put in place things which would trump heritage in our state?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think in relation to heritage I have been very clear, and the Premier has been very clear, and I think when we eventually get to the section in this bill relating to heritage that it is specifically in relation to this site. There is no change being made to the overall heritage legislation. This is specifically about building a new Women's and Children's Hospital on the police barracks site.

Mrs HURN: In a similar vein to the member for Flinders' question, on clause 4(1), 'This Act has effect despite any other Act or law of the State', could you elaborate or outline which pieces of legislation this act has effect on, despite any others?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think we have specifically identified in subclauses (2) and (3) areas where we know there is an issue and hence we have made very clear that this act—and the provisions related to that real property transfer and the land acquisition—the provisions of this act, would apply.

I believe that this is a clause often used in various pieces of legislation, where there is a concern that there may be other pieces of legislation that could come into conflict, to make clear that the provisions we are debating in this parliament for this bill for this project site would apply in relation to this bill if there were identified any other conflicts. We are not aware of another conflict, but I think that that has been drafted to make sure that, if one was identified, what we are debating here and the provisions that we are considering would make sure that they hold the day, so to speak.

Mrs HURN: To be crystal clear, what you are effectively saying is that there may well be other laws which this trumps but you are just not aware of any at this current stage.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The only other one where this could be considered is in relation to the planning and development legislation as well, but broader than that there is not an awareness of other provisions that may apply to.

Mrs HURN: In that vein, if it is outlined by the minister that it would have impact on the planning and development act, why is that not listed under clause 4, whereas the Real Property Act is listed and the Land Acquisition Act is listed?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It is a good question. It was a question that I was considering as well. The answer is in relation to subclause (2)—that apparently the Real Property Act has a provision in it that says that, if another act was to conflict with it, it specifically must mention that in the other act. The Land Acquisition Act was listed for clarity, to make very clear that process, and that is why those two were specifically brought out.

Another one that has just been raised with me by our advisers is in relation to the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, which is an area we have already traversed in our discussions; it may well be another one and hence subclause (1) provides clarity that the provisions that we are debating would supersede those provisions.

The CHAIR: The member for Schubert—

Mrs HURN: This might be my last one; is it?

The CHAIR: Is it a supplementary?

Mrs HURN: It is. I want to be very crystal clear. You have spoken about wanting to provide clarity, which is why the Real Property Act and the Land Acquisition Act have been identified under clause 4. I suppose my question is: why, out of an abundance of caution, was the planning and development act not included as another subclause? I fully appreciate that that is in essence why there is clause 1, but it seems like it was a very prompt answer that the PDI Act was one that would be impacted.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The answer is in relation to the drafting. Clause 8 was reasonably clear in relation to the interaction with the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. It was thought that that provided some level of clarity and hence it was not specifically drawn out as a separate subclause in clause 4.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, you have exhausted your questions.

Mr TEAGUE: It is a question—

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, no, sorry. If the member for Flinders or the member for Finnis would like to ask some questions, they are most welcome. I have also given supplementaries, so I have been really generous.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, and—

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, no.

Mr TEAGUE: Not to ask a question—

The CHAIR: In that case, what is it? Do you have a point of order?

Mr TEAGUE: We can call it that—and I hesitate, as I do not want to be overly, as it were, combative or resorting to rules in that sense. I will raise a point of order, if it is strictly necessary in the Chair's view, but I wanted to indicate that the question I had might be of assistance to the committee. It relates to the note and might give the minister the opportunity to address the exclusion neatly at this point. If it is necessary for me to raise it subsequently, then I can see where that might be relevant to do so, so I just flag that. I do not know whether there is a separate standing order I can—

The CHAIR: I think the member for Flinders would be more than capable of asking that question.

Mr TEAGUE: Well, sure. Sorry, I was labouring under the misapprehension that the member for—

The CHAIR: No—

Mr TEAGUE: We have all been doing our best to take our—

The Hon. C.J. Picton: Delay it.

Mr TEAGUE: Sorry?

The CHAIR: No, the member for Flinders has an opportunity to speak; he has not on this clause.

Mr TELFER: In looking at clause 4, there is an aspect down the bottom there—I do not know if it has been brought to the attention of the minister or not—called Note. It says:

Nothing in this Act affects the operation of any Commonwealth law or authorises the Minister to affect any right, title or interest held by the Crown in right of the Commonwealth.

The question is: is this an aspect, a noting, that is consistent with other pieces of legislation, or is there a specific area of commonwealth law that there might be some uncertainty on whether this might be at odds with—any concerns or any conflict?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: One day I will understand the peculiarities of parliamentary drafting, because when I have tried to include notes before in bills I have been told, no, you should not put notes in there. I took notes, but here we have a provision that is just making very clear that there is no attempt whatsoever to cover the area of commonwealth law—not that we would even have the ability to do so if we wanted to.

One area, for instance, that may be considered is in relation to issues of railways, etc. To be honest, I do not think it would make a significant difference whether or not we had this note in there, because sadly we do not have the constitutional power to override commonwealth legislation anyway.

The CHAIR: Member for Flinders.

Mr TELFER: Thank you, sir. Seeing as you are counting, I will use my third. In light of that note in particular, is there any risk of this project being disallowed or superseded by pieces of commonwealth legislation that would mean that this would then be not able to be delivered as this legislation is put out?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Not to my knowledge.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr TEAGUE: The purpose of clause 5 we see previewed in clause 3—and we have already dealt with it to some extent, that the definition of 'project site' is clause 5 itself, so it is perhaps relevant

when we are here commencing to consider clause 5 that both the definition of 'project site'—which in turn, as we have adverted to in the process so far, refers to schedule 1.

It is no reflection on parliamentary counsel—if indeed parliamentary counsel was involved in the drawing of the mud map, but I would extend that to indicating no reflection on the authors of the diagram at all—but in making the observation, and from this distance, the legislation that the minister referred to earlier—I think the 1913 act, a bit over a century ago, and the 1907—

Mr Telfer: 1917.

Mr TEAGUE: 1917, so pre and during the Great War—appeared to display a certain amount more detail insofar as they were setting out site locations and so on. This is just to say that in contemplating the project site we have it very broadly defined, indeed, for the purposes of this act. It is sufficient for planning purposes, I presume, or is deemed to have been presumed by others, but clearly it is not intended to serve any more technical purpose than that. To the extent that the 1913 act or the 1917 act were used as precedents, there is no attempt to outdo even them.

We are here concerned with, in a very broad brush, a planned area of land that is, I think, to be identified by the minister by notice in the *Gazette*. Correct me if I am wrong, but I am presuming that it is to be identified by the minister in the *Gazette* upon the passing of the bill, as opposed to any other indication that might have been given by the minister. Perhaps the answer to that, or the clue to that even, is in the fact that we have not had said already, in so many words by the government, who the minister for the purposes of subclauses (a) and (b) of the definition is.

Seeing as it is the first opportunity to zero in on that, can the minister, because we are talking about up to four or at least four ministers—five perhaps, I forgot about the Minister for Police for a minute. The Minister for Police, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, the minister for heritage—I think her title is Minister for Environment but with responsibility for heritage—and, of course, let's not forget the Minister for Planning, are all more usually involved in executive responsibility for this space.

I think the minister has answered quite succinctly in response to my question, and I think I indicated or apologised for any clumsiness in asking the question about what would appear obvious on the face of the record about the definition of development and the application and the administration of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Bearing in mind there are—and I do not hear anyone demurring on this point—at least that number of ministers who have a direct and relevant, one might say arguably more relevant, role to play in each and every aspect of this bill, that there are plenty of precedents to it.

You certainly have a Minister for Education who has an interest in the construction of infrastructure on school sites, but it will be the Department for Infrastructure to the extent that government is involved directly in relation to that. This is really a lot further down the line, though, since it does not even purport to address what has been defined as the project—the subject of the bill, the Women and Children's Hospital itself—so that the Minister for Health's interest on the face of it appears to be tenuous at best.

Against that background, and in the context of all that, is the government able to indicate, and can the minister indicate now, who the minister is for the purposes of those references in (a) and (b)?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As I think we traversed either perhaps in the chamber already or certainly in our briefings that we have given the opposition, my understanding is that most legislation, if not all, is drafted in relation to the minister and then, after, legislation is considered by the parliament. There is an administrative process by which acts are assented to. They are given to the responsibility of different ministers. I presume that it may well be that the Premier decides that the health minister should take responsibility for this, but it would be far from me to prejudge a decision of the Premier in that regard. So this is a standard form of parliamentary drafting in this regard.

I also want to make a correction in relation to the 1913 and 1917 acts. I am now becoming an expert in the government of Archibald Peake and his various times in the Premier's role. I apologise that I have not yet given you the acts to digest, so you are at a loss. When I held up the 1913 act, even though I should not do that in the chamber, you might have seen a whole variety of

different shapes; however, that was because there were two separate projects being considered at the same time. There was not only the area of land in relation to what is now known as the barracks site but also what became the rail yards and then later became the Royal Adelaide Hospital was considered in the same legislation in 1913.

Later, Archibald Peake, as I understand, lost the election and then was returned to government. In relation to the 1917 act, there was a change to the boundaries of the barracks site. So there is not a significant difference; in fact, I think there is much more specificity in terms of provisions that we have put in relation to the support zone element. However, I just correct the issue that we have used this as a precedent. We have not used this as a precedent.

After the matter of whether this was unprecedented or not was raised by you and others, we went through the archives, dusted them off and found that the exact same area that we are talking about was subject to previous debate in this parliament under the Peake government, which, as I am sure you would be familiar with, was a good conservative government back in its day.

I understand that the Peake government also brought in the 6 o'clock swill. Apparently Archibald Peake was Presbyterian. There is lots more to learn. I will bring in some more facts and we can debate it as this goes on.

Mr TEAGUE: I mean no particular criticism about this, but we are in unusual circumstances and unusual circumstances might reasonably call for the more proactive response. The question has been out there. Indeed, the proposition has been out there. I will leave it for South Australians to consider whether or not reference to those turn of the last century pieces of legislation ought more to be regarded as contributors to the wealth of heritage value associated with the area at this stage when we come to consider it in late 2022.

Whether, indeed, they in some way answer the characterisation of this proposed legislation as unprecedented, I tend to the view that if we are going to be reflecting on the legacy of the Peake administration, and those still relatively early times of development in our state, reference to them in the context of this debate, I suggest, really rather raises the question of what this bill would purport to facilitate the destruction of, as opposed to any working manual for conduct going forward. In that sense, I maintain the observation that, for relevant purposes, these things have to be dealt with temporally.

One might have said, in 1918 or 1919, about some minor change perhaps to enhance the new barracks or to make adjustment to a development at that time, that it might be a reasonable retort to say, 'This is not unprecedented; it continues a course of practice.' Of course, the very acquisition of heritage status that followed is the result of the passing of the more than 100 years that have followed that time. So one could turn around and say, 'Well, it's not unprecedented because we actually built the heritage buildings at some stage, and therefore their destruction now by the application of specific powers that are the subject of this short piece of legislation in 2022 is okay.' It is a kind of reverse logic to say that, because you once built the heritage buildings by virtue of a piece of legislation that permitted them, it is equally the subject of precedent to go ahead and knock them down.

If that is the beginning and end of the story—the beginning and end of the result of the researches that have been done with all the powers the government has at its disposal to debunk this notion that it is a bit extraordinary to be contemplating knocking these buildings over—then we have set a very low bar indeed for the consideration of the destruction of heritage sites. I will therefore make sure that that is clearly understood, and I would welcome any reassurance that might be given in particular response to the committee, now or subsequently, in the course of the consideration of the bill.

That as an aside, I hear the minister therefore saying, 'It's normal for legislation to be drafted in such a way as to identify the minister'—yes, okay, that is understood—and for it to be a matter within the government's capacity and appropriately controlled to subsequently go ahead and determine who that minister might be. But again these are particular, and I would say unusual, circumstances in which the Minister for Health is carrying this bill in the House of Assembly, in circumstances where I think it is fair to say there has been widespread public interest about the

subject matter and the various interests that it is going to affect, and there have been observations about the role of various ministers ordinarily.

We did not hear the Minister for Health saying anything to me in response to my question about the definition of development, for example. No, it is a straightforward matter: the Minister for Planning is responsible for the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. There is no indication that that is to be departed from for the purposes of the facilitation of this act. It strikes me that it is in all our interests, and particularly the interests of all South Australians, that there be a bit more of an effort to provide some indication, if not reassurance, about who it is that South Australians, let alone those who are on this side of the house, ought to be engaging with by knowing who it is that is going to have the executive responsibility for these extraordinary powers that are the subject of the bill.

I ask the minister to give the best indication that is possible of the government's consideration to this date of just how exactly that is going to pan out.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Chair, I refer the member to my previous answer on the same question.

Mrs HURN: Minister, I refer to clause 5(b), which states:

- (b) if the Minister at any time determines that not all of the land referred to in paragraph (a) is required as the project site—

but of course it can go back and be deposited in the GRO. Could the minister advise what the process would be if it is determined that more land is required as part of this site?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The provision, as it says, is about reducing the site potentially if it is not entirely needed for the purposes of building the hospital on the project site. Then, if that were to be the case—we are not sure whether it would need to be—we would go to the government registry office and identify the site that we would no longer need.

I think that if the question was 'if there is additional land that would be required'—and there is certainly no intention or desire at this stage that that would need to be considered, and there is no provision in the act that would give us any ability to acquire additional land other than what has been put through here—obviously we could go through standard processes outside the legislation, hypothetically, but that would carry the significant complexity we are seeking to avoid by making clear what our intention is in relation to this legislation.

We believe that the site that has been put forward as part of the legislation—as has been outlined and set forth in schedule A—does give us the ability to provide for the hospital services and also other associated amenities, such as car parking, etc., we will need as part of the project.

Mrs HURN: To be clear, when the minister says that there is no desire at this stage, presumably that indicates that the door is being left open for the potential of expanding the project site, or are you ruling out that there will be no such need to expand the project site? If indeed you are wanting to extend the project site, on what grounds would you like to expand that? What would the profile of the decision-making look like?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I know what the member is trying to do—create an idea that something is afoot. If we had a view that additional provision were required, we would have come to the parliament in relation to that provision. The work that we have done has led us to what we are putting forward in relation to this.

This is far, far, far bigger than what the team had been working on in relation to the previous site. This gives us the ability, as has been outlined, to build the hospital for the future, to be able to make sure that we have additional beds and capacity as part of the hospital, and to make sure that we have the ability for those hot floor services to be connected, which was a key issue raised by clinicians. The site that is being put forward enables us to solve these issues.

There is absolutely no consideration of additional sites that may be required and there is no ability in this legislation for that to occur. We have not put a provision saying, 'By the way, if you want to get something else, here's how you do it.' There is no provision, as you have indicated. The only

provision in relation to clause 5(b) is in relation to potentially giving land back that may not be needed at the end of the project.

Mrs HURN: The minister was seemingly trying to infer that I was trying to concoct some big public outrage on what I thought was a very simple question. I have to say that I think the response did highlight some level of distinct sensitivity towards this question, so that is certainly something we will continue to monitor.

I would like to ask a question in relation to clause 5(a), where it talks about the area of land indicated as the project site. If I may, I would like to ask the minister about the Hallion review in relation to the site selection. We know that, of course, there were six sites that were selected across three different locations. My question to the minister is: when it comes to the Hallion review and the site review, who set the parameters for where the Women's and Children's Hospital could be and therefore the site selection?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think we were very clear in relation to discussions with Mr Hallion, and certainly I was when I asked him to take on that role, that we wanted him to consider sites within the biomedical precinct. Clearly, there has been a lot of work that has happened in relation to building up the biomedical precinct, which now includes the Royal Adelaide Hospital, University of South Australia, Adelaide University and SAHMRI and will soon include the Bragg Comprehensive Cancer Centre. I think that a clear desire of clinicians across the community was to make sure that the Women's and Children's Hospital was part of that precinct.

As has been outlined, we received briefings upon coming into government that concerned us in terms of where this project was up to and how difficult it was going to be to be able to construct on the existing site, hence we asked Mr Hallion to look at other sites within the biomedical precinct.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, this is your last question on this clause.

Mr TEAGUE: Thanks for that indication, Chair. Perhaps I will do my best to wrap up what are related observations, picking up on the minister's reference to the Hallion review and perhaps a remark about the significance or substantiality of the scope of that consideration. My understanding is that the Hallion review was limited to six sites and three locations. How was that narrowing of the consideration determined and why was it limited to only three locations? Was there not really much more open possibility for consideration? Who, therefore, had responsibility for narrowing it in that way?

Perhaps, in that context, the minister might take the opportunity to zero in on the intended adequacy of what we see at schedule 1, and this perhaps might foreshadow it. It is described as:

...(being more particularly delineated in a plan or plans to be deposited in the GRO and identified by the Minister by notice in the Gazette for the purposes of this provision)...

I think we have indicated that has not happened yet and that would ordinarily happen subsequently. Can the minister, in addressing that question, indicate whether or not that is sufficient identification of the site and whether or not there is any indication to be given about the area that might necessarily be more particularly described that is depicted in schedule 1? Can he first address the Hallion point?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am not sure if I understood the second question, but I will do the best that I can. In relation to the first question, as I understand there was early work done by the Hallion team and the panel that was assembled. They looked at work that had been done by the original task force that had been appointed under Jim Birch.

Jim Birch was part of the Hallion review as well and looked at sites that had been considered in that process and what sites should be examined in more detail as part of the site review process. They did further work in relation to those sites that were considered the most likely options. There was further work done in relation to some alternative options for those sites as well.

As the report I think makes clear, this site that we are now proceeding with and the configuration of the hospital on the barracks site was not the original look that happened in relation to the barracks site because the original look at that site raised a number of issues. There was more work done and so it was an iterative process by that independent work from Jim Hallion and Jim Birch and the team that were a part of that to look at how we could find the best possible site.

Lots of sites ended up being considered. They were scored for a variety of different purposes and then, ultimately, it was a decision for cabinet and government in terms of whether we wanted to proceed down that path, which we ultimately have, and now we have decided to bring this bill to the parliament to enable it to proceed as quickly as possible.

Mr TELFER: I am a very simple man, minister. I am still trying to get an insight into the process. I know that the Hallion review considered three locations with six sites. Who narrowed it down in the brief to Hallion to look at these three locations in particular? Was that a direction of the minister or the Premier? Who gave that direction?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: From my perspective and I believe the Premier's perspective, we were clear that we wanted sites within the biomedical precinct considered, but we did not sit down and say to Jim Hallion and his team, 'We want you to look there, there, there and there.' We broadly said to them that we wanted sites considered within the biomedical precinct to find the best possible location.

We were very prepared, if this process came back and said that the existing RAH west site was the best option, that we would proceed upon that basis. We thought it was worth going through the process to have a look at the options before we proceeded with such a significant project that had already faced nine years of being discussed and proposed without any sod being turned in terms of its construction and with so many issues being raised about it.

I am very glad we went through that process and very thankful for Jim Hallion, Jim Birch and the team who did that work. Ultimately, they then came to us and said, 'These are the sites that we have examined. These are the issues. These are the benefits. This is the scoring.' We have made all that scoring and information publicly available, and that is the basis upon which we have made this decision.

Mr TELFER: As well as being a simple man, I am also a practical man. Looking at this piece of legislation, and specifically looking at clause 5—which references schedule 1, which I am sure we will have questions on when we get to that point—it speaks about the area of land indicated as the project site.

Albeit there is a precedent from previous legislation in 1913, which has the same map detail as we have been provided in schedule 1, I am more accustomed in planning processes—and once again, I respect you are not the planning minister, but you are going through this process—to receiving site maps with more detail and more direction than a scale 50-metre long line on the legend, which we will refer to later on, I am sure. Does the minister have an exact number of square metres that the project site actually encompasses, rather than talking in reference to schedule 1?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: My advice is it is approximately 40,000 square metres but, given the practical man that he is, the member for Flinders is keen for the exact number. We will certainly take that on notice and provide that to him.

Mr TELFER: Flowing on from that, and I am sure it is somewhere within the information that the minister has, is there a breakdown of that 40,000 square metres into what the project envisions to be car park and other associated areas and what is actually under a building, where the footprint of the building would actually be? The 40,000 square metres of the project site obviously encompasses a lot of different aspects, so I am sure it would be interesting to the public, and certainly to those of us on this side, what the footprint of the building itself would be and how much of that 40,000 square metres would be car park and other associated areas.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Firstly, to correct some advice I was previously given, the 40,000 square metres—and we have put this map out publicly—is in relation to the site where the hospital is being considered. In addition, there is the 13,000 square metres that was previously being considered in relation to the car park when it was going to be on the RAH west site. That 13,000 square metres stays there, and there is the addition of the 40,000 square metres. My advice is that the entire footprint is in the order of 53,000 square metres, but we will get the exact number, as I said, and provide that to you as soon as possible.

In relation to the detailed layout, that is obviously still being worked through, but I think we made it clear in our previous briefing—and, I think, in the first briefing that we made available to the

opposition after the announcement was made—what the current planning in relation to the site is. The car park will predominantly stay in a similar location to what had been proposed to the east of Gaol Road, as was being considered for the RAH west site, and then the hospital will fit across the other site in relation to the broader barracks site.

It does need to be set back some distance from Port Road to enable the traffic configuration, both through to the car parking and through to the emergency department, so there will be some green space on that side, and there will be additional green space on the back of the hospital. In addition to that, broadly in the support zones there will be other improvements made to the Parklands areas that are currently inaccessible. It will improve the amenity of those Parklands and make them accessible to the public.

The CHAIR: Are there any other questions on clause 5—in addition to members who have not asked questions already? The member for Heysen has already exhausted his three questions.

Mr TEAGUE: I take that as a technical response as opposed to anything pejorative. Have I exhausted my three questions—

The CHAIR: On this clause, yes. That is what I meant by the three members who have spoken already. That is what I meant by that. The member for Finniss is quite within his liberties to ask a question if he wants to.

Mr TEAGUE: I am sure any member is.

The CHAIR: That is what I meant, but he is at the moment present here.

Mr TEAGUE: Again, we have been here—

The CHAIR: We have been here, but you do not seem to understand that we have been here. I am trying to be helpful. I am trying to give you another chance to ask another question if you wish to.

Mr TEAGUE: I understand that.

The CHAIR: I am trying to give you a lifebuoy, and you just throw it back at me. That is fine.

Mr TEAGUE: I have been pulled up on standing orders in relation to—Chair, I would note that we would do well to continue to observe standing orders in relation to the presence or otherwise of members of the chamber.

The CHAIR: Why is that a point of order? I am just saying the reason I mentioned the member was that he is here and he might want to ask a question. I wanted to make sure you understood that—that is all.

Mr TEAGUE: I am sure it is well understood.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

Mr TELFER: I am trying to get an insight, and it probably follows on a little bit from what my colleague the member for Heysen has been trying to ascertain within the detail of this legislation. This clause in particular refers a number of times to the minister. Looking especially at the end, the note states:

Once the land is vested in the Minister under this section, the Minister will have powers in relation to the land as the holder of the fee simple.

Noting the answer that the minister has given already, in this clause in particular, could the reference to the minister in all these different aspects be referring to different ministers? For instance, in relation to the note that 'the land is vested in the Minister', could that be a different minister from the minister referred to later on in that sentence?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: No, it would be the minister who has carriage of the legislation.

Mrs HURN: Minister, I have a point of clarification. I am referring to some material that has been put out by SA Health and the government, where it refers to the site benefits of the Women's

and Children's Hospital. It says the total new Women's and Children's Hospital site size for the RAH west site is 20,000 square metres, and at the barracks site it is 40,000 square metres. Then we move down where it talks about the actual building size. It makes reference to the fact that the RAH west site is 109,000 square metres, and the building size of the barracks site is 117,000 square metres.

I recall comments made by the government in one way, shape or form that the new Women's and Children's Hospital is double the size. Minister, can you clarify that what you are actually referring to is the overall new Women's and Children's Hospital site size, or is that the building size? Can you just clarify that?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yes, the site size is double the size. That enables us to build a bigger hospital. It enables us to build a hospital that better connects the services that are available. This has been an issue that has been raised time and time again by clinicians: the connection between various intensive care services—operating theatres and the like—and having to move between floors. There was no other way around that, despite a significant amount of work.

I do want to be political about it. Successive governments have tried to make the project work on that site and found that it was impossible to do because the site is too small. Having this much bigger site now enables us to build a bigger hospital, plan for the future and also connect those services that need to be connected.

Mrs HURN: Just to clarify that, the building size which is the actual hospital—that is, the building size—is not actually double. The insinuation that has been provided publicly is that this hospital, the actual bricks-and-mortar hospital, is double the size, when actually it is not. When you are referring to a doubling of the project, what you are actually referring to is a doubling of extra Parklands and those types of things. Regarding the actual whole project site size, not the building size itself, the former government's RAH west site was 109,000 square metres and the new barracks site is 117,000 square metres. So it is not a doubling at all; in fact, it is just a slight increase in building size for a new hospital.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The same question has essentially been asked again.

Mrs HURN: There was not clarity provided in the former—

The CHAIR: I am happy to allow the question. That is fine.

Mrs HURN: As a point of clarification, because the minister seemed confused by the difference in the question that I put forward, my previous question was about the broader differences between the site size and the building size. My new question is: can the minister confirm that the building size of the new Women's and Children's Hospital under the Labor government, versus the Women's and Children's Hospital that was proposed under the former government, is not actually a doubling in size? In fact, it is only a very minor increase when it comes to the building size, which is the bricks and mortar of the building.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I can confirm that this will be a bigger hospital on a site that is double the size in relation to the hospital footprint and in addition to the car parking element, which was shared between both sites, as I mentioned earlier. It is worth going through a number of the elements where we will be adding space and services in relation to the hospital.

One is in relation to the women's ICU, which we made clear. Another is in relation to the additional beds that this government has committed on top of what was being provided by the previous government. The third element is in relation to pathology services, which were not going to be part of the previous hospital build. There are a number of those different services that will now be inside the hospital.

In addition to that, part of the planning work that we will be considering is clearly how this hospital could potentially expand within that footprint over time, whereas that obviously was not going to be possible in relation to the previous site. In fact, not only was the previous site not going to allow any expansion of the Women's and Children's Hospital but it would significantly impede expansion of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which I think we are now clear at some stage is going to have to expand, whether that is in 10, 20 or 30 years' time. If we built the Women's and Children's Hospital there, that would significantly curtail the ability for that to happen.

Mr TEAGUE: Reminding ourselves in the process of the committee, it is just that. This is not an occasion for some sort of gloss or making a political point or something of that nature, because we are looking to analyse the facts. I did not hear in the minister's answer just now anything that departed from the details that were indicated by the member for Schubert and the subject of the relevant part of the government's published information in relation to site benefits.

So we are clear, there is a table with a headline indication that the former government's project land area site size was 20,000 square metres, and what has been described as the barracks site is 40,000 square metres. But the building sizes clearly indicated on the existing plan, the previous government's plan, are for a building with a building size of 109,000 square metres, yet the building that is at least foreshadowed by the new government is described as being 117,000 square metres.

How that comes to pass and what the specifications of that are ultimately, and what in fact the Women's and Children's Hospital amounts to that comprises those 117,000 square metres, we have already been told we will not find elucidated in this bill. We can be clear that we are talking about a building of similar size, and the subject matter of this bill is otherwise concerning the treatment of a different land area and a potentially significantly larger land area than was previously the plan.

I bear in mind the minister's observations about what might be the benefits associated with a move and the facilitation of anything that might come into the future, but we are just clear about what the starting point is when considering more particularly clause 6 and how that will operate. This bill is, if not solely then very much predominantly, concerned with the project site and therefore consideration of site size and so on.

The minister has already given an indication of sorts to the member for Flinders, I think it might have been even clearer than that, that the minister for the purposes of all of clause 6 is contemplated to be one and the same minister. We just do not know who that might be, which minister that might be of the, and I am not sure what the collective term is, cohort of ministers who have been identified—it is a relatively large number—who would very reasonably be regarded as candidates for the purposes of clause 6.

I do not know if we are in for a kind of, 'Wait and see; at the end of the committee process we will give you the big reveal.' The indication so far seems to be that the decision has not been made about who that might be. There is no cavelling on this side about the approach to legislation that might be made more generally. In particular, in relation to subclause (1), it would be unusual perhaps for the site, to the extent it is going to be vested in a minister in fee simple in these circumstances, for it to be other than the minister with the responsibility of the operations of the particular activity.

Given that, would the minister at least be able to give some indication that it is likely to be the Minister for Health in whom the project site is vested, or is there some relevant step prior in which it may be necessary for the site to be vested in the Minister for Planning or the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport for the purposes of the project, even if it might ultimately be vested in the Minister for Health when the time comes when the building is complete?

I acknowledge that the clause does not contemplate a two-step process, but in terms of endeavouring to explore what might be considered—if it has not already—is there anything in contemplation here beyond a single minister and once and for all vesting, for the purposes of both the project site preparation and its ultimate operation as a hospital, and if that is the case is that a clue as to who the minister might be?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: There is not much that I can add to the previous answer, which was related to this. In relation to clause 6(1), it would be the minister who has carriage of the act. I presume, as I said previously, that is likely to be the Minister for Health, but obviously that is a decision that is made administratively from time to time. There are new acts that are moved from time to time and there are new ministries that are created from time to time, and it is not for me as a lowly Minister for Health to decide such things that the Premier may want to consider; however, I think it is likely, as I said previously, that this would be under the carriage of the Minister for Health.

Mr TEAGUE: I make the observation that somebody has at least made the decision that the Minister for Health has carriage of this bill in the House of Assembly, and to the extent that that is a decision of the government procedurally, I guess, all South Australians might be forgiven for treating that as an indication of the government's attitude to the responsibility for the outworking of the relevant parts of the bill. The only extent perhaps to which it has been made clear that there might be a departure from that is at clause 10, and we will come to that in a moment.

As I am understanding the minister—as I think we are understanding the minister—for the purposes of clause 6 at least there is a decision to be made, and it would be unsurprising if it was the Minister for Health who was the minister. The minister has not in his answer given any indication that there might be anything more than a once and for all vesting that is contemplated, although he has not ruled that out, and there is an invitation to do so if necessary.

I suppose it would not be unreasonable in all of those circumstances for anyone who is following the development of this process to think, 'Well, aren't we entitled to some slightly greater than usual prior indication of how this is going to pan out, particularly in relation to clause 6(1)?' We have a bill that is providing for the vesting of the project site in the minister.

There are several ministers who, at least for the time being, have a keen interest or need to in terms of discharging their executive responsibilities and, at least for the time being, all of them might reasonably be expected on one view to be that minister. I take as a starting point that the Minister for Environment might be expected to have perhaps the most direct immediate interest in the project site, perhaps alongside the Minister for Planning, and that interest might then tend to move along down the line in the process.

I just underscore the importance, if not obligation, of the government at this point to give an indication of its intent, beyond having assigned the responsibility for the carriage of the bill to the Minister for Health, as perhaps a sign of good faith for the people of South Australia in circumstances where, in terms of popular discourse—the media and elsewhere—there has been the preloading of the promotion of the end result in media across the state over the last month or more and a characterisation of this all being really a *fait accompli* that we may as well regard as just being given a rubber stamp through the House of Assembly.

It might, given all those circumstances—if the government wants to have its way in terms of the characterisation of the running of the project—be desirable to similarly front-load an indication about who the responsible minister is in respect of this variety of transfers of responsibility to a minister, perhaps none more so than the vesting of the project site in a minister.

To the extent to which the minister is able to give any greater level of indication about consideration that has been given to how that might pan out—and, if not, when that consideration is going to occur and when we might all hear about it—then I invite the minister to do so.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Unfortunately, there is not much to add to my previous many answers in relation to this topic.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

PRIVATE PARKING AREAS (SHOPPING CENTRE PARKING AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

TUMBY BAY JETTY

Mr TELFER (Flinders): Presented a petition signed by 1,105 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to invest significant funding to ensure the long-term future of the Tumby Bay Jetty.

YELLOWTAIL KINGFISH

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey): Presented a petition signed by 199 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

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Remuneration Tribunal—

Determination No. 4 of 2022—Overseas Accommodation and Daily Allowance—
International Bar Association Annual Conference—Justice Livesey
Report No. 4 of 2022—Overseas Accommodation and Daily Allowance—
International Bar Association Annual Conference—Justice Livesey

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles)—Miscellaneous

By the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Annual Reports 2021-22—

Murray-Darling Basin Authority
Native Vegetation Council

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Plastic Shopping Bags (Waste Avoidance)—General

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Road Traffic—Miscellaneous—Drug Driving and Careless or Dangerous Driving

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

Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme, South Australian—
Annual Report 2021-22

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Annual Reports 2021-22—

Adelaide Venue Management Authority
Tourism Commission, South Australian

By the Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Multicultural Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2021-22

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

Annual Reports 2021-22—

Commission on Excellence and Innovation in Health

Controlled Substances Advisory Council
Health Services Charitable Gifts Board
Pharmacy Regulation Authority
Public Health Council, South Australian
Wellbeing SA
Women's and Children's Health Network
Health Advisory Council Annual Reports 2021-22—
Balaklava and Riverton
Bordertown and District
Hawker District Memorial
Lower North
Millicent and District
Mount Gambier and Districts
Naracoorte Area
Northern Yorke
Penola and Districts
Port Augusta, Roxby Downs, Woomera
Port Broughton District
Port Pirie
Quorn
Southern Flinders
Veterans'
Yorke Peninsula

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. J.K. Szakacs)—

Annual Reports 2021-22—
Correctional Services, Department for
Parole Board
Official Visitor Annual Reports January to June 2022—
Joanne Battersby
Lauren Messmer
Timothy Fitzgerald
Tristan Colmer

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. N.D. Champion)—

Urban Renewal Authority—Annual Report 2021-22

Ministerial Statement

HYDE AND ALEXANDER CHILD PROTECTION REPORTS

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: The state government has received child protection reports from former police commissioner Mal Hyde and child protection expert Kate Alexander, and action is already underway to address the recommendations. All 31 of the Hyde recommendations have been accepted in principle; two of the three Alexander recommendations have been accepted in principle and the third is under active consideration.

The Hyde report examines the circumstances surrounding two specific cases: the tragic death of seven-year-old Makai in February and six-year-old Charlie in July. The Alexander report was a direct response to the recommendations of the Deputy Coroner's report into the tragic deaths of Amber Rose Rigney and Korey Lee Mitchell in 2016.

The report reviewed more than 800 recommendations made across royal commissions, coronial inquests and public reviews since 2016. Ms Alexander met with more than 160 professionals across the child protection sector, including oversight bodies, NGO sector, government service delivery partners and families with direct experience.

Ms Alexander's report recognises the complexity inherent in child protection work and recognises those who work in child protection. Her report also acknowledges progress since the Nyland royal commission and calls for trust in this process. Ms Alexander's report 'Trust in Culture' is publicly available. Based on legal advice and advice from SAPOL and Mr Hyde, the Hyde report is not currently being released.

After examining the reports and their recommendations, the state government is taking the following immediate actions:

1. The Hyde review conducted a high-level screening exercise to identify other children that may be in particularly high-risk settings—526 children were identified. SAPOL is coordinating a multi-agency effort to check those children's welfare as quickly as possible. These efforts are already underway.

2. Establishing a South Australian child protection expert group, as recommended in the Alexander report. The expert group's first task is ensuring the prioritisation of cases and an understanding of child neglect, as identified in the Hyde report.

3. Forming a chief executive oversight committee, led by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, to ensure all of these actions and the broader recommendations contained in the reports are coordinated and integrated across government.

The government has already recognised the need for further investment in child protection. We made major commitments in our first budget, including:

- \$128.9 million additional funding over five years to fund the cost of caring for children;
- additional supports for young people transitioning from care, funding for that of \$3.2 million;
- \$0.8 million for care advocacy services;
- \$0.8 million to CREATE Foundation;
- \$0.8 million to Grandparents for Grandchildren; and
- funding for the Child and Young Person's Visitor of \$1.9 million.

Some of the funding from the \$128.9 million will immediately be made available to recruit 42 social workers who will be placed in areas where there is need. An additional 10 principal Aboriginal consultants will also be employed to provide cultural advice to social workers working with Aboriginal families.

We must always strive to improve our child protection system, and Mr Hyde and Ms Alexander's reports provide important recommendations for further improvement. Sadly, we cannot stop every difficult circumstance in every family home. However, we will work every day to improve the system.

Parliamentary Committees

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:14): I bring up the report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Aboriginal Governance—Final Report.

Report received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (14:15): I bring up the 11th report of the committee, entitled East Grand Trunkway, Stages 2A and 2B.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BROWN: I bring up the 12th report of the committee, entitled Ethelton Railway Station Platforms Replacement Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BROWN: I bring up the 13th report of the committee, entitled Augusta Highway Junction Upgrade (Horrocks Pass Road, Winninowie).

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BROWN: I bring up the 14th report of the committee, entitled Princes Highway (Drain L) Culvert Replacement Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

COVID-19 DIRECTION ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:16): I bring up the report of the committee, entitled Report.

Report received.

Question Time

PREMIER'S COMMENTS

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier regret the language he used last week, and will he offer a simple and straightforward apology? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The Premier told the media today that he did not realise the language he used last week was offensive, but rather than offering a simple and straightforward apology with an expression of regret he instead attempted to laugh it off.

The SPEAKER: I am not certain that 'laughing it off' is necessarily a fact; that's an opinion, leader. Nevertheless, I am going to permit the question.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:17): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question because it provides me an opportunity to say what I have already said publicly. All I can do is answer these questions with the utmost of honesty and explain that I was not on Friday of last week aware of the more widely, more recently publicised meaning of the term that I used. For that, I have expressed regret and I'm more than happy to apologise to the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else who was offended by the remark.

POWER SUPPLY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received any advice that indicates how long South Australian households and businesses will be left without power and whether there is any risk of a statewide blackout over the coming weeks?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:18): I thank the member for his question. I do point out to the house that this is now the fifth occasion there has been a separation event where South Australia has been islanded. There have been a number of measures put in place since the 2016 statewide blackout to ensure that, when islanding occurs, South Australia will be able to withstand it. Those measures were put in place throughout 2017-18. All those measures that were put in place were not changed by the previous government other than one aspect, which was the sale of our backup generators. They were—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When there was a separation event just recently, on the weekend, when the transition tower dropped in Tailem Bend, that didn't cause a single blackout—not one. Because members opposite know the difference between transmission breaks and distribution breaks—I can tell by the blank looks on their faces they don't.

There is a difference and that difference is very, very important. In fact, the resilience of the South Australian electricity market is a bipartisan effort: it's not a single-party issue. We are part of the National Electricity Market, with national rules governing it, and we have national measures and national agencies in place to oversee the operation and security of the market. All those mechanisms kicked into place and we are all collectively authors of that system—all of us.

There has been a long-term bipartisan view in this house that as the national regulations that govern the electricity market are legislated in this house, those national reforms are implemented on a bipartisan basis because the state is a national regulator in terms of parliamentary legislation for all national electricity laws. I have not received advice that says the state is at risk of another separation event or a statewide blackout, but what I do say is that everyone responded as they should.

It was a storm. The reason we are having blackouts now is because the distribution network has had trees take out distribution networks. We all love our tree canopy in South Australia; it's what makes us unique among other states. The tree canopy, which I have heard Leader of the Opposition talk about before, is a very important part of decreasing the heat impacts from the more extreme summers we are getting because of climate change. One of the consequences of climate change is more extreme weather events, which means that that canopy is a threat and risk to our distribution lines.

The problem is that, if you wish to underground the distribution network throughout South Australia to avoid those risks, the cost to the taxpayer and the cost to the energy consumer would be immense. I have seen estimates of up to \$75 billion to \$100 billion to underground the distribution network that members opposite privatised. The question is: why would we use taxpayers' money to underground our distribution network to minimise the risk of blackouts through these serious weather events and then be accused after the serious weather events of gold plating the distribution system? I think, in the end, the system worked well.

POWER SUPPLY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on when he expects the power interconnector with Victoria to be back up and running?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:22): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. The latest advice that we have received from ElectraNet—and I understand they may have made a public statement to this effect—is that they are aiming to have the interconnector up and running by the end of the weekend. Obviously, it's a very substantial exercise. There are complexities with the site in terms of heavy vehicle machinery that is required to be able to get to the particular location of erecting the appropriate towers that would be required.

To put a bit more detail around the challenge with the interconnector, as the Minister for Energy has explained with a degree of detail, the interconnector going down on the weekend as a result of the lightning strike in no way informed so many South Australians being out of power. In fact, the challenge that we've got in the days ahead is not to do with an undersupply of power due to the interconnector going down. It's quite the opposite: we have the challenge of dealing with an oversupply of power as solar panels kick into action as we start to see more sun come towards the state.

There will have to be active management of the grid over the course of the days ahead. We particularly turn our minds to Wednesday and Thursday to deal with that risk. Of course, the very fact that the state has a challenge in terms of oversupply of power speaks precisely to why this government has a very bold initiative, an incredibly progressive initiative, in building the world's—

Mr Tarzia: What did the Productivity Commission say about that one?

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is called to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —largest hydrogen electrolyser and power plant because so much of the principles that underpin our policy is the prospect of oversupply within South Australia—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —particularly with our strong prevalence of both wind and solar. In South Australia, we are very proud of the fact that we have not just led the country but led the world when it comes to renewable energy. I appreciate there were various iterations in the past. We have seen people complain about South Australia's position of leadership, comparing the big battery to the big banana and the like, but on this side of the house—

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order that I will hear from the member for Morialta under 134.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is called to order. The member for Morialta has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: the question was whether the Premier can update the house on when the power interconnector with Victoria would be up and running. He is now going far beyond that and debating.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully. I permit the Premier some latitude, as I do the leader. Some context is also permitted; however, I will draw the Premier's attention to the question.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I have updated the house in respect of the specific details that the Leader of the Opposition was asking, but it's important that the Leader of the Opposition, as all members of the South Australian public, understands that this government has a robust plan to deal with what we use oversupply of power for. On this side of the house, we believe in a clean energy future. On this side of the house, we are quite proud of the fact that we have a big policy and a big agenda to be able to use the challenges that we have in the system as an opportunity for the industrial benefit of the future of our state.

POWER SUPPLY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Energy. What action is the government taking to support river communities and irrigators left without power for prolonged periods? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr WHETSTONE: The opposition has been advised that there will be disconnections for up to 2,000 Riverland customers this week and a potential for up to 6,000 in coming weeks, with outages set to last for up to three months or more due to prolonged high river flows.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:27): The member has been in contact with me personally about this issue and asked me to raise these issues with SA Power Networks. It is a very good question. I have received a briefing from the department on this matter, which I thought I would inform the house about.

As a result of prolonged and sustained rainfall over catchments, the flow rate for the River Murray in South Australia has commenced rising, which in turn has caused the river to start rising, obviously. The flow rate of the river at this stage is expected to peak over December 2022, with elevated flows persisting until February 2023.

Advice from SA Power Networks is that approximately 107 connection points have been disconnected as at 15 November, mainly consisting of shacks and community infrastructure such as public barbecues in Morgan. These emergency disconnections are for safety reasons and as such fall outside the Guaranteed Service Level scheme.

As the flow rate rises to 120 gigalitres per day, it is expected that approximately 2,000 customers will need to be disconnected. SA Power Networks is providing customers with as much notice as possible of an impending disconnection, typically a few days' notice. However, it is not possible in all circumstances to provide a notice.

I am advised that SA Power Networks is in communication with the local councils, business and agricultural groups and other organisations to help prepare landholders and residents for the flood impact. Where disconnections occur, it can generally be expected the power will remain off for several weeks. SAPN has established principles for safe reconnections at the earliest possible opportunity.

There is a potential for impacts on pumping stations for River Murray irrigators as water levels rise. SAPN has been working with irrigators and has offered to assist where there are alternatives available. At a substation level, SAPN considers the Renmark substation at potential risk. Work to strengthen the substation to withstand a significant flood flow rate will be completed by the end of this week.

SAPN is also carefully surveying clearances to water levels where powerlines span across the river. Where distances between a line and the water breach the minimum required clearance level, the line will be disconnected for safety reasons. Current modelling forecasts that the key likely peak flow rate is dramatically higher than we had anticipated.

The problem that we have here is that we are acting within the protocols of the National Electricity Market to keep people safe, which means that there will be some disconnections. Those disconnections are highly undesirable for the local community, but they are done in the best interests. I undertake to work with the member of parliament to make sure that we can minimise the impact and use every regulatory process we have at our disposal to make sure we can inform those residents as early as possible about when disconnection is coming and reconnect them as early as possible.

This is an act of nature. This is not something that we could possibly have built infrastructure to withstand. This is no different from a bushfire, a storm or a flood. I know that residents will be doing it tough in this part of South Australia, and the South Australian government is with them. We will be working with their local representatives, including the council, to make sure that South Australian Power Networks and ElectraNet use all the facilities they have to make sure that people are looked after, and I undertake to the house to keep in regular contact with the member. He has my personal number. He can call me at any time he wants to discuss this.

CHILD PROTECTION REVIEWS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier satisfied that the Alexander review responds to its terms of reference and, if so, how does it ensure that practices of the minister and the department align with their statutory obligations?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:31): I thank the shadow minister for his question. Yes is the short answer. I think both the Hyde review and the Alexander review serve different purposes and have been worthwhile exercises. The government received both those reviews at essentially the same time and we have found them both to be instructive in different ways from different perspectives, in terms of the actions that the government should consider and indeed take in respect of the response to the tragedies that have been well documented.

Last week, the government announced its receipt of those reviews and its response to them, and we are grateful for both the former police commissioner Mal Hyde and indeed Kate Alexander undertaking her review. Naturally, having received those reviews, I have also spoken to both reviewers. I'm happy to inform the house that following the receipt of the review I also was fortuitously at a prearranged meeting with Margaret Nyland to discuss with her her royal commission report in the context of what has happened since then.

That was a meeting that was already scheduled and I just happened to get the review a couple of days before, so it actually worked out quite well. We discussed the various challenges within child protection, governance arrangements within child protection and the outcomes of the review. My office is seeking to arrange for a copy as best as possible if the appropriate authorities are able to be granted for Margaret Nyland to get an unredacted copy of that report, because obviously we have been able unable to release the report fully publicly in the way that I would have, quite frankly, hoped because of the advice from South Australian police. Nonetheless, we do still remain committed to releasing the report as quickly as we can once that advice from South Australian police changes.

MAJOR EVENTS

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:33): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house about the calendar of major events coming to South Australia over the next six months and the economic impact these events will provide to the state?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:33): In the lead-up to the state election, we announced a very deliberate policy in regard to tourism in the state of South Australia. There were multiple components of our policy that was developed largely by the then shadow minister for tourism and, I am pleased to say, the now Minister for Tourism in South Australia, the Hon. Zoe Bettison.

It was also a policy that was informed by the experience that each and every one of us had the privilege of being able to encounter by talking to people at the frontline of those who paid the biggest price during the course of the pandemic. There should be no misapprehension or misunderstanding about the fact that during the pandemic there were a lot of people in our community who were actually economic beneficiaries of the circumstances. But they were only able to have that benefit as a result of the extraordinary sacrifice that was paid by only a few, and they were principally tourism operators and hospitality operators. So we said we were going to do something about it, given the chance.

We have formulated a comprehensive policy. Two keys elements to it I will refer to right now—one, a big boost for tourism marketing funding that was funded by the Treasurer in this year's budget, and the second was a \$40 million major events attraction policy—and we have delivered in not too short a space of time.

What I would like to point out is that not only have the announcements been made, but on all accounts, despite them only being days old, it is already driving demand within the very sector where we had hoped to see that demand. I am pleased to report on the remarks and the quotes from the Australian Hotels Association:

Hotels are seeing a surge in bookings since the announcement LIV Golf and the AFL magic round. They are forecasting record booking levels that haven't been seen in many years, and there is a sense of optimism and excitement about these massive two events for our state. The events send a fantastic message to other accommodation and tourism investors for our state.

This morning, as it so happens, I was able to speak at the AAA conference, which is the Australian Airports Association conference, which happened to be meeting in Adelaide for the first time in three years—quite a big event.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned for a second time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: What is becoming clear is that we have got work to do between now and April next year to get airlines putting on additional flights. For the AFL Magic Round alone, the AFL are booking out—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We could have a new name in due course, but for the purposes—

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

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —of the AFL Magic Round, the AFL themselves are booking out 1,400 rooms just to meet the needs of their players and accommodation. I welcome the support from the member for Schubert, who is already out there—not the member for Schubert. I should say the member for Schubert's—

Mrs Hurn: Brother.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —brother, who is out there advocating for a game in the Barossa which we are really determined to deliver. We would—

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: She is keen on it? That's good, because what the member for Schubert clearly understands is that these types of events are a big deal for our state and the economy, but most profoundly they are a big deal for those people who paid the big sacrifices during the pandemic. I know we are in a different phase. I know lockdowns feel like a long time ago, restrictions feel like a long time ago, but the people who endured them and paid the sacrifices remember the pain and the hurt and they are looking forward to April next year to be an opportunity to showcase our state, to be at work and to have our economy pumping on all cylinders.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain to the house whether or not SAPOL officers will conduct rapid checks on children identified as being at high risk? If so, how are they equipped to do so and how long will that take?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:38): Yes; in fact, the police commissioner and I have been in contact about this very issue including as recently as earlier today. As I outlined in our press conference when we announced the government was in receipt of both of those reports, SAPOL are coordinating an exercise to see approximately 500 children across the state being visited in order to check for any signs of child neglect.

To be a little bit more specific, that's approximately 400 unique addresses that need to be visited because there are some instances where there are siblings involved, so that's a very substantial undertaking. It is being coordinated by SAPOL, but the bulk of the work done on the ground won't be done by SAPOL; it will be done by a combination of the Department for Child Protection and also utilising resources from the Department of Human Services.

That process is sought to be done as expeditiously as possible. It is quite a substantial undertaking because of course there are existing functions that both those departments do on a daily basis at the frontline in an emergency context. Nonetheless, I think we will recognise the importance of this exercise, and that's why we are having SAPOL coordinate it.

In answer to the shadow minister's question, SAPOL are coordinating it. That doesn't mean that SAPOL can't make visits, and that may well yet happen, but the bulk of the volume of the work in terms of the actual visits to the home will be done by those two agencies.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:39): In the context of that answer, a question to the Premier once again: did the Premier involve the Minister for Child Protection in his decision last week regarding rapid welfare checks? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: I heard the commissioner tell ABC radio last week that he had received a call from the Premier on or about 9 November and prior to the announcement requesting SAPOL to apply resources to rapid welfare response. When asked on radio on 10 November about the rapid welfare checks being carried out on 500 children, the minister said, 'I understand that SAPOL will be coordinating their efforts, so I won't speak to their processes, but I understand they will work hand in hand with DCP to do very rapid welfare checks, so physically going to homes to check on the welfare

of the children.' When asked, 'Sorry, you understand, so you're not sure?' the minister replied, 'No, I do understand. What I'm saying is that SAPOL will oversee those welfare checks.'

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:40): Yes, that all sounds right and entirely consistent with what I just explained earlier. It won't surprise the shadow minister that myself and the Minister for Child Protection, with other ministers in the house, are in regular contact on this issue because it is so important.

The Minister for Child Protection has been working—to say 'very hard' is a massive understatement—to make sure that the Department for Child Protection is responding to these tragedies appropriately, and the Minister for Child Protection is showing the leadership that is required in receipt of these two reviews. Naturally, her and I are talking on an incredibly frequent basis regarding this. Not too dissimilar, as recently as today with the police commissioner, the Minister for Child Protection and I have spoken about this on an almost daily basis, including today.

VISITOR ECONOMY

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister update the house on the recovery of the South Australian visitor economy?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:42): Thank you very much, and I am delighted to talk about the excellent results we are getting from the National Visitor Survey. Let's just remind ourselves how important tourism is to this state: it's 8 per cent of our economy and it's the fourth largest export for Australia.

We know that it has suffered incredibly difficult times during COVID, when our borders were shut. In fact, we had a low here in South Australia of a \$4.4 billion visitor economy, coming down from a high of \$8.1 billion, but I am pleased to say the results of August 2022 are exceptional. In fact, they are 115 per cent of the pre-COVID results. This means that we had a \$747 million total visitor spend in the month of August.

This is the fifth consecutive month where we have seen above or near pre-COVID levels here in South Australia. Why does this happen? This happens because we as a government have put a focus on building back tourism—

Mr Whetstone: Why don't you thank the businesses for doing what they do?

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is called to order and warned.

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We know that major events are a significant impact to attract people to come to South Australia. In fact, the double-header of the Wallabies and the Wallaroos on 27 August was the biggest ever night we had in hotels in Adelaide ever. That event attracted 8,000 people from interstate and had a significant impact on our tourism economy. We are looking to continue that momentum and, when I think about the upcoming rounds of the National Visitor Survey, it does make me a bit excited because we have a lot happening.

Just this month, we have had the ICC T20 match. Can I tell you how exciting it was, particularly for our Indian, Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities. They love coming out to see their heroes play. This weekend we have Harvest Rock. This is the first time it has come here. It is a two-day event for music, food and events, and we are going to have a great time—we are just hoping for the best weather possible.

Let's not forget the VALO Adelaide 500 from 1 to 4 December. The streets are calling, and we can't wait to see that. That is followed in January by the Santos Tour Down Under. Of course, we then go back to what is probably our favourite time of the year with the Fringe Festival and WOMAD. Just after that—and we had the great announcement this week—is, of course, the AFL Magic Round, which is going to be a fantastic addition to the—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

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

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Thank you so much, member for Schubert. Then, of course, LIV Golf as well. What we are seeing—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —is, of course, national events that turn people's heads—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens! The minister has the call.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —and make them book a flight. We hear that flights are already booked, but then we have an international event that turns people's heads. While we were up 32 per cent of interstate visitors in August, the international visitors are going to take some time.

So it is events of international significance, like the Santos Tour Down Under, like LIV Golf, that give people reason to come to South Australia. We need to build back because we have still got a long way to go, and those businesses involved, whether it be a hotel or a tourism operator, suffered, and they suffered in quite substantial years of uncertainty, and we want to give them that confidence and that momentum.

Just this morning, I announced that international flights were back to nearly 90 per cent in January, and we are seeing significant increases in flights from Qatar, Singapore, Malaysian Airlines and, of course, Virgin Australia going to Denpasar from South Australia for the very first time.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:46): My question is to the Premier. How many rapid welfare checks have been carried out since the Premier's announcement?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:46): I understand that there is an intention to start the rollout of those rapid welfare checks tomorrow. When I spoke to the police commissioner earlier today, he explained to me the process that is being gone through to be able to get us to that point. Like I said, the intention or aspiration is to be in a position to start that by the end of tomorrow.

They are working as quickly as possible. It needs to be done thoughtfully and methodically. I don't want to give anything away operationally that I am not supposed to speak to, but in respect of the 500-odd task not surprisingly a very significant number of those children are known to the state government in some form, and making sure that it is done in a coordinated way, particularly when we are doing it with multiple agencies, does require effort.

However, the exercise is being done as quickly as possible and, like I said, there is an aspiration for that to start tomorrow. I don't want that to be interpreted as a commitment or a guarantee that it will start tomorrow, but that's certainly what is being worked towards.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Of three members, I recognise the member for Heysen on a supplementary and then I will turn to the member for Playford.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:47): The Premier has just indicated that many of the children are already known to the department. If that's the case, why is it necessary to include that cohort in those on the receiving end of these rapid welfare checks?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:47): That's an excellent question. Let me answer that by sticking to what is already in the public domain. With respect to the tragedies that we became aware of earlier in the year, these of course were children who were already known to the Department for Child Protection.

I don't think it is appropriate for the government to work on—well, I'm not allowing for a circumstance that we work on the basis of presumption, in that just because a child is already known

to an organisation it immediately precludes them or excludes them from the possibility of being in a more difficult situation than the state knows about.

That is to say, to put it more succinctly, there is no harm in double and triple checking when we get the opportunity to do so. The 500 were identified through the Office for Data Analytics process in the Hyde review, so we take the view to check on all those children even if they have been known to the Department for Child Protection or DHS or any other agency previously.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:49): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer provide the house with an update on the state of South Australia's construction industry?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:49): Can I thank the member for Playford for his question.

Mr Tarzia: Who paid for lunch?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I'm not sure who took the member for Hartley out to lunch, but I will make those inquiries and also who paid the bill. I am pleased to update the house about some good news for South Australia's construction industry because very recently the Australian Bureau of Statistics released some figures which demonstrated that there are now more people employed in the construction sector in South Australia than ever before.

More than 85,000 people in South Australia are employed in this industry, or nearly one in 10 workers in South Australia in this industry. This is nearly 6½ thousand more people engaged in this industry than the previous record, which is good news. Of course, it's not one particular sector of the construction industry which is driving this: it's several different sectors of the construction industry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Flinders nominates the one person he knows who is engaged in the construction industry, and isn't it lucky for the media in this state—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —to inform him? Isn't it lucky that we've got the media to inform the member for Flinders about who might work in this industry? We all know that the housing industry has been the large driver of the total volume of construction work that has been undertaken around the country, largely because of the federal government's HomeBuilder scheme which they ran in response to the economic conditions of the pandemic.

Dwelling unit completions are the highest on record in the June quarter. Also in the same quarter, there were 14,743 residential dwellings under construction in the year to that quarter, which is the highest on record. The commercial sector is also making a strong contribution. The total value of non-residential building approvals in South Australia was the highest on record, with a total value of \$5.7 billion. Of that \$5.7 billion, \$3 billion was from the public sector and \$2.7 billion was from private.

Pleasingly, it is activity in the health industry that is driving much of this activity, which of course is good news. We are looking forward to getting on with these important health projects for the benefit of South Australians—of course, as soon as we can get some important legislation passed. We are looking forward to that.

We are aware that conditions have also been strong in the civil construction sector as well. As I have reported to the house previously, we are aware and concerned about the news that continues to come through media sources nationally and globally of expected downturns in economic conditions. That is all the more reason why government should be investing in all three different areas of the construction sector, to support activity on an ongoing basis in the coming years.

We will be doing that in housing, not just through our own public housing builds but also in partnership with the commonwealth as part of their Housing Accord. We will be doing it in the commercial construction industry, not just in health but also because we are building five new technical colleges and a range of other infrastructure upgrades, and who could forget the civil projects that are underway—a Labor government finally getting on with the job of completing the north-south corridor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We will be doing it quicker and we won't be allowing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Colton! Member for Hartley!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —four years of delay and denial by those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The construction industry is in good hands in South Australia.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier have plans for another plebiscite on council amalgamations and, if so, what councils will be involved?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:53): No, at this stage there are no other plans for any other plebiscites that the government has. The plebiscite that occurred in the South-East had a strong result, and that might be celebrated by those in the opposition, but on this side of the house we take the view that we were genuine about wanting to engage with the South-East community on this issue. We thought the best way to do that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We thought the best way to do that would be the most democratic application of consultation that has ever occurred in a situation such as this. Having a democratic vote on a potential consultation strikes me as a consultation on a consultation, which lends itself—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: It begs the question: what is there to lose? It also begs the question: how much more consultation would the opposition like than a consultation on a consultation in the form of a democratic vote?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: This has been a really important opportunity that has come at virtually no cost to facilitate a discussion in and around the Limestone Coast. I think that it has been worthwhile. I'm very proud of the fact that this government has the most pro-South-East policy that has been seen in a long time. We have over—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —\$100 million dollars' worth of policies that are specifically orientated towards the Limestone Coast in a range of different areas, everything from forestry to

health to skills to education. These policies have been endorsed by a great number in the South-East, including, dare I say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —by members opposite and we welcome that. We welcome the degree of bipartisanship—to an extent, a degree of bipartisanship—towards our endeavour in the South-East. Why do we do that? It's not just the obvious fact that Mount Gambier is the second largest city in our state. It actually speaks to the extraordinary opportunity that we see in the South-East of the state. We heard many cries from the member for Chaffey in the former government that #RegionsMatter, but just not when it came to the budget in the South-East.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson! Member for Florey! Member for Hammond! Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I had great pleasure in attending a very substantial event with the Chamber of Commerce in Mount Gambier only a couple of weeks ago, which was completely sold out. Let me tell you, those businesses know the difference between a Twitter hashtag and what we are delivering in real policy, in real money, on the ground, because that is the difference. The people of Mount Gambier and the people of MacKillop know it and I just invite you to go and ask them and they will explain to you the difference.

Members interjecting:

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

TAXI INDUSTRY

Mr BROWN (Florey) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister inform the house how the Malinauskas government is supporting the taxi industry and reducing the cost of being a taxi owner or operator?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:57): I thank the member for his keen concern for taxidrivers. He's a strong advocate for the taxi industry. It's a vital part of our state's transport mix and for disadvantaged and vulnerable South Australians it's often their primary means of travel.

In the lead-up to the election, the then Malinauskas opposition announced a range of reforms to improve and support the taxi industry and to provide a level playing field with rideshare services. One of the reforms was to assist with running costs. The house will be aware that, for the financial year from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022, registered taxi owners and operators received a rebate for compulsory third-party insurance premiums. The rebate for each taxi was \$3,092.41 for the full 12 months' registration. In the 2021-22 financial year, the rebate program fully concluded by 30 September 2022 and, in total, 1,117 payments were made, totalling approximately \$2.72 million in support to the industry.

I'm pleased to advise the house that a similar payment will now be made to eligible registered taxi owners to rebate CTP insurance premiums paid for taxis registered between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport will commence payments for this period from today.

I am advised that another \$528,000 of support for the taxi industry is going out today just for the period between 1 July 2022 and today. The full rebate for 12 months is \$2,526.13 and includes amounts for both CTP and the lifetime support levy paid during the eligibility period. Any person responsible for the payment of registration fees will receive the payment. Eligible registered taxi owners do not need to apply or take any steps to receive their payment. People should expect to receive their cheques in the mail within coming days.

I am also pleased to advise the house that the Department for Infrastructure and Transport has worked hard to add a new process for the 2022-23 financial year rebate program. This new

process will automatically issue rebate cheques as and when people pay for the registration: if a person renews their taxi registration monthly, they will automatically receive a cheque monthly. Other than postage, people do not have to wait to receive their rebate, which is a fantastic outcome. The government looks forward to rolling out the 2022-23 financial year rebate program and other reforms that are already improving and supporting the taxi industry.

SACE EXAMINATIONS

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. When did the minister become aware that students were able to use a writing assistance app in their SACE English exam, and will he now take steps to stop it in the future?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:00): I thank the member for Morialta for his question. Precisely when I was alerted to the fact that students in their SACE exams had access to what is referred to as Grammarly, which I understand is an app embedded into a website which gives students who are using that website access to things like spellchecking and grammar checking and things like that, I will have to come back to the member on precisely when I heard that access had first been allowed to that app.

But I can say now that both the Acting Chief Executive of SACE, Michaela Bensley, and the Chief Executive of the Department for Education, Professor Westwell, have both said this morning that that was an error and that access should not have been given to Grammarly. They have been at pains to say that they don't think those students who didn't have access to Grammarly will be in any way disadvantaged by the fact that some of their classmates or other year 12 students taking those exams did.

I have, of course, asked for some advice from both Ms Bensley and Professor Westwell about what specifically will be done to make sure access is not given again because I agree with the sentiments of both acting the CE and CE that it is not ideal. I think we can probably safely say that even if no students were disadvantaged through this process, having all this conjecture and speculation about the fact that some students did does not really go to the integrity of the SACE, and we want to avoid situations like that one at all costs.

I am happy to come back to the member for Morialta on the specifics of when were first alerted to the fact that access had been given, and I will also happily furnish this place with further detail around what exact and precise steps are being taken to make sure students can't have access to something like that again.

SACE EXAMINATIONS

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): My supplementary question is: will the minister ensure that the SACE Board prevents the use of Grammarly in subsequent SACE exams this year?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:03): I thank the member for Morialta for his question again. I understand those steps are already underway. I can't give the member for Morialta the IT specifics. I must admit, I had never heard of Grammarly before. Many people in this chamber are probably in the same boat. I remember when spellchecking was a very new thing.

I can't give the member for Morialta those specifics around exactly how access to Grammarly and anything like that is being ensured, but I am happy to get those details. I have been reassured by both SACE and Professor Westwell that steps have been taken already to make sure that cannot happen again, and I think that is absolutely the proper and right course of action.

WOMEN IN BUSINESS

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Small and Family Business. Can the minister inform the house how the state government is supporting women in business?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:04): I thank the member for Adelaide for

her question. As the member knows, the Malinauskas Labor government is very keen to support small and family businesses in South Australia and, in particular, to support female entrepreneurs to start and grow their businesses in this state.

It is something I am particularly passionate about, having started my own business at the start of 2015, a commercial law firm, which, after many years of being in a large commercial law firm, gave me the opportunity to run my own business. I was very well aware of the challenges I faced as a woman in business, as were also many of my clients, who were also female entrepreneurs.

I know that some of the issues are around building your networks, upskilling opportunities, business fundamentals, access to capital and of course, as the member for Adelaide will know, the well-documented juggle of caring responsibilities and work, and that particularly comes to the forefront when you are running your own business.

We have undertaken extensive consultation and rolled out the Women in Business program, which I am particularly proud of. In the consultation we have undertaken for the Office for Small and Family Business, we know that 40 per cent of female respondents right across the state still experience gender bias barriers, including some of the comments coming through about feeling they weren't being taken seriously as business owners and that their customers preferred dealing with men. Those issues are still coming through in the feedback that we are getting.

We know that we need to make it easier to support female business owners to manage their finances and improve their financial literacy, improve their marketing skills and their digital literacy. All those issues are feeding through into the Women in Business program that we released last week.

We had a recent Deloitte report commissioned by SBE Australia that found only 22 per cent of Australian startups are founded by women and, quite shockingly, only 0.7 per cent of funding secured by startups—0.7 per cent—went solely to female-owned companies. That is a shocking statistic that we need to work on. That same report showed that women founders who had networking and these sorts of program supports that we are offering in the Women in Business program were 1.4 times more likely to raise capital than other founders.

Having looked at those challenges and those opportunities, and working that into our election commitment with \$4 million for the Women in Business program over the next four years, last week, at a very successful launch on Tuesday, we announced the Women in Business program. We actually had to do a version 2 of that launch. The original one was partnering with the Port Adelaide Football Club through their Her Story business program, and we will be partnering with the Port Adelaide Football Club to run a number of leadership and networking events over the next 12 months. I want to thank them for their support, particularly for the launch last Tuesday.

Our initial intent was to have 100 people at the Port Adelaide Football Club. That sold out in 15 minutes, which was remarkable. I want to thank Matthew Richardson for allowing us to move to a larger venue, where we had over 300 passionate women in the room talking about our program.

We are running a foundations program, partnering up with the Adelaide Business Hub to support early stage business owners through mentoring and capability programs, and an advisory program that is being partnered with Behind Closed Doors to run that program for fast growing businesses to help them with their strategic planning governance and a whole range of other issues. The Port Adelaide Football Club have been a terrific partner to come on board with us with their AFLW team, and I look forward to rolling out that program further.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL FUNDING

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Arts. Does the minister stand by her words at the launch of the Adelaide Festival program last week? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Last week, at the launch of the program the minister claimed that the Adelaide Festival had the strong support of the Malinauskas Labor government. However, documents released to the opposition under FOI reveal the new operating grant for the Adelaide

Festival provided by the new government is nearly \$200,000 less than that budgeted last year and \$350,000 less than that provided last year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order. Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:09): I thank the member for the question. I think what the member is referring to is the efficiency savings that were announced in our first budget. Across the arts portfolio and across government, excluding, I think, health and education, we had quite a modest 2½ per cent efficiency savings that have been rolled out across a number of portfolios.

It's substantially less than the Marshall government's first budget, which was 5 per cent efficiency savings across the arts portfolio. So, unless the member is seeking for us to increase our efficiency savings, that's what has been rolled out in our first budget. It's to support what we went to the election with, which was increasing arts funding in a range of ways, including not only Fringe funding, annualising the Film Festival and a whole range of other supports for the arts but also our significant investment in health and education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ARTS FUNDING

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Arts. Does the minister value the contribution made by the Festival Centre to South Australia's culture and economy? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Documents released under FOI reveal that since the budget the government has reduced funding for the Festival Centre, from \$18.1 million, in last year's operating grant as budgeted, to \$14.5 million this year—a \$3.6 million drop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:10): In part, I reference my earlier answer, which was on the efficiency savings, but I actually think some of those figures involve funding that went to the Festival Centre while it was closed. I will come back to the member on specifics of that, but I don't—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Florey is called to order. The Treasurer is called to order. The member for Morialta has the call.

ARTS FUNDING

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:11): My question is for the Minister for Arts. Does the minister value contributions made by the South Australian Museum, the Art Gallery of South Australia and Country Arts SA to reconciliation, scientific research, our regions, culture and tourism in South Australia? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Documents released under FOI reveal that this year the government is providing funding at reduced levels to these institutions: the Museum, dropping by \$290,000; Country Arts SA by \$160,000; and the Art Gallery by \$1.7 million.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:11): Again, that is the efficiency savings at half the rate of the first Marshall Liberal government budget—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: —and also half the rate of the second Marshall Liberal government budget.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: In answer to the member's question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey! Member for West Torrens! The Treasurer is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: In answer to the member's question, yes, we fully support all those institutions, who do fantastic work, including the Art Gallery, the Museum, the Adelaide Festival Centre—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: —and the Adelaide Festival. We look forward to bigger and better programs being rolled out over the next 3½ years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Planning. What is the government doing to assist apartment owners impacted by dangerous flammable cladding, and are there any alternative proposals?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (15:12): Nothing can be more important to a government than the safety of its citizens. Citizens in these apartments—and there are about six buildings in this extreme range and about 40 or so in the moderate range—live with anxiety every day because their buildings are covered in composite cladding which is flammable and highly dangerous.

Of course, this is been an issue for a long time, since not the previous government but, initially, the government before that, and arises out of the terrible tragedy that occurred with Grenfell Tower. Last week, we announced a loan scheme which we believe will assist building owners and apartment owners in buildings affected by this cladding. The essential part of this scheme is a fixed interest loan at the government rate of 4.93 per cent, a loan repayment term of 10 years, no application fees and individual loans to buildings of up to \$15 million to the owners corporation of those buildings.

We believe that this provides valuable assistance to people who are in a very, very difficult situation, and we think that's incredibly important. To assist the body corporates and the individual owners of these apartments in these buildings, we have appointed Wendy Campana, who has a long history of assisting governments and citizens with this issue. She was appointed by the previous government to assist cladding owners and she has been reappointed by this government. We hope

that she can reach out over the next couple of months to individual building owners to assist them with our program.

I was asked also about alternatives, and it's interesting because the member for Bragg—future leader of the Liberal Party, I understand; self-appointed future leader of the Liberal Party—claimed he had run a long-running campaign to bring zero interest rates for people in this situation. It seems like the Liberal Party has jumped from doing nothing for three years to a position of extreme generosity. I would just like to remind the member for Bragg what was said in this chamber in 2019:

South Australians can look forward to the fact that in our state at least this issue will be dealt with much more quickly than it has been and will be dealt with in jurisdictions around the country.

That was the former Minister for Planning Stephan Knoll in this chamber in 2019. What followed that was three years of zero financial help to people in this situation, so much so that I was inundated by people making representations to me when I was appointed as planning minister. Even more interesting, the member for Bragg might want to understand who is responsible for this and all he needs to do is ratchet his head to the right and he could see the member for Dunstan is here—good enough to join us today. In a question on notice, replying to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —the now Treasurer and then former shadow treasurer, he said, and this is a direct quote:

Financial options to assist building owners with replacement costs have not been considered, given that all the ongoing costs associated with building, such as maintenance and repair, are the responsibility of building owners.

So what we have had is a situation where in government, and we have heard plenty about the great achievements of the Marshall government—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, we hear it from them all the time—they move motions all the time—but what we don't hear is about where they fell flat, and they fell flat in this situation and they left people—

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister's time has expired.

MAJOR EVENTS

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:16): My question is to the Premier. How much did the government commit to attain the LIV Golf tournament and also the extra round of AFL in 2023?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:16): As I have foreshadowed publicly, and as I am more than happy to do in this place, our commitment to attracting major events is sincere. It has the intent of driving economic growth in the state, particularly in the areas I foreshadowed earlier. The funding for both the AFL's 24th round, nominally now called the Magic Round with a new name pending, along with LIV Golf, is coming from the major events attraction fund, which the Treasurer outlined in the budget earlier this year.

Grievance Debate

MORIALTA ELECTORATE

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): The weekend saw significant weather events that dramatically impacted on the lives of many South Australians. More than 160,000 SA Power Networks customers experienced blackouts as a result of Saturday's storms. Constituents in Morialta and across the eastern suburbs—and I know in the member for Hartley's electorate, and indeed right across metropolitan Adelaide and certain regions in South Australia—felt dramatic impacts. Some people suffered trees and branches falling on their houses and cars and other property. Some people experienced severe and significant flooding events. I know that some of my constituents had that very profound experience and it was a great challenge to many.

The loss of power had a dramatic impact for residents and businesses—businesses in Newton, for example, such as Fine Food Cucina. I visited them first thing Sunday morning after talking to the owners. As I understand it, tens and tens of thousands of dollars worth of stock had to be destroyed as a result of the power outages. Businesses right across Morialta and metropolitan South Australia have had dramatic impacts. Some of them have been insured for stock but that does not take into account anything like the significant costs to those businesses, not to mention the fact that it is such an extraordinary and heartbreaking waste of so much good product, so much good South Australian product. There were more than 420,000 lightning strikes and winds of up to 106 km/h, with the Adelaide Hills and southern suburbs also hit very hard.

As of this morning, there were still more than 12,000 SA Power Networks' customers without power. In my electorate, that includes residents in Athelstone and Rostrevor. I was very fortunate, and my family had power restored only in the early hours of Monday morning. We were expecting it to be out until tonight as, indeed, were many others. In the member for Hartley's area—residents in Felixstow and Paradise—and across the South Australian metropolitan area, thousands and thousands are still affected.

Nearly 50 schools were closed on Monday, with another 24 still closed today. This is the largest outage event experienced in South Australia since the statewide blackout in 2016. Emergency services workers have been working around the clock since Saturday. Crews from interstate have been brought in. I visited the Athelstone CFS on Sunday morning, bringing them some food that was still good from Fine Food Cucina as it happens. They had been out until three in the morning and they were back in the CFS at 8 o'clock, prepared to do another full day's work. They were again going through the night, as were so many other volunteers and personnel, including CFS brigades, SES units and other volunteer groups around the state.

South Australians should be commended for their resilience over the last few days. Looking forward, we know that the storms have damaged our interconnector with Victoria, which has left us islanded from the national grid. The interconnector is critical because it allows us to import power at a time of need but, equally important, it allows us to export when we produce excess renewable energy. The former member for Stuart, Dan van Holst Pellekaan, would regularly inform the house about the risks of what it would do to damage the system if we had a situation of negative net demand on a regular basis.

That is why the interconnector to New South Wales was such a critical priority for the former Marshall Liberal government. That is why the former Marshall Liberal government invested in an interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales: Project EnergyConnect, a \$2.4 billion infrastructure project that will drive billions upon billions of dollars of investment into renewable energy projects and serve to create thousands of new jobs. It will work to drive down the price of electricity for families and businesses around our state. Importantly, in light of recent events, Project EnergyConnect will strengthen our power grid. If Project EnergyConnect were in place, then the next few days would be less nervous.

The Labor Party promised to have that South Australia and New South Wales interconnector 20 years ago, in 2002. It was on Mike Rann's pledge card. There are people who put Contact over those pledge cards and they still survive to this day. The Museum of Australian Democracy no doubt has a copy. People can look it up. It was one of the key pledges that Rann would deliver, and then Labor spent 16 years not interested—

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —until it was invested in, supported—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —by the Marshall Liberal government against the constant argument, the constant refrain from the now Minister for Energy and Mining when he was in opposition—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: His criticisms were constant. He talked down the project vigorously ever since it was announced, until yesterday when he went on radio and finally supported it. We welcome that support, we look forward to the government overseeing the final delivery of this crucial project and I thank once again all our emergency services volunteers and personnel who have served our state and our residents so well over the last four days.

DAVENPORT ELECTORATE

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (15:22): I rise to thank and acknowledge our incredible SES and CFS volunteers and also MFS and council staff who have been working incredibly hard day and night over the last few days with the power outage and storm damage.

I would like to particularly thank some of the crews in my electorate of Davenport, including the CFS for Happy Valley and also Cherry Gardens, and also the O'Halloran Hill MFS who have been working extremely hard and sometimes working 14, 15 or 16-hour shifts over the weekend to make sure that people can get to and from their homes, get out and about and get what they need, get to work, get to school and look after their loved ones.

When we have challenges like this in our communities there is often a silver lining. This time it has certainly been that the community has come out and banded together to support each other. We have seen our local businesses, restaurants and cafes offering their coolrooms, offering their charging points in their stores to the community. The community centres have offered hot showers and, again, places to charge their phones and their laptops. It has been wonderful to see how supportive people have been of each other.

I would like to particularly have a little shout-out to the residents of Black Road at Flagstaff Hill. They get absolutely hammered every time there is a storm in our state. It was not that long ago that they were cleaning up along Black Road and now they have had to do it again. It felt like almost every second tree on Black Road came down on Saturday afternoon, and immediately the residents were out there with their chain saws clearing the road and making it safe for people to get through.

We had a couple of homes completely lost in the storms on Saturday. I mention the home of one family of five on Black Road at Flagstaff Hill where a huge tree fell down and absolutely obliterated the home. There is not much left of it, and this happened just after a recent renovation too. My heart breaks for that family who are now living in a one-bedroom unit with their elderly mother and their dog until they are able to work out a plan going forward.

What was most incredible was how positive the family stayed throughout the situation. We were on the phone to them trying to get them information as best we could, but as we knew with the hundreds of call-outs across the state that information was hard to come by, and it took them a couple of days to learn when they were going to get some support.

However, they stayed positive. They understood that they were not the only ones and never got down and out despite their challenging situation. I am sure that it also had a lot to do with the support they received from their neighbours and from the local businesses that were offering all sorts of assistance.

In a street in Aberfoyle Park a Stobie pole came down and completely blocked off a road. We had residents doing traffic control for two or three days. It was only this morning that we had assistance to remove that tree and the Stobie pole off the road. The residents have been managing that community for the past few days, and it became quite the community event. I think that the neighbours all got to know each other, which again is a silver lining. People were bringing out food, wine and really enjoying the social activity that this challenge brought to our community.

There is still a long way to go. There is still a huge clean-up to do in my electorate of Davenport. I think it will be a few weeks before the streets look the way they did before the storm, so I would just call on the community to continue to be positive and continue to be patient.

Council staff are getting out there this week particularly, and hopefully with some shift changes the SES and CFS staff will have some new energy to get out there and clean up the mess that has been left behind. I am calling on our community and our neighbours to continue to be positive, to get out there and to offer some help wherever they can and to stay safe on our roads.

HARTLEY ELECTORATE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:27): Certainly there have been devastating scenes right across my electorate after the storms of the weekend, and I want to take this opportunity to thank our emergency services personnel for their tremendous efforts, people in organisations like our SES, our CFS and our MFS who have done an amazing job.

I also want to thank SAPN and local councils for working together to restore power as quickly as possible. Of course, we do unfortunately have a number of residents who are still without power. I do encourage anyone who is not getting the communication they want to please make contact with me and I would be happy to follow up their concern.

I also rise to speak today because I have received particular correspondence from yet another resident, Gina, who is still without power. She is unable to cook, her girls are unable to study and her family is unable to use the most basic household utilities. In some respects it actually does feel like the 2016 statewide blackout all over again in these pockets. We still have homes without power, and not only that but businesses have lost thousands in lost produce and other potential revenue.

We know that South Australians pay more than any other state for energy, and Labor cannot even keep the lights on in these areas. What is Labor's answer to this energy crisis? We have heard about a \$593 million hydrogen facility, and they call it clean, green hydrogen. We are led to believe that this grand hydrogen plan is going to fix everything, but we have seen a recent, very thorough, Productivity Commission inquiry into South Australia's renewable energy competitiveness that actually might say something a bit different.

We know that the commission's central purpose is to provide the Premier with independent, evidence-based economic advice on how to improve our state's economic growth and in turn South Australian income as well. What does this report say about this grand hydrogen plan by the Labor Party? The report says that South Australia first and foremost does not have a commercially managed port necessarily suitable for exporting hydrogen.

If I look at finding 27, it states, 'The lack of a commercial port is a constraint on the development of a large-scale green hydrogen export sector.' This is product export 101. It goes on to say that the barriers to renewable energy development identified in the report make it harder for South Australia to then take advantage of any competitive advantage from its wind and solar endowments. It goes on to say:

The favourable endowments of solar and wind do not guarantee that South Australia will be able to secure an economic advantage from the global energy transition.

Finding 4 states:

The South Australian region of the national electricity market has insufficient commercial and industrial load to absorb the solar generation on sunny spring and summer days. This poses a risk to system stability and increases electricity costs to consumers.

So the expert opinion is crystal clear, and it carries with it a weight that this government cannot ignore. The report goes on say that, out of 92 unique hydrogen projects, South Australia only has five listed, the smallest number out of any state, and that South Australia does not have a large-scale extraction workforce creating a potential lack of readily available skilled workers to support any hydrogen projects. Is it even financially viable? Finding 25 of the report states:

An export-scale green hydrogen plant would increase GSP by \$1.9 billion and create an additional 4,900 jobs, conditional on market prices for hydrogen being high enough to make its production financially viable.

This is the thing. By the looks of this, we simply do not have the budget to go it alone at the moment, which is certainly likely to continue to be the case under a Labor government. Finding 31 talks about challenges in South Australia's budgetary position. It says that it constrains the extent to which the

government can support the development of a local green hydrogen sector. In many respects, this report has been absolutely scathing about Labor's ambitions.

What we are coming to see here is that Labor's hydrogen plan is just a bunch of hot air. We know that you need a commercial port to take the hydrogen somewhere, and guess what? If we need to take the hydrogen further away to different jurisdictions, there are jurisdictions that are closer to ours, such as Port Hedland, that can take hydrogen where it needs to go. If you take that hydrogen further, guess what? It costs more. That is called a competitive disadvantage. It is not rocket science, but to a Labor government it may as well be.

HARGREAVES, MR M.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:32): Today, I rise to acknowledge the recent passing of a man in our community, Mick Hargreaves. Mick Hargreaves has been involved with the Southern Districts Junior Soccer Association since its beginning approximately 44 years ago. Mick Hargreaves volunteered for those 44 years. We often rise in this place to acknowledge the work of volunteers because we know that they are the bedrock of our community, and I will always proudly stand here in support of the work that volunteers do. But this service by Mick over 44 years to junior soccer in our community is absolutely extraordinary and one that we are all so very proud of—the contribution that he has made.

The soccer facility is located in the electorate of Gibson on Bowker Street at North Brighton. Many of us have fond memories of attending there. He ran the soccer season, and the primary schools registered in the league spread far across the southern metropolitan schools, schools from Hawthorndene to Woodcroft and across to Goodwood, Plympton and Brighton—in fact, every year there were almost 3,000 children in home and away fixtures, night games and carnivals. That is an incredible number of children he oversaw as president to have an opportunity to play the world game.

In order to enable this, Mick ran free coaching classes and referee clinics to allow parents to participate in the game and support their children. Once again, he did this for free and at no cost to those people who wanted to be involved in the game.

It is not uncommon when you talk to people in the community that they recall meeting Mick first when they were a child playing at Bowker Street soccer carnivals, when they were learning to play, and now as parents they are proudly taking their children back to participate and often find that they are in such a fantastic environment that they also end up participating as a coach.

One of the things that I think Mick can be most proud of is the value that he put on every child having equal time on the pitch regardless of ability. That is something he drummed into the association and it was very clear: every child who rocks up to play gets equal time. He also wanted to ensure that the spirit of the game was instilled in those who played and that it was about having fun and supporting your team. I can say that children who participated in those soccer carnivals have also gone on to become professional players.

Equally important to Mick was his encouragement to get girls involved in soccer. He was passionate about keeping the sport affordable and making it inclusive. Thousands of children have benefited from Mick's hard work at the junior soccer association in the south. In addition, Mick's presence at the oval made everyone feel safe. Since Mick was often there at all hours, often with his wife, Carole, many members of the community who use the oval after hours to walk their dog, to go for a run or to have their own kickaround would often spot Mick at the oval.

Under the Kerin/Olsen government, when it looked like the Bowker Street reserve was going to be sold to developers, he was one of the team that was instrumental in preserving the reserve status. The longevity of the club and its position in the community were very important to Mick and he worked hard to secure a long-term lease for the club. By virtue of his own contribution, he inspired others to help out.

Mick was quiet, he was unentitled and he worked hard to improve the grounds at Bowker Street oval. Not only did he volunteer most evenings at Bowker Street but he also spent his weekends observing other primary school matches because he wanted to make sure that the modified rules that occurred at Bowker Street were progressing with how the game was played elsewhere, so he took a keen interest in the sport throughout his time.

Of course, Mick would not be the pillar of our soccer community in the south without the hard work and dedication of his wife, Carole, who, like her husband, dedicated herself to the club. Carole has often been found fundraising, running the canteen or busy working hard for the club, but never too busy for a chat. In fact, they often both spent Friday nights cleaning the clubrooms. Yet, even as his health continued to deteriorate, he ensured that the fixtures for the 2023 season were organised.

When I last met with Mick, it was a night of a soccer carnival and he had only just left hospital that day, but he was determined to make sure the carnival ran smoothly. I would like to offer my condolences to the Hargreaves family.

FINNISS ELECTORATE

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:37): I rise to thank the community in my electorate for the wonderful work we saw over the weekend, when we had some very severe weather conditions go through. We have seen reports, particularly up here, of wind damage and power issues, but communities that were probably the hardest hit, which certainly has not necessarily been publicised as much, have been those that were hit by stormwater going through their properties.

I estimate that about 20 homes in the town of Middleton had at least a foot of water through them. There were also 28 permanent residents of the Middleton Caravan Park who had their caravans or their cabins inundated with water, up to two metres deep in some cases, absolutely decimating those properties.

We also saw significant damage and water through businesses in the town of Middleton. The General Store had all its fridges destroyed. They have only been open two years, and it took them six months to order those fridges from overseas two years ago. They are not sure how long it is going to take to get fridges back to be fully operational going forward. We also saw them lose the bottom two shelves of stock right across the shop, with quite significant damage to the buildings and mud through everything.

Alongside them was the chemist shop. They were not quite as badly damaged. Luckily, their structure was able to hold out most of the water, and they probably had about six inches of water actually in the shop, as well as significant mud and things to clean out.

Across the road is Big Surf Australia. Many of us grew up hearing Big Surf Australia, with Andy Inkster giving surf reports on SAFM for many years. The business was bought by Tom and Anna Vincent many years ago, and they have been running it ever since. They had water go through their shop that did enormous amounts of damage. On Sunday, my wife and I, along with other members of the community, helped them do a stocktake of all the damaged items. It was certainly great to see how many people came out to help not just them but all the businesses.

Tom's brother, Andrew, owns the caravan park with his wife, Cash, and the park had enormous damage. The cabins floated out of the ground, taking their concrete footings with them, so significant repairs are going to be needed to get it back operational. Basically, the only solid building that did not go under in the caravan park was the office itself. There was quite extensive damage to their facilities.

The Mill House Medical Centre in town had a foot or so of water through their building; it damaged all their computer and phone systems and they are not operational yet. They are doing everything they can to get back up operational, but they have no records of appointments or quick access to anyone's files, so they are working through that challenge at the moment. Some bed and breakfast businesses were significantly hit in the old mill itself, and we also saw the landscaping business across the road also have water damage go through their property.

I have complete admiration for the community. On Sunday, it was actually near impossible to get a park in the town, as there were so many people helping out. People just brought their brooms down and were sweeping mud out of the shops. It was absolutely amazing to see the community come together and work together to actually address those issues.

I thank the Minister for Human Services and Minister for Emergency Services for touching base and helping, making sure that people were looked after. It is important that we look after our

communities in these difficult times and, as I said, it was so pleasing to see the community out there helping. It gives me faith in the people of my electorate.

AFGHANISTAN

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:42): I rise today to draw the house's attention to an ongoing issue affecting many in my community of Enfield, and that is the ongoing situation in Afghanistan. With the fall of Kabul and the Taliban taking over, not only does it affect the people over there but it does have a deep impact on our local refugee community, particularly those living and working in Enfield.

What brought this to light for me was actually at a premiere of a fantastic documentary at the Adelaide Film Festival called *Watandar: My Countryman*. I met the filmmaker and director, Jolyon Hoff, and the subject of the documentary, Muzafar Ali, at the Hawke Centre. On the Hawke Centre emailing list, I received an email about a Afghan refugee who was having a photographic exhibition at the Hawke Centre earlier this year, so I thought, 'I wonder if the Afghans in my electorate know that this is happening.' I am always trying to bring my portfolio into my electorate and make sure we have that crossover, so I invited a group of people from my electorate to see this photographic exhibition at the Hawke Centre.

I had a really good conversation with Jolyon Hoff and Muzafar Ali, who talked us through not only the photographic exhibition but the production of the documentary, *Watandar*. It was premiered at the Adelaide Film Festival. I had tears in my eyes from probably the first 30 seconds, when Muzafar walked through the Adelaide Airport with his very young children and his wife, coming here via Indonesia as refugees.

It prompted me to think about the fact we are probably not hearing terribly much about what is going on in Kabul at the moment. It is not really on our TV screens and I think this is a good opportunity for me to raise that issue, as the atrocities are continuing and they are having a significant impact here.

If you get the opportunity to have a look at the documentary, Mr Speaker, it is a fantastic documentary that actually is about Muzafar going through to Marree and the areas where the Afghan cameleers in the 1880s—in particular the 1860s to the 1880s—were brought over to help transport routes essentially, to help get goods through the north and west of South Australia. They did an incredibly difficult job. He has gone back through the history and the importance of identity for Afghans in Australia. It is not just the new refugees we are more aware of; it is the history of the Afghans who came here in the 1800s. We had the first mosque at Marree, and it was finished in 1882. There is not much of it left, but it is shown in the documentary.

The other interesting take on the documentary was the interaction between the Afghans and our First Nations people. One of the photographs and one of the stories is of Nici Cumpston, who you, Mr Speaker, might be aware is a fantastic First Nations curator who works at the Art Gallery of South Australia. I saw the photo of Nici when I was at the Hawke Centre. I always saw Nici as a First Nations curator and did not realise she had an Afghan background.

There are so many of our wonderful First Nations people from that area who have Afghan blood and First Nations blood. To have those stories interact and to have that identity being explored through this documentary, particularly for the new Afghans who are looking for their identity in Australia, I think is a really important story to tell.

The documentary touched me, and I would love as many people as possible to see the work of Jolyon Hoff and Muzafar Ali in telling that story. Muzafar is the most grateful, positive person I have ever met, with a very tragic history in his story of coming to Australia. Part of the documentary is him talking to friends still over in Kabul. As the documentary progressed, the desperation in those voices came through—of being worried about being killed by the Taliban and having their children taken away. Kids, particularly boys from 14 onwards, are being taken by the Taliban and forced to join the Taliban.

On a day-to-day basis people are trying to make sure their children are alive and trying to get them out, when they cannot. Those stories are important for us to know, important for our local community, and it is something I encourage the house to pay attention to.

Bills

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 6.

The CHAIR: According to my records, we are on clause 6. Member for Flinders, this will be your second contribution.

Mr TELFER: Your record is the same as mine. If you remember, Mr Chair, we were discussing clause 6 and some of the detail, the vesting of the project site. The questions that had just preceded were around the square metreage of comparable sites. The minister discussed a few of the different aspects around the difference between the site square metreage and the building size square metreage. The documentation that the government has provided to the public on this discusses the differences in a bit of compare and contrast between the proposed RAH west site and the barracks site.

I note there is a 20,000 square metre arrangement for the site as far as the RAH west site proposal and the barracks site of 40,000 square metres. I also note the difference between the proposed building site of 109 square metres and 117 square metres between the two sites so, by my very rough maths, it would be about a 7 per cent increase.

Minister, I am just trying to get my head around what the rest of the space is going to be used for. There is about a 7.3 per cent increase in the square metreage of the building site. The actual site size for the women's and children's is the number which you say is double the 20:40 square metreage approximation. In the car parking there is a slight increase, from 12 to 15 in the 2021 plan for the RAH west site and over 1,300 car parks for the barracks site.

We are going to have significant amounts of land. Is this just going to be set aside for any potential future growth and, if so, what is the short term going to be for those extra significant square metreages or is there going to be a greater footprint for the actual building site on the ground and not as much vertical?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I thank the member for his very good question. During question time we got the exact figure down to the square metre in relation to the project site, which, when you include the entire project site including the Gaol Road section, comes to 56,780 square metres.

That represents, as I said, the roughly 40,000 square metres to the west of Gaol Road and roughly 13,000 square metres to the east of Gaol Road that we talked about earlier. When you account for the entirety of that space within the project site box and also Gaol Road itself, it comes to 56,780. As you alluded to, there are significantly greater options and flexibility available in terms of now designing the hospital and that is one of the predominant reasons why we have gone down this path.

It does allow us to build not only a bigger hospital but also a much wider hospital than was possible on the RAH west site. The RAH west site did not enable services to be connected on the same floor. You are correct in that it will be a much larger footprint in terms of the hospital but, of course, that will not be the only thing that will be on that site. The car parking will also have to be established on that site, various plant and equipment, and various traffic movements in and out of the site.

There will also be significant landscaping and, as we have made public, we want to establish quite a significant playground area adjacent to the hospital as well to make sure that we have the best opportunity for families. I keep in mind the number of siblings who would spend a lot of time visiting the hospital to see their sibling, so it is about having somewhere fun and exciting for them to go when they are at the hospital as well. It gives us those opportunities and, in the detailed design,

we will obviously be considering within that project site how there will be future orientation for expansion as well.

Mr TELFER: For clarification—and this is important information and it is important for it to be on the public record—what is the actual building footprint in the preliminary plans, the actual footprint of the building itself? What proportion is it of that approximately 40,000 square metres on the west side of Gaol Road?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As has been outlined, the exact detail is being worked through. We have provided the opposition in briefings previously the current schematic design of the orientation of the hospital we are looking at, which would be in the order of about 20,000 square metres to fit all of those hot floor services together, but there is obviously significant work that is underway in terms of the detailed planning of that.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, this will be your last contribution for this clause.

Mr TEAGUE: I had forgotten about those earlier ones.

The CHAIR: I have not forgotten.

Mr TEAGUE: No. Thank you very much, Chair. My question to the minister in due course is we have just received therefore an indication more precisely of the project site and we ask, I suppose all of us collectively, to recognise that or think about that for the time being as the whole of the area indicated as the project site in the plan set out in schedule 1. But tell me if it is something different from that.

For the purpose of the definition the subject of clause 5, 'project site', which is either the whole of the land area or some subset of that land—I think the minister has indicated that it is not going to be more than that but it could be less—there needs to be a determination at some point of what the project site is. Schedule 1 shows a boundary around a project site; that is the whole of the land.

If it is a situation in (b) where the minister actually makes a determination and it is not going to be the whole of the land that is required, then that becomes the project site, as I read it, and we could perhaps come back to this when we look at the schedule, and then as far as the vesting of the project site we have in 6(1) the whole or any part of the project site that is going to vest.

Is that there contemplating that there is going to be, first, a decision to determine what the project site is and would it therefore not make sense for that to be (a) the whole amount, and then subsequently a decision that vests possibly any part of the project site in the minister, and that is done by the notice in the *Gazette* because, if not, what work does that have to do in 6(1)? Clearly, the work of the definition needs to provide certainty prior to the consideration of the 6(1) determination because otherwise one would be doing no work or the other one, and I know we have already completed it, but we would have to revisit clause 5 and the project site definition in that case.

So to put it in practical terms, the project site has been described as the 56,780 square metres and made up of those component parts. Are we not therefore to take that as necessarily the project site as defined, and are we right to then think that there will be some subsequent exercise of discretion for the purposes of clause 6(1)?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: My understanding—and we have already obviously dealt with clause 5—is that clause 5 makes clear what the project site is. The question being raised was there would be a future determination of that, is not my understanding. The project site is the area of the land, except for (b), if that essentially we could give up some of that land that is not in the project site in a future way if that was no longer required in the future.

The second section regarding clause 6(1) is in relation to investing it to the minister in fee simple. We will get some advice. I dare say we may well be back to discuss this. We might not finish this bill in full in the next minute, so I will get some clarity before we next join our happy discussion on this bill. It may well be that that could be in relation to either a timing question why that has been drafted in that particular way—some of the ownership may be taken on various points in time—or there may be another reason. We will seek some clarity for why it has been staged like that and not just the entire ownership would come into the minister immediately.

To clarify, we have had some advice: there may be a stage requirement in terms of the ownership of the barracks site and that is why that option has been given in clause 6(1).

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. C.J. Picton.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 3 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 have to be asked by members on their feet and all responses are given by ministers on their feet. Questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2021-22 Report and Agency Statements for the year ending 2021-22, as published on the Auditor-General's website. I welcome the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and also the member for Hartley. I call for questions.

Mr TARZIA: Thank you, sir. Good afternoon, minister. I refer to the Auditor-General's Annual Report, Part A: Executive Summary, page 53, figure 9.2, where it talks about the Torrens to Darlington leg. It reads: '\$151m Original budget' to '\$256m Actual'. Obviously, there is significant disparity here; some would even call it a significant blowout. Are these figures the minister's latest understanding of the current costings?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I cannot win with the shadow minister: either we are not spending enough and getting on with it on the north-south corridor or now we are spending too much. Perhaps if my young Padawan learner would turn to page 54, he will see the second point which says, and I quote:

- The North-South Corridor (River Torrens to Darlington) project spent \$256 million in 2021-22. This was \$104 million over budget. DIT advised [the Auditor-General] that this increased expenditure was due to earlier than anticipated finalisation of the acquisition of some properties required for the project.

Given that the member is saying he was aware of this dot point, it would make one wonder why he would say is this a blowout, unless he is perhaps questioning the validity of the Auditor-General's observations. No, he is not. Here endeth the lesson.

Mr TARZIA: I refer to the Auditor-General's Annual Report, Part A: Executive Summary, page 15, dot point 4.2, 'Authorised access to Cabinet records'. I note that the Auditor here refers to 'significant problems in accessing documentation from government agencies related to Cabinet submissions'. Minister, was your office one of those agencies?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is a decision of the cabinet. I fully support the decision. The Westminster tradition enables us to make those decisions in a room where we can debate openly and freely and run good executive government. My advice to my friend the shadow minister is that, when he ultimately achieves executive office, this is a principle he should embrace—that is, that executive discussions within the executive should be done in secret. That is how they should be done, and the decisions of that room are then announced publicly.

The deliberations of cabinet should be for cabinet only. That has always been the principle of our Westminster democracy. It has got our federation from 1901 to here using that principle. The commonwealth government has, I think, privacy provisions for 30 years before it releases its cabinet documents; in South Australia, it is 10. There was a process also that the previous government did not release every document sought after by the Auditor-General, and I support that. Every cabinet will make its own decisions about what documents it releases, and I support that.

Mr TARZIA: Minister, referring to the same line, can you confirm whether or not your ministerial office was approached by the Auditor-General to request documents?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice I have is that all those requests are made directly of the Cabinet Office rather than individual agencies, but I will double-check that and get back

to the member for a prompt response; however, if the Auditor-General had asked me my response would have been no.

Mr TARZIA: I refer to the Auditor-General's Annual Report, Part A: Executive Summary page 11, and figure 3.2, 'Grants to sporting clubs and local infrastructure projects as a result of election commitments'. Did the minister personally approve of any of these local infrastructure grants?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think I have. I will have to get back and check which ones I authorised. I understand there were a couple that I authorised. I cannot remember which ones they were, but I will check that and get back to the member.

Mr TARZIA: I refer to the same line. Did the minister delegate the approval of any of these grants; if so, to who?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I delegated the execution of all the grants to the CE, and the deputy CE or the executive director where possible, to execute the grants, but the decision-making process was made by cabinet.

Mr TARZIA: I refer to the Auditor-General's Annual Report, Part A, section 3. Minister, are you able to advise the full extent of the minister's role, the role of the office and the role of the department in assessing, approving and administering the sports and infrastructure grant payments?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What is the reference again?

Mr TARZIA: Any one of these but figure 3.2, 'Grants to sporting clubs and local infrastructure projects as a result of the election commitment'. I am trying to understand the full extent of the minister's role, the role of the minister's office and the role of the department in assessing, approving and administering those sport and infrastructure grant payments.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the total amount of grants expenditure incurred by the department in the 2021-22 financial year for the Community Infrastructure Grant Program was \$27.937 million. These payments were included in the 2021-22 grants and subsequent expenditure in the department's financial statements.

The department's role was to administer the Community Infrastructure Grant Program. In undertaking the administration of the program, the department obtained relevant ministerial approvals and delegation to undertake negotiation and payment of grants, liaised with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to obtain required grant scopes, took instruction from the Premier's Delivery Unit when further guidance was required, liaised with grant recipients, developed grant agreements in line with the requirements—for example, Treasurer's Instructions and whatever relevant legal advice was available or offered—excluded grant agreements with recipients in line with approved delegations, and established ongoing reporting to relevant stakeholders. That was the level of the involvement, I think, from my office and my department.

Mr TARZIA: Referring to the Auditor-General's Report, Part A, section 3.3, the Auditor-General asserts that the payment of public money should only occur after all public sector processes are completed. Does the minister agree with this assertion from the Auditor-General?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is a higher authority than the Auditor-General, and that is the public of South Australia. They have spoken with a clear voice about who the government of the day will be. What the Auditor-General and the opposition are conflating is an existing grants program that takes applications based on merit compared to election commitments. They are two separate processes.

If the member and the Auditor-General are asking us to then go out to the public, make an election commitment but that election commitment has a proviso—that is, a question mark at the end of it saying 'only if the public sector agrees'—that is not the democratic process. The democratic process is. 'If we are elected, we will expend taxpayers' money on this infrastructure program.' That is an election commitment. The public of South Australia have the final say on whether that is delivered or not—not the opposition, not the Auditor-General, the parliament.

If this was a program of infrastructure grants where grants were offered for application—where the website publishes applications for grants, people can come along, make an application on behalf of the Blue Eagles Soccer Club, make an application for new change rooms—and their local MP writes a letter of endorsement and that is put into the mix, and then there is ministerial interference, I think that is the type of behaviour the member is talking about.

But if the member for Hartley at the last election made a commitment to, say, a local community group in his electorate, that if a Marshall government were returned this amount of money would be expended on this piece of infrastructure at this local community group, they are the public sector processes that should be implemented. The public sector processes after that point are the appropriate execution of that grant through the appropriate legal mechanisms, and the appropriate legal mechanism for that was the cabinet of South Australia and the budget process which was endorsed by this parliament.

Mr TARZIA: Referring to the Auditor-General's Report, Part A, section 3.3, the Auditor-General makes the following statement that 'the payment of public money should only occur after all public sector processes are completed'. Referring again to the same line, does the minister consider these payments for local infrastructure grants and otherwise have completed all public sector processes?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I do, and the highest authority in the land has endorsed them—the people of South Australia. Again, this is not the same as a grant line where people make applications and they are assessed independently by the independent Public Service that makes recommendations then to the cabinet for approval, or the minister. This is an opposition going to an election promising infrastructure works—for example, the north-south corridor and, for example, Majors Road.

If we take the logical extension of the member's argument, that commitment we made to invest \$60 million to be co-funded by the commonwealth government is not an iron-clad guarantee that we can make to the people of South Australia at an election. We have to wait for some independent process of the public sector afterwards. The public sector work for the Crown. They do the bidding of the cabinet. The cabinet works for the will of the people, so we followed all the public sector processes appropriately. We were endorsed by the public. We took our program to the election. The public endorsed it and we executed it in the first budget.

Mr TARZIA: Referring to the Auditor-General's Report, Part A, section 3.3.4, titled 'No government records of why projects were chosen', does the minister's office have any records or assessment criteria available as to why certain projects were chosen?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The next line is that 'this is because this process was undertaken by the South Australian Labor Party while in opposition'—again. The democratic process is a complex one. It is not pretty. We have just gone through it with local council elections where people make all sorts of commitments to get elected, as the member for Hartley did when he ran in the most recent election. He made commitments to local community groups.

The process for formulating that is one in consultation with the local community. I can tell you that, in formulating that for a local community organisation in my electorate—for example, the Thebarton Aquatic Centre, which is to receive a \$6.1 million grant for its upgrade—I did not call the Auditor-General during that process in opposition to see if he thought it was an appropriate expenditure of money. But the Auditor-General was free to vote at the election. He was free to vote yes, vote Labor, vote Liberal or something else if he wanted to.

The Labor Party was successful at the most recent election. We published what we were going to build. We published how we were going to reconcile that within the budget. We were then elected. Ministers were appointed legally. Those ministers formed the cabinet. The cabinet then created a budget. We brought that budget to the parliament. The appropriation was passed. The budget bills were passed and the cabinet, through its agencies, executed those grants.

Is the opposition saying that there is now a new layer of that democratic process that involves an unelected official who has no mandate to talk about exactly what election commitments are made? Because the inference is that, after we make our election commitments, we run it through another

process through the department where the department could then look at our election commitments and decide which ones they want us to do and which ones they think we should scrap.

The discussion here would be the exact opposite. It would be, 'Why aren't you delivering on your election commitments?' Indeed, the first question I think the member asked in this current parliament was, 'Will the government follow through with all its election commitments?' The answer to that is yes.

Mr TARZIA: It is a shame the minister and I only have half an hour today, so what I will do is ask one question about Keolis Downer and then move onto energy, the other skill set of the minister. Very simply, is the minister able to advise when the contract with Keolis Downer will be terminated?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We made a commitment at the last election that we would return the operation of our trains and trams back into public hands. We did so before the then government announced they were breaking their election commitment of no privatisations to outsource the operation of our trains and trams. We wrote to all the proponents who were participating in a tender for these services. In effect, those letters said, 'Buyer beware. There is a general election scheduled for 19 March 2022 and if the Labor opposition are successful, they will be returning these services, regardless of any contractual obligations, back into public hands.' We intend to do it within this term.

Mr TARZIA: If the minister needs to change his personnel, please feel free to do so. We will move onto energy. I will go slow. I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Part A, section 8.1, page 44, paragraph 3, referring to the government's commitment to build a hydrogen electrolyser facility at an estimated cost of \$593 million, particularly in reference to a clean energy future. Is the minister confident that South Australia will reach its greenhouse reduction targets?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that we are on track to meet them and of course we have put plans in place to try to go further if we possibly can. It is a vexing challenge for the planet, but South Australia leads not just the nation but the world.

We are seeing the impact of climate change now. We are seeing it on the river communities in South Australia. We saw it on metropolitan Adelaide on the weekend. We are seeing it across the planet with these extreme weather events that are becoming more ferocious and more frequent. So we must do all we can to meet these targets and we are doing everything we possibly can to meet them.

Mr TARZIA: Minister, I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Part A: Executive Summary, at 2.1.1, page 1, entitled 'Inherent risks rise with urgent and challenging government agendas', dot point 3, 'constructing a hydrogen electrolyser facility, power station and storage facility'. Can the minister firstly advise that this figure sits firmly at \$593 million?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It does.

Mr TARZIA: On the same line, has the minister received any advice from any agency that this figure is likely to change?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That depends entirely on the scope and size of the project, but we have made it very clear to agencies that the budget is \$593 million. We have done an initial market sounding and we are going out to the market in December. That process will come back with a series of options for us to consider, but we have made it very clear that our expectation is that the \$593 million figure for capital infrastructure be honoured.

Mr TARZIA: Referring to the same line, with regard to the hydrogen facility, can the minister advise whether there has been any decline in wholesale energy prices?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: From when?

Mr TARZIA: Recently.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The problem we have in South Australia is not that wholesale energy prices are high, it is that retail energy prices are high and the disconnect between wholesale energy prices and retail energy prices, which is frustrating. The problem we have in South

Australia is the illiquidity in the forward markets. If we were able to achieve the wholesale energy market and make that available to local customers, that would see a dramatic improvement. However, international forces are vexing the wholesale power prices across South Australia and, indeed, Australia.

What we are seeing after a decade of delay on climate action is that the international price shocks that have occurred around the globe because of the war in Ukraine have seen a dramatic reduction in the availability of uncontracted gas, which has pushed the spot market up dramatically, and also because Russian gas has been cut off to Europe. Europe and the world are now burning more coal than they ever have over the last couple of years, which has dramatically increased the price of coal.

Coal last year was roughly between \$A40 and \$A50 a metric tonne. Today, it is over \$600. Gas in South Australia was about \$8 on the short-term trading market, up to \$12; it is now nearly over \$40. We are seeing our gas prices internationalised here locally, which means that whatever trading is occurring in the forward wholesale market is increasing wholesale power prices.

This is a national crisis, which was brought to bear by the most recent commonwealth budget when Treasurer Chalmers, in bringing down his first budget, basically informed the national parliament that they expected power prices to increase by over 50 per cent. In South Australia, that is a dramatic number which would exceed \$1,000 for the average household, so these are major problems. What we need to do is work out a way to decouple gas and coal prices from the international market.

Importantly, what we are seeing now is New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland setting the price of electricity in this country, and the commodities that are setting that price are coal and water. Snowy Hydro and coal generators on the east coast have been setting the price in Australia for a long period of time and the plan of the geniuses opposite is to better interconnect our market with the New South Wales market, which is seeing wholesale prices dramatically increase. So we are in for a rough time.

Mr TARZIA: Referring to the same line and given the minister's comments, can the minister advise when exactly consumers can actually experience lower costs as a result of this hydrogen plan?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: During the most recent election campaign, the opposition criticised the then Leader of the Opposition, the current Premier, for saying at an event that politicians who turn up promising dramatic price drops in retail pricing can never meet those promises—like members opposite, when they promised a \$302 decrease in power prices as referred to in the 2016 ESCOSA report. They never even got close to reaching that number—not once.

In fact, from memory, and I stand to be corrected, every year that they were in office power prices were higher than they were under the previous four years of the Weatherill Labor government. Again, this mug's game, where politicians get up and say, 'I can drop your power prices by X,' quite frankly is not what the public want. What the public want to see is sincere policy work, long-term thinking about how to bring power prices down.

I often reflect on Sir Thomas Playford looking down on the current opposition disapprovingly for the way they have trashed the electricity market here in South Australia and the way they treated South Australians with contempt when they broke their solemn promise never to sell ETSA ever but did, and now we are paying the ultimate price for having complete loss of control of our electricity assets and they now complain about prices being higher.

We do not control our energy assets; we do not own our energy assets. We are building another energy asset. The last time we had an energy plan, we bought over 250 megawatts' worth of generation to be backup supply for the South Australian state. They were to be converted to gas-fire generation and stored in the interests of South Australians for backup reserve and spinning reserve. Members get in and they sell them.

We are now back here again building another 200 megawatts of generation to be owned and operated in the interests of South Australians to firm renewable energy using hydrogen as its fuel source. Again, we are pushing the envelope of technology, pushing the envelope of the transition to

renewables to try to lower power prices, but I fear that if Labor is ever removed from office they will revert to form and just sell those assets again. They cannot be trusted with power and they cannot be trusted to lower power prices.

Mr TARZIA: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Part C, page 93, controls opinion findings, where the Auditor-General outlines that the Department for Energy and Mining used its departmental special deposit account for transactions associated with the Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia (OHPSA) after it was established on 19 May 2022. Can the minister outline the overall value of the non-approved transactions associated with the OHPSA that were paid out of DEM's departmental special deposit account?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It was \$113,000 and it was obviously done to quickly establish the Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia. We agree with the Auditor here. It would have been better to have done this differently but obviously the fierce urgency of now overtook us to try to deliver the government's agenda. Again, this is a very good recommendation by the Auditor, which will be implemented in full.

We are completely committed to delivering our Hydrogen Jobs Plan. Rather than delay the implementation of this crucial election commitment by up to two months while the office could be fully and independently established, including establishing a new special deposit account, DEM supported the transactions during this period. The government accepts that the Auditor-General is right to raise this but circumstances prevented us from doing it any other way.

Mr TARZIA: Referring to the same line, can the minister give the committee a breakdown of those non-approved transactions associated and provide an outline of what those transactions related to?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It was \$113,000, mainly in wages and I think some supplies and services.

Mr TARZIA: Referring to the same line, were any other staff seconded to OHPSA from DEM but paid out of DEM's existing budget in the 2022 financial year and, if so, what were their job titles and job classifications?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that no DEM staff were seconded during this period.

Mr TARZIA: I refer to the same line for the same project. Did OHPSA refer the hydrogen power station to Infrastructure SA, or is it intending to do so?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Infrastructure South Australia have a statutory role of doing gate reviews. I understand that is the norm for all infrastructure programs. Again, this was an election commitment the government is going ahead with. We are not waiting for an independent assessment about whether we should do it. We are doing it, but it is being submitted to the usual gate reviews is my advice. If that is not accurate, I will get back to you and check.

Mr TARZIA: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Part C, page 93, in response to findings of the Auditor-General that the Department for Energy and Mining explained that it used a special deposit account for non-approved purposes because of the need to implement SA government priorities. Minister, have you put aside financial controls and established public sector frameworks to implement government priorities?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No.

Mr TARZIA: On the same line, minister, the Department for Energy and Mining then went on to say that 'a new special deposit account will be established for the OHPSA'. Minister, can you advise the committee if a new special deposit account has now been established? What date was it established?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It has been established. I do not have the date with me, but I can get that for the member.

Mr TARZIA: I refer to the same line. As part of the audit process, did the Department for Energy and Mining or OHPSA provide the Auditor-General with the independent modelling and costings by Frontier Economics of the \$593 million hydrogen facility?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The independent modelling was done for the Labor opposition, not for the South Australian government. The South Australian government has done its own body of work, and that is a current piece of work that is ongoing. I understand that the Office of Hydrogen Power SA does continual modelling, but the works that were done before the election are the property of the Australian Labor Party and remain so.

Mr TARZIA: The last question (and it is a shame because we are having so much fun) and still referring to the same line, does the minister foresee any risk associated with the OHPSA relying on nearly two-year-old independent modelling of the \$593 million budgeted amount in the current high inflation environment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is a good question. As a shadow infrastructure minister, he should know that escalation is wreaking havoc across all jurisdictions—New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia. Every jurisdiction is having this problem. Projects are costing more and more because we are in a high inflationary market. Yes, that is all a risk but, like the Treasurer says, everyone has to cut their cloth to meet the times.

The CHAIR: There will now be a changeover of ministers.

Mr WHETSTONE: We will start with police and refer to report 8, Part C, page 380. Minister, how many FTEs have SAPOL recruited throughout the 2022 year?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: To clarify, member for Chaffey, the 2021-22 financial year?

The CHAIR: That is correct, the 2021-22 financial year.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I will take the net number on notice, member for Chaffey, and I will come back to you on that one.

Mr WHETSTONE: On the same note, minister, how many FTEs has SAPOL lost or what has the attrition been throughout the 2021-22 year?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: The 2021-22 year, I am advised, was a high attrition of 37.0 FTEs.

Mr WHETSTONE: So, minister, you know how many you have lost but you do not know how many you have recruited. Is that what you are saying?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Other than referring to the fact that I have taken the net recruited number on notice, member for Chaffey, that is correct.

Mr WHETSTONE: Since we last spoke in estimates, what measures is SAPOL currently employing to combat the struggling FTE count?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: What page number was that, member for Chaffey?

Mr WHETSTONE: Page 380.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Member for Chaffey, as far as the 2022-23 financial year, I will bring your attention to next year's estimates that will be more able to furnish you with that response. But suffice to say that there are two particular factors that have shifted the dial on recruitment with SAPOL, the first of which is that we are now as a community and particularly as South Australia Police operating in a phase on the basis of post-COVID lockdowns and post-COVID restrictions and, most particularly for SAPOL, post emergency management declaration, so there is thankfully—and I think everyone would share my thanks on this—return to business-as-usual operations for SAPOL.

What we have seen as a result of that is a particular decline in the number of applications to SAPOL during the periods of COVID policing. There are many factors I could assume influenced that, but I think it would be fair to say that people were not applying to SAPOL in the same numbers as pre COVID because they saw policing look very different from the policing that they had come to know or would expect to know.

Since the emergency management declaration has ceased, I am advised that the net number of applications to SAPOL has increased significantly and what that means is that the total pool of potential recruits has increased significantly as well. I will take advice from my adviser in a moment, member for Chaffey, on the average number of applicants who are successful, but it is a relatively low number comparatively speaking, so I can advise you that that has shifted, the dial has shifted.

Secondly, and I will take on notice a particular breakdown of the expenditure, through a portion of SAPOL's existing resourcing as well as carryovers from 2021-22 we have seen the amplification of the SAPOL recruitment campaign. It is not just that. People like you and the member for Hammond are reminding people, as am I, that now is a great time to apply for SAPOL; in fact, it is a hell of a job—secure work and well paid.

That amplification has been funded directly and that additional amplification, as I am advised, has been reaping the benefits with a high number of applications, a high number of available recruits, and that has therefore washed through with recruitment being amplified since the 2021-22 financial year.

Mr WHETSTONE: I understand the complexities of COVID, but has there been a concerted effort to address the struggling FTE count? Do you have a public campaign that you are currently undertaking?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Yes, there is. Broadly speaking, it's called the Calling All campaign. That is multifaceted, and I can walk you through some of the detail on that. At a very basic level, when it comes to paid advertising, digital activation and the like, there has been collateral designed around the Calling All campaign. Multiple individuals from SAPOL have participated in being the face of that campaign from a diverse range of backgrounds. They have talked about their experience, and they have also talked about the benefits of SAPOL and recruiting.

We have returned to public activities, to a large degree business is as usual, and I give the example of the Royal Show. The Royal Show forms just one but a significant part of that public facing, public activation of recruitment. When I was at the Royal Show and spent significant time with SAPOL at their stall, there was the Calling All portion of that. They are the things that SAPOL could not roll out.

I would acknowledge that, as a member of the former government yourself, there was a lack of levers to pull as a government when you could not have that public activation to show the public face of SAPOL, which in itself is one of the greatest recruiting tools we have.

Mr WHETSTONE: Moving on to report 8, Part C, page 381, why has the establishment management committee not met since you have come into government?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that at the transition from the emergency management declaration, as I previously mentioned, the EMC has been replaced by the business continuity executive management group. It is not that one committee in the operations therein have ceased; it is that there has been the transition to the aforementioned committee.

Mr WHETSTONE: Do you see the reformation of the EMC?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised further, and subject to the Auditor-General's remarks on the re-establishment of that committee, that at the conclusion of the COVID-19 activity there will be the transition back and the re-establishment of the committee.

Mr WHETSTONE: Moving onto report 8, Part C, pages 382 and 383, what is the current state of the Shield Business Transformation Program? Are you expected to have that program completed by June 2023?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am working back to front in your question: I am advised that the current approved schedule remains June 2023 for completion of that Shield project. Broadly speaking to your first part of the question, as you would no doubt know, the Shield program has been a longstanding piece of work undertaken by SAPOL, its genesis being 2009. That was the first approved submission for the project. It has been tranced out, three and four. Currently, one has been completed and the next one is being embarked on. I can give the member my advice to me

with satisfaction that the June 2023 completion date remains on track and is approved by the Shield management board itself.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, can you give me a better understanding of what remediation actions the Shield program board has developed to address the reports areas that needed improving?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that the board is managing the implementation and remedial actions that have either been undertaken or are to be undertaken. I am advised that some of the recommendations for remedial action, as recommended by the Auditor-General, have already been completed. I am advised that there is a further suite of remedial actions which are being fleshed out and which will be implemented under the guidance and governance arrangements that the board currently has.

Mr WHETSTONE: What steps will SAPOL implement to address the identified weaknesses in the user management controls, particularly in the CHRIS21 and the SACAD programs?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that is a different project and may be a different reference in the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr WHETSTONE: Sorry, minister?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that your question relates to a different project and may relate to a different line item in the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr WHETSTONE: I refer to report 8, Part C, page 385. What steps will SAPOL implement to address identified weaknesses in user management controls, particularly in the CHRIS21 and SACAD programs?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that CHRIS21 is maintained by Shared Services, and that, with certain user access management controls, is managed directly by SAPOL itself. The Auditor-General reviews 'the SAPOL user access management controls for the CHRIS21 environment, including privileged user access, user onboarding, user offboarding, user access reviews and audit and logging of application users'.

The 2020-21 review identified insufficient review of application audit logs and privileged users. I am further advised that SAPOL has implemented the process for the independent review of the audit logs for this privileged user cohort. The review and audit are conducted each month, and a formal SAP has been developed to provide guidelines regarding the process. The quarterly audit of CHRIS21 users continues, and this includes the identification of users who are currently on long-term leave.

Mr PEDERICK: I refer to the annual report, Part C: Agency Audit Reports. At the bottom of page 396 it states that the emergency services sector had not developed an information, communication and technology strategic plan. My question is: how safe is information held within the emergency services sector, considering there is no ICT strategic plan, including compliance with the expectations of the South Australian Cyber Security Framework?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I will take the question in two parts, the latter being that I am satisfied that there are significant safeguards. In direct response to your question whether it is safe, yes, it is, but we do know and acknowledge the findings of the Auditor-General for the 2021-22 year.

I can advise in direct response to those findings of the Auditor-General that the emergency services sector has already commenced work on the development of a strategic ICT plan with support from an experienced IT consulting organisation. The ICT strategic plan will be developed alongside and aligned with the new SAFECOM Strategic Plan which is due in 2023. This ICT strategic plan is anticipated to form the basis of future submissions and initiatives that will further enhance cybersecurity and IT general controls. Both these matters I believe were remarked upon by the Auditor-General.

The identification and reporting of the emergency services sector ICT strategic risks have been included as an initiative in the ESS 2022 security uplift program—this has already been

included. The program of work is addressing the top security improvements identified as a result of the 2022 security at a station reporting period.

The reporting of ICT strategic risks will be incorporated into the reporting provided to the newly formed ICT Governance Committee, and the ESS Risk and Performance Committee, ensuring an appropriate level of oversight and risk management. I am further advised that work has commenced on the development and testing of an ICT disaster recovery plan. This project commenced in August 2022 and is expected to be completed by March 2023.

The anticipated outcomes of this project will include the development and testing of an IT disaster recovery plan, the identification of gaps between the current achievable systems recovery times and the required MAO and developing actions plans for improving recovery times, and, finally, audit of backup management policies and practices and document opportunities for improvements. The findings were also made with respect to the ITGCs for Alert SA, but that will form a different body of work undertaken by the ESS.

Mr PEDERICK: With regard to that, on page 397, and noting your answer to the previous question, how are we going to get on noting that there will not be an ICT disaster recovery plan in place over summer, and what risk does this pose to the community and the ability to reduce damage or disruption from disaster events?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I can give you the confidence to advise that the systems for this matter are in place. The findings and recommendations of the Auditor-General are limited to governance and frameworks, so that is the body of work that has been undertaken, but the systems are well and truly in place. With respect to your question, they are well and truly in place at this juncture, leading into the bushfire season.

Mr PEDERICK: At the end of page 397, the Auditor-General talks about the need for further improvements of the emergency services sector asset management practices and the ESS responded saying that it has made progress on improving this but that it was hindered by some challenges. Can the minister provide an update on whether the ESS has made further progress on its asset management practices since the audit took place?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am pleased to advise that, yes, the emergency services sector has taken action arising from the audit findings. I do note that those findings were in some part regarding the MFS, and I can advise that the MFS matter at hand is a contract that was entered into in 2018 with Babcock. This is not a new contract, nor are there new systems, but we recognise that there has been a review in the audit that has made these recommendations.

The MFS is working collaboratively with Babcock to ensure that the asset management service partnership agreements are materially provided and that agreed assets are appropriately maintained. The MFS is currently liaising with Babcock to define and develop suitable key performance indicators and provision of related supporting information required under this agreement.

Regular operational meetings with Babcock will be formalised. I am advised that today they have not been formalised but will be formalised through 2022-23 to record agreement outcomes, discussions and matters for action, including the presentation and adequacy of reports and these KPIs that have been developed.

Mr PEDERICK: Referring to page 398, I understand that six Metropolitan Fire Service sites were contacted by the Auditor-General to check whether they had maintenance scheduling matrices. It was found that none of the six sites had schedules established. Is the minister concerned that there is a risk that some equipment and appliances are not up to standard due to some sites not having maintenance scheduling in place?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I have been advised and I am pleased to report that the MFS is taking that remedial action, as advised in my previous answer, with respect to these audit findings. As I remarked, this is not a new contract; however, there are systems and governance matters that are being attended to.

Insofar as my own personal concern or otherwise regarding the fleet and the MFS, I think it is fair to say that this government has been well and truly up-front about our concerns with the way the fleet and the MFS, across the 2021-22 financial year and in fact the years before that under the former Marshall government, were significantly forgotten about. We have made a significant capital investment. We took that to the public and were very up-front about that leading into the election. We made an election commitment, and I am very pleased to advise the member for Hammond that we are delivering on that election commitment to roll out new trucks and new appliances to significantly lower the average fleet age within the MFS.

Mr PEDERICK: On page 400, it talks about SAFECOM's Alert SA mobile application. The Auditor-General's review identified some areas where controls can be improved and that SAFECOM agreed to take remedial action to address this issue. Can the minister outline what remedial action SAFECOM is taking to address the control risks?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I can advise that, with respect to the Alert SA recommendations and remedial action being undertaken by the sector in response to the Auditor-General's recommendations, the Alert SA disaster recovery plan is tested annually. Issues arising from the audit that occurred during the previous test period have been subsequently resolved. The audit and reporting of the ITGC implementation by the Alert SA supplier is planned to be addressed when the current support contract is renegotiated in 2023.

I am further advised that DPC have been approached to provide advice on the relevance of the web application standards to the Alert SA mobile application. DPC have advised SAFECOM instead to continue to focus on improving cybersecurity controls in line with the ESS 2022 security uplift program.

Mr PEDERICK: Also mentioned on page 400 are some areas of weakness where controls could be further improved with the South Australian computer dispatch system (SACAD). Has the minister made it a priority to improve controls with SACAD, given the control weaknesses may increase the opportunity for inappropriate access and unauthorised changes to the application?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Yes, I can advise that it is a priority of the MFS to respond and undertake remedial action in respect of the Auditor-General's audit. I can advise the member that in August the Auditor-General's Department provided the outcomes document, which described the findings of the audit and outlined the security risks inherent with the MFS SACAD environment.

It was requested that the MFS review the findings and provide feedback and detail remedial action to be put in place to mitigate the identified risks. The MFS has reviewed the report and, in most cases, has accepted the recommendations and identified internal controls that are being implemented to mitigate these identified risks. I am advised that the only exception to this is where the risk has been identified as generic and is an issue for all emergency services organisations, and the AGD and the supplier, Hexagon, will address and has been tasked to address these.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, I would like to move to Corrections, if I could, please. Also, minister, I do have one question in regard to the Motor Accident Commission. Is that something that we can—

The Hon. J.K. Szakacs interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: I refer to report 8, Part C, page 54. Why did the Department for Correctional Services cite the federal Auditor-General Act to refuse access to copies of the audit management letters and their corresponding audit reports?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I will take the substance of that on notice. Advice I have received is that that may be subject to an FOI application, but I will take that on notice and provide a more fulsome answer to you.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, have the Department for Correctional Services recently been audited by the federal Auditor-General?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: No, they have not, member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, I do have one question I would like to ask with reference to the Motor Accident Commission. Referring to report 8, Part C, page 325, MAC's total comprehensive result for the 2022 year was a \$409,000 loss, but in 2021 there was a total comprehensive result of a \$10 million profit. Can you give me an understanding why there was such a turnaround?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: When I remarked before, I needed to hear the question from you before I could direct you in the right direction. If you refer to page 325, which I think you did, you will note at the bottom of that page those matters are administered by the Department of Treasury and Finance, so I cannot provide you with an answer to that. That is a matter for the Treasurer, if he is yet to be in.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, can you give me an understanding why there was such a comprehensive drop, from a profit to a loss in a one-year turnaround period?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Member for Chaffey, within my portfolio responsibilities and as quite clearly articulated by the Auditor-General, as Minister for Police responsible for road safety I am not able to provide that information. That is not within my portfolio responsibility.

The CHAIR: The examination has concluded for that section. We now move to the Minister for Small and Family Business. 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 all responses are given by members on their feet. All questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2021-22 Report and Agency Statements for the year ending 2021-22 as published on the Auditor-General's website.

I welcome the Minister for Small and Family Business and the member for Morialta. Are you ready to go?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I indicate that I am looking at the attachments on the web that, as I understand it, form part of the proceedings, the financial statement for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, in which it identifies state government grants at page 8 of 20, for 2021 being at \$15.496 million and 2022 being \$25.881 million. I understand that may well include some additional supplementary funding that was provided as a result of the pandemic.

Can the minister identify what portion of that 2022 operating base grant is the standard operating base grant and are there any other grants that make up that figure of \$25.8 million?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: I can take some of that on notice, but I can indicate to the member that, out of that \$25.8 million, \$7.7 million was given to the AFCT to replace lost revenue during the closure of the AFCT and that \$2.8 million was given as part of a business disruption insurance claim with SAFA. They are the main two, so that would come off that. The base operating grant I do not have the figure for on hand, but I will take that on notice.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I understand that Mr Woolhouse wrote to the chair of the Festival Centre Trust board identifying a figure of \$18.1 million in last year's budget. That sounds like it includes the \$2.8 million you referred to before. I note that there is \$14.5 million this financial year. Has the minister during the relevant time in the 2021-22 financial year had any meetings with representatives of either the board or staff at the Festival Centre Trust indicating a reduced requirement for government funding? Indeed, were there suggestions and requests from the organisation for increased funding especially in its 50th anniversary year coming up?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: The time period from the March election until 30 June I did have meetings, but not that I recall anything specific on the 50 years in that period of time. Subsequently, we have had discussions on what might be required for that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Was the government proposing to provide funding in addition to the operating grant to celebrate those 50 years, or is the Festival Centre Trust expected to fund 50th celebrations out of that operating grant?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: We are working through that at the moment.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I ask the minister—and I note she has taken on notice the breakdown of the operating base grant—if she is able to advise if there are any other grant programs that the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust is able to access under the new government.

I note that on page 8 there is the Her Majesty's redevelopment funding, which I assume is now completed, the AFC redevelopment supplementation and also other SA government revenue, that is a more modest number. Are there other sources of income from the state government to the Festival Centre that are available under the new government?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: In respect of 2021-22, I am not sure that that question is particularly relevant. Subsequently, we are obviously working with them on various funding including, for example, AFCT has conversations with SATC if there is a program that is being brought over, so there are those conversations happening. There is funding for the plaza as well and activating that, which I think was a \$3 million figure last year, and that is an ongoing activation program. Yes, they have ongoing funding for the plaza activation.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Has the minister had any discussions with the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust about the impact of that efficiency dividend, which was announced prior to 30 June, on staff or programs for the Festival Centre in an ongoing way?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: I have not specifically, but in terms of the previous savings there have been conversations around that—previous savings of the Marshall Liberal government. There have been conversations around that but they are managing within their budget and most of the conversations are happening at department level.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I think in question time the minister described those savings as 5 per cent. Does she stand by that claim?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Those 5 per cent figures do not relate to the 2021-22 financial year but they are figures from your first budget.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I turn from page 8 of the financial report to page 8 of the Auditor-General's overall report, again related to the Festival Centre Trust, where the Auditor-General reflects on the decision of the previous South Australian government to transfer the Festival Centre complex assets from DPC to the AFCT and that that asset transfer is expected to occur in this current financial year. I note that this reverses a transaction the other way from 30 June 2008—in fact, the Auditor-General notes that again at the bottom on page 8 of his report. Can the minister confirm: is that transfer proceeding—indeed, it may have already happened—and what is the government's position on that approach?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Again, the department is working through that transfer at the moment. It has not actually been lodged with the lands titles office yet.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: But to be clear, there is no change in policy approach by the new government. Now I refer to the financial report of the State Theatre Company, again on the website captured by the motion as I understand it. The financial report at page 2 indicates revenues from the South Australian government as being \$2.621 million in 2022, which is an increase from \$2.603 million in 2021. Is the minister able to identify how much of that component, that \$2.6 million, is the 2021-22 operating grant from the South Australian government? Does that figure include any other separate grants that are separate from the base operating grant?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: For the 2022 financial year—and it is on page 7 of that report—the base funding is \$2.469 million and tied grants funding is \$152,000.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the minister for that assistance. In relation to the State Theatre, has the minister met with the State Theatre to discuss challenges around their rented premises, which is of course one of the significant expenses met out of this and other funding identified on page 7, as the minister has been kind enough to point out? Are there any further grants in addition to this base funding that the new government is providing to the State Theatre?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: In respect of the 2021-22 financial year you are referring to?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: As we have established previously, the report reflects the 2021-22 figures. My question relates to not just the decisions taken in the first three months of the new government up to the end of that financial year but their response to the figures herein.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: In respect of the 2021-22 financial year, I do not think I can make comment on that. To respond to your question, there have been discussions obviously about their facilities. I regularly meet with the State Theatre Company chair, the artistic director and the CEO. Those meetings are happening regularly with a number of these key organisations.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Is it the government's policy to provide any other grants or assistance to the State Theatre Company other than that provided in the base operating grant, which we have established was \$2.469 million last year?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: At this stage, no.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Minister, I move to the Adelaide Festival Corporation financial statement which identifies, on page 1, SA government grants of \$9.075 million. Can I confirm that that is the base operating grant that we have been talking about? The question that will follow, as it has with the others, is: are there any other sources of grant or other revenue for the Festival Corporation that this government is proposing to provide or is it the government's policy that that operating grant is the funding that the Festival Corporation gets?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: That is largely the base operating grant. There was some COVID money in there. I do not have the figure for that. I can provide it on notice. If you turn to page 6, the note at 2.1 indicates there are some additional commonwealth and overseas government grants as well that supported the festival. The figure of \$187,000 is for the COVID support.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Page 6 talks about the \$9.075 million South Australian government grant, which I assume is the base operating grant, and then it has \$50,000 from the commonwealth and \$138,000 from overseas governments. Is the funding you provided in the very last answer, the COVID-related funding, on top of this \$9.263 million?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: It is within that \$9.075 million figure.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the answer and ask if the Festival had indicated that they were expecting to have a lower level of cost going forward when they reflected on the bounty of the \$9.075 million that they got in the last financial year. In the discussions that the minister has had with the board, the artistic director or the CE of the festival, have any of them suggested that \$9.075 million was indeed too much and they wanted less?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: I have not had any conversations suggesting that was too much.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member. I now go to the Art Gallery board financial statement. It tells us on page 7 that there is a recurrent operating grant of \$11.609 million in 2022, other state government grants of \$1.2 million, external grants of \$687,000 and commonwealth grants of \$670,000. Can I ask if that recurrent operating grant question can be unpacked a little bit. Was there an adjustment for COVID for that one as well? I will repeat the question perhaps.

We are at page 7. The recurrent operating grant is listed as \$11.6 million. I think 2020-21 says \$12.4 million, and my recollection is that \$12.4 million includes COVID supplementary funding. I am asking whether the \$11.6 million includes COVID supplementary funding and, if so, what is the base level recurrent operating grant for the 2021-22-year?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: We need to take that one on notice to pull apart that figure for the COVID support.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: In relation to the external grants, or in relation to any other source of potential income for the Art Gallery, has the minister provided any suggestion to the Art Gallery board that there will be any other source of grant or other revenue for the Art Gallery over and above the operating grant that comes from the state government?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: I have not had those conversations to suggest anything, but the organisation would be out looking for other grant opportunities, I imagine, if that is what you are asking.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: It is, but I am interested in whether the minister is involved in that, but maybe I will go to a specific question. Page 7 talks about the state government grants that are separate from the recurrent operating grant. It has \$1.2 million listed in 2022 and \$373,000 listed in 2021. Presumably these are grants from either the minister's department or other departments that are separate from the operating grant. I am curious to know whether it is the new government's policy to apply those grants going forward to the Art Gallery in the way that it was clearly done in 2021 and 2022.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: In terms of what that money would be for, as I understand it a large part of that would be grants for running the facility. None of that will change, so to answer your question, no, there is no intention to change.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Confirming then that the grant in question—which is listed as \$1.2 million in 2021-22 and for other state government grants \$1.238 million is listed on page 7—is expected to happen again?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: I cannot confirm the quantum going forward, but it depends on what their requirements are.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Is the minister able to identify from what source that \$1.2 million comes or what sources?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: It is DPC funding.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I take us to the library board's financial statement. I refer to page 9, which delineates operating grants for both the State Library and the support of public library services. As I understand it, the public library services is a multiyear agreement, and that is set in place for the next three or four years, I think, after which it is a matter of government policy as to what that funding level is.

In relation to the provision of State Library services, the funding figure allocated in here is \$14.866 million. Have there been any discussions with the director of the State Library, or indeed anyone in relation to the State Library, to suggest that \$14.866 million is more than they need to provide the services that the South Australian community has come to expect from the State Library?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: They worked towards their budget. That was their budget in that financial year. They have their budget for the current financial year. That is how these organisations operate, so they will work to the budget that they are provided.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: It is my understanding that in the current financial year the budget in question that the minister just referenced is about \$1.2 million less than that \$14.866 million. Is the minister able to identify what services the State Library will not be offering in the future as a result of that change?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: The State Library board will be working through that to reach their budget. I do not have any detail on what that will involve from their perspective for the current financial year.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Are there any other sources of revenue available to the State Library other than this operating grant from the state government?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: If you have a look at page 9, there are other contributions they receive, including from council, other investments, and there would be philanthropy available to them and other sources of grants from potentially the federal government and sponsorship.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I turn to the Museum board's financial statement. Page 2 refers to grant income, although there is a note sending us to item 2.1. The minister may happen to have the page reference for that if I do not. Page 8 talks about grant income, the Museum board receiving \$12.09 million in grant income. Is it possible to unpack that? How much of that is the total annual operating grant, and are there any other funds that are included in that \$12.039 million figure for grant income on page 8?

To save the minister some time we will go to page 11 which does start to provide some of that information. It says the operating grant is \$11.002 million. I think that is the figure I was looking

for a minute ago. Then it talks about a state government grant of \$350,000 and a general grant of \$230,000 as well as a commonwealth grant. Can the minister identify where that other state government grant of \$350,000 comes from, and is that a grant that the Museum can count on receiving in the future?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: We will take that one on notice to see the specifics of it. It might be very similar to the Art Gallery figure we were talking about before, but we will take that on notice.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Can I ask a similar question in relation to the general grant on the next line of \$230,000?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: We will take that on notice.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I have one other question in relation to this run, on Country Arts SA's financial report, and taking us to page 5 that has a rundown of cash inflows, including \$4.6 million in state government grants, \$1.15 million in receipts from grants and subsidies. How much of the Country Arts SA \$4.6 million grant is the operating grant, and are there any other aspects to it, or is that the base operating grant that the government provides?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: What was the page number?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: It's on page 5 of the Country Arts Trust financial statement.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Is that the statement of cash flows that you are referring to? Yes, and the figure is?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The \$4.655 million is listed as SA government grants, and I am wondering if that is entirely the operating grant, the base operating grant, or if there are other grants comprised in that as well.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: We will have to come back to you after we get a breakdown of that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Three lines below there is a figure of \$1.15 million received from grants and subsidies. I am happy to take this on notice, but can the minister provide a breakdown of where that comes from? Are those grants and subsidies going to be available in the future?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: We will take that on notice and come back to you.

Mr TEAGUE: Referring to the Auditor-General's Report, Part C, page 19, there is an indication from the Auditor-General that one of the revenue streams in the LOGIC revenue was identified as being the subject of incorrect fee waiver. As I read the report, the Auditor-General has identified that, and it relates to fees under the Land Agents Act 1994 for auctioneer variations.

The indication is that CBS responded and has updated policy so that the correct amounts are waived, but the question is: with what consequence? I can perhaps make that more particular, if necessary, but has the cost to either customers or government been calculated? Have there been overpaid fees returned? What has been the wash-up of all that?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: No, it is actually the reverse. What had historically happened was that the auctioneer fee and the application variation fee were the same, and one of those fees was waived. In 2021-22, the application variation was charged at a lower rate, so CBS received less income than it would have, rather than affecting the customer on the other side. That has been corrected now, only because of the variation in the regulation that set the fees that changed them.

Mr TEAGUE: So there is no intent to take steps to recover that with a view to increasing CBS's income for 2022-23?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: In fact, it reduced CBS's income that they would have otherwise been entitled to.

Mr TEAGUE: At page 19, we see the revenue from gaming and taxation, totalling \$356 million. I see that is replicated at pages 24 and 28 in the table respectively, as I understand it. Taxation revenue on page 24 at the top of the table is up \$37 million, and at page 28 there is the

same reflection in narrative. If I am so far on the right track, is it possible to advise the breakdown between what are described there as gaming revenue on the one hand and taxation revenue on the other?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: To clarify your question, are you asking for a breakdown between the net gambling revenue and the gaming tax liability? For 2021-22, net gambling revenue was \$831.12 million and the gaming tax liability was \$356.23 million.

Mr TEAGUE: In relation to the Residential Tenancies Fund, there is a note at the bottom of page 19. The description 'unclaimed bonds' is something of a misnomer insofar as it relates to bonds that have been attempted to be returned but there has been an issue with the bank account or something of that nature that has prevented it from being returned. Over the page, there is an indication that 4,600 such unclaimed bonds, valued at \$6.3 million, have been returned. Is that reducing, therefore, the \$14.2 million, or how is that best interpreted?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS: Overall, the fund is increasing. There have been significant improvements in returning unclaimed bonds, as I am sure you are aware, through the bonds management system. Although there is an overall increase, it is not increasing as substantially because of the improvement in returning bonds, if that makes sense.

The CHAIR: The time has expired for this portion of the examination. Now we move to development and planning. 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 and all questions must be responded to on their feet and directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2021-22 Report and Agency Statements for the year ended 2021-22 as published on the Auditor-General's website. Minister and member for Colton, are we ready to go? The questions are all yours.

Mr COWDREY: Minister, there was clearly little interest from the Auditor-General in regard to the trade department this year, with there only being, from my reference point, one single reference to the department on page 577, referencing that the department would not be audited this year. However, we do obviously have the annexure to his report, which is the Auditor's view of the financial statements. Are you able to confirm whether or not the Auditor did conduct any sort of work in regard to the Department for Trade and Investment outside that to do with the financial statements?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The answer to the member's question is that we received a letter from the Auditor-General saying he has audited the financial report of the Department for Trade and Investment for the financial year ended 30 June 2022. Obviously, it is the Auditor-General who decides to do more in-depth reports per agency. I think in this case he decided to group smaller agencies like the Department for Trade and Investment together for supplementary reports, as I understand it.

Mr COWDREY: So, to confirm, there was no further correspondence between the Auditor-General and department over the preceding 12 months?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, just the normal audit reports.

Mr COWDREY: Has the Auditor-General provided you or the department with any indication of when he may provide a more in-depth audit of the department's processes into the future?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I am advised that this year is just that single letter that the department has been given. Next year, obviously the agency will be somewhat larger because planning will be included, having transferred over as part of the machinery of government changes from Attorney-General's into the Department for Trade and Investment. So we expect to have a more fulsome report next year but, again, that is up to the Auditor-General.

Mr COWDREY: Has the Auditor-General or his office provided any reasoning to you or the department as to why there was no further work done this financial year?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No. That is a matter for the Auditor-General. He chooses to what degree he audits the relevant departments.

Mr COWDREY: With regard to the financial statements that the Auditor-General has viewed this financial year, are you able to confirm whether or not Invest SA was part of the audit process in terms of those financial statements this financial year?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The answer to the honourable member's question is that the investment function, which was always present in the department, was of course in this report but the government's commitment to establish Invest SA will be in next year's report because it did not begin until the subsequent reporting period.

Mr COWDREY: This may be a similar answer but in regard to the financial statements, was Brand SA captured as part of this reporting period?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Brand SA, of course, was subject to cuts under the previous government; it was effectively abolished. We are re-establishing it as of this financial year, so it will be in next year's Auditor-General's Report.

Mr COWDREY: If I take the minister to the provided annexure, at page 33, administered income and administered expenses, it sets out the SA government grants, subsidies and transfers that are covered by the financial statements of the department. Are you able to provide an overview of how many grant programs are administered by the department?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: There are a number of them, such as the Landing Pad, the wine program and a range of others. What I will do is take that question on notice and provide you with a full list.

Mr COWDREY: In that same vein, are you able to confirm the total quantum of money provided through grant programs by the department?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I will take that on notice and undertake to do that as well.

Mr COWDREY: With regard to those programs—again, I am not asking for a wholesome list from you because I know you have taken that on notice—are you able to confirm what programs have been announced and commenced or are yet to be commenced since the change of government in March 2022?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I might take that on notice as well.

Mr COWDREY: Through the same line of questioning, again not asking for specifics in terms of the total programs, can the minister provide the committee with information regarding the grant programs that have ceased or wound up since the change of government in March 2022?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: As part of the 2022-23 budget savings targets, we decided to wind up early the following time-limited programs: the Export Fundamentals Program, the virtual business matchings program and the National Trade Program, and we have also wound up the South Australia Export Accelerator Program. Does that assist the honourable member?

Mr COWDREY: Is that the totality of the programs that have ceased?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Yes.

Mr COWDREY: The minister is able to advise on which programs have ceased but is unable to give the committee any information regarding programs that have commenced?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I have taken that on notice, so I will provide the information to the committee.

Mr COWDREY: Is the minister able to provide to the committee any further information, outside the Landing Pad, as further information in regard to grant programs provided by the department?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The department's ongoing funding of the South Australian Landing Pad program and the Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program, and if there are any other programs that have begun in that time, I will take that on notice and provide it to the honourable member.

Mr COWDREY: My questions are again in relation to the annexure provided by the Auditor-General in relation to the financial statements of the Department for Trade and Investment, in particular section 3.3, employee benefits and expenses and salaries and wages. Was the recruitment process of Christopher Wood as Executive Director of Invest SA by direct approach, or was there a recruitment campaign undertaken in each appointment?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: There was an appropriate recruitment campaign. It was advertised nationally and all the normal arrangements and protocols were undertaken.

Mr COWDREY: What KPIs sit with the executive director, Christopher Wood, of Invest SA?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I do not want to be difficult with the honourable member—and perhaps he could ask me in the house or on notice—but the appointment of Mr Wood is subsequent to this particular Auditor-General's Report. I do not think the question is in order.

Mr COWDREY: I am happy for you to take it on notice if you wish now?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I cannot take on notice a question that is not in order. If the honourable member asks me in another forum, I am only too happy to answer.

Mr TELFER: I direct your attention to page 18 of the aforementioned document, the overseas representative officers. You see the differentiation between 2021 and 2022 of the London office operating expenses: \$1.512 million for 2021 and \$1.740 million for 2022. Can you give me an insight into the reasons behind that differentiation of \$228,000?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I think I might take that question on notice.

Mr TELFER: As a follow-up to that, there is a difference in the operating revenues as well which would be of interest on that same page. Obviously there is a decrease in the Jinan as opposed to the significant increase in the London, so it would be of interest to know the reasoning behind those two.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I am happy to take them both on notice.

Mr COWDREY: In regard to section 3.3, again on TVSPs, and given that the minister brought the 2022-23 savings task into the remit of the committee through his answer earlier, how is the department going in terms of meeting its savings task and how many TVSPs have been provided to Department for Trade and Investment employees?

The CHAIR: Up to 30 June 2022?

Mr COWDREY: Up to 30 June.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: There are none in Trade and Investment, and one in Planning.

Mr COWDREY: And the savings task, minister?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Yes, we are confident that we will deliver it, and obviously with the programs I mentioned before and a restructure of the department we are confident that we will meet the government's savings target.

Mr TELFER: Moving to Planning, my reference is report 8, Part A: Executive Summary, pages 6 to 9—Payment of sporting club and local infrastructure grants because of election commitments. On page 6, the Auditor-General explains:

...I have qualified my opinion for aspects of the processes used to select the recipients and determine the value of specific sporting and local infrastructure grants made in June 2022 as a result of election commitments. These processes were conducted outside of the usual public sector framework for government grants. Consequently, the controls that would be expected to operate over determining these grants were not applied.

The Auditor-General goes on to state:

I was advised by DPC that there are no government records that capture the assessment processes and decisions about which individual sporting clubs and local infrastructure projects would receive grants or the value of the grants.

Furthermore, on page 9, the Auditor-General notes:

This was consistent with my understanding from information the Premier provided to the Parliament, that the funding commitments were made by the South Australian Labor Party prior to the 19 March 2022 State election.

The Auditor-General continues:

As explained, I have qualified my annual controls opinion because the processes to select and decide the value of funding to recipients of grant payments of \$133 million were not conducted within the public sector framework and processes.

In my opinion, the payment of public money should only occur after all public sector processes are completed.

I appreciate your taking the time to re-read these aspects with me and I can begin to assume what your answers might be. I think that it is very important to have a high level of accountability when it comes to public funds, especially throughout a process that should be followed transparently, fairly and complying with public sector protocols. Can the minister offer an insight as to what analysis was undertaken by the SA Labor Party while in opposition on the merits of each project that has been awarded government funding without due process?

The CHAIR: Can I just clarify the initial reference for that?

Mr TELFER: Report 8 of 2022, Part A: Executive Summary at pages 6 to 9.

The CHAIR: I cannot see the references to the minister's portfolio.

Mr TELFER: Sir, I am talking about processes that are followed and we can follow on because, to give more insight to you, the minister has previously spoken about these projects being funded out of the Planning and Development Fund, thus it is well and truly under his portfolio.

The CHAIR: So you are asking if they were funded out of the Planning and Development fund?

Mr TELFER: Yes.

The CHAIR: Up 30 June 2022.

Mr TELFER: Yes. I am asking about any insight as to what analysis was taken on the merits of each project.

The CHAIR: I think this question has been asked at least a dozen times.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Yes, Chair, it must be the first time in human history a government has been taken to task for meeting its election commitments. It is quite extraordinary. I have been in opposition myself once or twice and, let me tell you, it is not the approach that we took. We looked for governments not meeting their promises.

So the honourable member is aware, Planning and Land Use Services did not provide any grant, I am advised. Planning and Land Use Services did not provide any grant payments under the Planning and Development Fund in 2021-22 which are associated with the 2022 election commitments. So the honourable member I think will have to wait until another time.

Mr TELFER: I will save that question for another 12 months, when we are having the same conversation if you are still in this position. Does that also include—

The CHAIR: I do not think that is necessary, member.

Mr TELFER: He may be Premier, sir. A man of such great stature may well be Premier.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: He may get promoted to Deputy Speaker.

The CHAIR: Promoted?

Mr TELFER: In your answer, does that also include funding from within the Open Space program?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Yes.

Mr TELFER: Perhaps I will save that one until the next one as well. I will then reference report 10 of the 2022 state finances and related matters, page 47, figure 5.12. The Auditor-General noted that non-residential building construction costs in 2021-22 had increased by 4.7 per cent and

that road and bridge construction costs had increased by 10.9 per cent. On page 46, the Auditor-General noted in relation to the infrastructure projects:

Significant increases in construction costs above the allowances provided for in the agency project estimates pose the risk of projects exceeding forecast cost estimates.

In August 2021, PlanSA announced the finalisation of plans for the Coast Park between Semaphore Park to West Lakes Shore. The previous Minister for Planning declared a linear park for a section of Coast Park between Grange and Tennyson stage 1.

On 4 November 2022, it was announced that the Minister for Planning had determined to establish a linear park from Semaphore Park to West Lakes Shore, with the design yet to be finalised and project construction due to be completed in 2023. This stage 2 Linear Park focuses on a section between Third Avenue, Semaphore Park, and the northern edge of the Wara Wayingga to Tennyson Dunes Conservation Reserve at West Lakes Shore. Does the minister expect the design plans for this section of Coast Park will change from those published in August 2021?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Again, I do not think the question is in order. It relates to what might happen next year rather than in this year.

The CHAIR: I did not get the original reference. What was the reference? You said it so quickly I missed the original reference, as did my assistants here.

Mr TELFER: Report 10 of the 2022 state finances and related matters, page 47, figure 5.12.

The CHAIR: To the extent that the minister can respond to anything which has happened up to 30 June, I notice that you referenced two announcements which were post 1 July. In that case, the minister is only required to actually respond to any information on or before 30 June, which I think he has indicated already that he cannot help. Next question.

Mr TELFER: Given the Auditor-General's comments in relation to the escalating construction costs, can the minister advise what is the current estimated cost of the construction of Coast Park stages 1 and 2?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It might be a question for another forum, Chair, but I do not think it relates to this section of the Auditor-General's Report. I do not think it is in order.

The CHAIR: I agree. Next question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: No, I read it as a point of order and I upheld his point of order. Perhaps members on my left should perhaps investigate the questions more carefully.

Mr TELFER: I will reference then, sir, and I will say it slowly for you: report 10 of 2022, state finances and related matters, page 3, paragraph 1.2.2. The Auditor-General notes:

The successful delivery of savings and maintenance of net operating surpluses may become more challenging if the SA Government's savings strategy continues to focus on non-frontline agencies. It is important that monitoring of these savings considers any potential service delivery impacts.

Can the minister advise specifically what savings targets or operating efficiencies have been set for Planning and Land Use Services, a non-frontline agency?

The CHAIR: Again, minister, you are only required to respond up to and including 30 June.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: That's right, 30 June. I am happy to respond to 30 June. The Auditor-General's Report ends on 30 June.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: on the question that the member for Flinders just asked, yes, you are correct; obviously, the statements are only referenced up to 30 June. But the question can include, as I understand it, reflections on whether the government has a policy approach that is in response to the 2021-22 financial year that might be relevant for the future; otherwise, questions about whether the government or an agency had responded to a

particular recommendation of the Auditor-General would also be out of order under the strict interpretation you have suggested.

The CHAIR: This is an examination of the Auditor-General's Report. I think what you are trying to cover are things that can be covered in other forums, either in estimates committees or by questions in the chamber. That is where you can go to your heart's delight about these matters. Can you please repeat the question.

Mr TELFER: My question was specifically around savings targets or operating efficiencies because the Auditor-General does note—on page 3, paragraph 1.2.2 of report 10, as I said—the challenges around government savings strategies for non-frontline agencies. I am asking the minister for his perspective and his advice specifically about what savings targets or operating efficiencies have been set for Planning and Land Use Services, which is indeed a non-frontline agency, as highlighted by the Auditor-General.

The CHAIR: That would have been included in the budget papers, and it should have been part of estimates. Savings are in the budget papers.

Mr TELFER: Sir, absolutely, I concur; the numbers are. I am asking about the impacts on the services of Planning and Land Use Services, which is a non-frontline agency, in response to the commentary that the Auditor-General has provided within his report.

The CHAIR: You are looking forward: an Auditor-General looks back. It is a simple formula. I used to work there. You can use all your time arguing with me, or you can use the six remaining minutes to ask questions relevant to the Auditor-General's Report. It is up to you. It is your choice.

Mr TELFER: I am happy, then, to get the perspective from the minister on the potential impacts up to 30 June 2022 on service delivery in Planning and Land Use Services.

The CHAIR: Minister, that question is in order.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The nature of this particular report is that it runs across two governments, so any efficiency dividends would of course have been set in previous budgets by previous governments.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: So if they were bad, yours were worse.

The CHAIR: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If there were to be any impact on the frontline services as a result of meeting them, they would not necessarily all be this government's doing. I do not know what more I can do to illuminate the honourable member's—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: You haven't identified any impacts.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, that's right.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: So there are no impacts from budget cuts?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The departments are meeting their efficiency dividends, as I understand it. I am advised that there are no impacts to the public.

Mr TELFER: So, to illuminate me, there are no potential impacts to service delivery or to upcoming programs of work that have been identified?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: In planning, as I am advised, we met those efficiency dividends through a combination of internal savings and staffing savings. That was all done to minimise the impact on the public under both governments.

Mr TELFER: Planning and Land Use Services obviously provide governance and administrative services to the State Planning Commission, which has no staff or resources of its own. We have had an insight from the Auditor-General about potential impacts to the non-frontline agencies.

The annual report of the State Planning Commission also outlined many projects of strategic importance, including five investigation projects that will provide a framework and an evidence base

to inform the development of regional plans in 2022, especially the regional plan for Greater Adelaide. I will not use up the time by mentioning those five points, but I am sure the minister is well aware of them. Can the minister advise whether those projects have been completed?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: As I understand it, those five plans are all ongoing. Some are in a state of completion and some are not, but I might take the question on notice and provide it to you in due course. I have certainly seen no indication myself that the State Planning Commission is not undertaking the role in the most professional and competent manner.

Mr TELFER: Can the minister provide some details about what the governance approach for growth planning endorsed by the State Planning Commission in May 2021 is?

The CHAIR: While you are looking it up, can you repeat the reference for me, please?

Mr TELFER: I will have to find it.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Given that we do not have much time, I might take that on notice and get back to the honourable member with a fulsome answer.

The CHAIR: This might be your last question, so make it a good one.

Mr TELFER: How do I choose? It is like choosing between your children. In light of the savings targets and operating efficiencies that have been put in place by this government in the May budget, is the minister confident that Planning and Land Use Services has the resources and capacity to provide the necessary support to the commission for it to progress all the strategic projects currently underway?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The question is not in order, but of course the government has a budget, and we are undertaking to make savings, and we are confident we will meet them.

The CHAIR: That concludes the examination of the Auditor-General's Report. The committee has further considered the Auditor-General's Report 2021-22 and has completed its examination of ministers on matters contained therein.

Bills

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (MONITORING ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO 3) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LIVESTOCK (EMERGENCY ANIMAL DISEASE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 18:15 the house adjourned until Wednesday 16 November 2022 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY**

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 May 2022).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. The Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network was aware that the ferry service to Kangaroo Island was reducing, and all required bookings on the ferry service for this period had been made well in advance so that vaccination staff could travel to and from the Island as required.

2. Kangaroo Island Health Service (KIHS) currently does not offer dialysis due to a number of barriers, including low patient demands for dialysis. The former liberal government also failed to address the ongoing workforce shortages.

Home dialysis is an option for those who are eligible, and those residents who are required to travel off the island to receive renal dialysis work closely with the local SeaLink office to ensure ferry bookings are secured.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 May 2022).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Patient Assistance Transport Scheme is an important measure to provide support for patients having to travel to Adelaide for treatment. As you are aware the previous liberal government did not increase the fuel subsidy during their four years in office.

Through the recent state budget, the new Malinauskas labor government has committed an additional \$2.4 billion over five years to the public health system, and as part of that has prioritised providing more funding to support the improvement of regional health services so more people can receive treatment close to where they live. This includes rolling out several initiatives to address aging health infrastructure and workforce and skills shortages that our government has inherited.

RESIDENTIAL LAND RELEASE

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (20 October 2022).

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning): I have been advised of the following:

In the six months since the March 2022 election approximately 4,200 allotments have been approved across the state. This is in conjunction with the additional 9,700 allotments currently under assessment by relevant authorities, including one application for 700 allotments within the Playford North extension.

RESIDENTIAL LAND RELEASE

In reply to **Mr TARZIA (Hartley)** (20 October 2022).

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning): I have been advised of the following:

There are a total of 773 active development applications seeking approval for additional residential allotments in the state.

Should these development applications be granted approval it would create an additional 9,700 allotments.

There are 24 development applications awaiting approval for more than 100 residential allotments each.

The largest development application awaiting approval is for 700 allotments. This application is located on land within the Playford North extension development front.

Approval time frames are based on a range of factors and therefore it is not possible to provide exact timeframes around when these applications will be approved.

What we can say is land division consent applications are legislated to be assessed within a 60-business day period. However, the assessment may take longer depending on several factors including the provision of a sufficient level of information from applicants, whether referral advice from other government agencies is needed, and if public notification is required. Current data indicates that average assessment timeframes for land division applications are well under the 60-day period.